

Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change  
Series II. Asia, Volume 2  
Series VI. Foundations of Moral Education, Volume 5

# **Chinese Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development**

Edited by  
*Tran Van Doan, Vincent Shen and George F. Mclean*

The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy

**Copyright © 1991 by  
The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy**

Gibbons Hall B-20  
620 Michigan Avenue, NE  
Washington, D.C. 20064

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication**

Chinese foundations for moral education and the character development / edited by Tran Van Doan, Vincent Shen, George F. McLean.

p.cm. — (Cultural heritage and contemporary change. Series III. Asia ; vol. 2) (Cultural heritage and contemporary change. Series VI. Foundations of moral education ; vol. 5)

Includes bibliographies and index.

1. Moral education—China. 2. Moral education—China—History. 3. Series.

I. Tran, Van Doan. II. McLean, George F. III. Shen, Ch'Ch'ing-sung. IV. Series. V. Series: Cultural heritage and contemporary change. Series VI. Foundations of moral education ; v. 5)

LC315.C5C447 1991  
370.11'4'0951—dc20

91-58113  
CIP

ISBN 1-56518-033-X & 1-56518-032-1 (pbk.)

# Table of Contents

Preface	v
Introduction	1
<b>Part I. Classical Chinese Resources for the Formation of Character</b>	
1. The Metaphysical Foundations of Traditional Chinese Moral Education by <i>Peter Kun-Yu Woo</i> (National Taiwan University, Taiwan)	7
2. Human Nature and Human Education: On Human Nature as Tending Toward Goodness in Classical Confucianism by <i>Pei-Jung Fu</i> (National Taiwan University, Taiwan)	19
3. Hsin-Techniques and Hsin-Leadership Psychological Aspects of Confucian Moral Philosophy by <i>Hang Thaddeus T'ui-chieh</i> (National Chengchi University, Taiwan)	29
<b>Part II. Chinese and Western Philosophical Foundations for Contemporary Moral Education</b>	
4. Developmental Psychology and Knowledge of Being by <i>John Farrelly</i> (St. Anselm's Abbey, USA)	45
5. The Person and Moral Growth by <i>George F. McLean</i> (RVP)	67
6. Anthropological Foundation of Moral Education Responding to Rapid Technological Development by <i>Vincent Shen</i> (National Chengchi University, Taiwan)	97
<b>Part III. Moral Education: Student and Teacher, School and Nation</b>	
7. The Ideological Education and Moral Education by <i>Tran Van Doan</i> (National Taiwan University, Taiwan)	113
8. Higher Moral Education in Taiwan by <i>Arnold Sprenger</i> (Fu Jen University, Taiwan)	155
9. In Defense of Character Development by <i>Kevin Ryan</i> (Boston University, USA)	185
Acknowledgements	



## Preface

This volume, *Chinese Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development*, is a basic step in a series dealing with "Chinese Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Life." In view of rapid social change which threatens loss of cultural root and systemic self-alienation for the future, this series is designed: 1) to explore the richness and depth of our cultural heritage, 2) to reconstruct it in the light of modern knowledge, 3) to relate it to practical life and, finally 4) to discover a new mode of life that is fully both modern and Chinese.

The enterprise is not easy; it demands energy as well as sacrifice. The difficulty consists not merely in communicating what is already known on these topics as if that were sufficient. New forces at work in the 20th century have reduced the person to a mere function, benevolence has been supplanted by system and philosophy by ideology: both God and man have died. In this situation attempt merely to repeat the past will not suffice; rather, the wisdom with which our cultural heritage has spoken through time gives promise that it has much to say, at this transition to the 21st century.

There is need then to reach back into our heritage to find there not only what it has done for the past, but even more what it can contribute to the future. Scholars in our day must work to give it new voice and to enable it to speak to the new issues which have emerged from the experience of this century. They must evoke from it the creative inspiration for building the Chinese civilization of the 21th century and for contributing richly to the even more closely interwoven history of mankind. This subject is too comprehensive to be handled in a specific volume, by a limited number of scholars. In order adequately to grasp the problem and elaborate responses there is need of multiple volumes dealing with the whole of Chinese history and Chinese society.

The general theme of Chinese Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Life must be studied from such aspects such as morals, religion, politics, education, science, etc. In this series each topic will be worked out by a group of experts, both from China and abroad. After an adequate period for research, a seminar on the topic will be convened in which the scholars share, mutually critique and refine their own ideas, as well as exploring together the ways in which to build the future, prepare the work for systematic and scientific presentation by the editors. This project is supported by the Council for Research in Values and Philosophy (Washington, D.C.), the Ministry of Culture and *The Asian Journal of Philosophy*.

The publication of the series on Chinese Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Life and the present volume would not be possible without the generous and tireless help of Professor George F. McLean of The Catholic University of America and Secretary of The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, the support of the Ministry of Culture, and the deep research and generous effort of the many scholars whose work is presented here. To all of these, the editors express their most sincere gratitude.

*Tran van Doan*  
*National Taiwan University*



## Introduction

Education in our day appears trapped in its own success. By broadening the base of an educated citizenry through near universal literacy, extended schooling and intensified communications, education in these times has become a mass effort. As such its management and implementation is facilitated by whatever is conducive to "objectification", and hence to abstraction from whatever develops the truly unique and personal, the free and creative.

In a fatal cycle increasingly the external and verifiable has become the central goal. As those trained by this approach themselves become teachers, the tendency is to intensify the focus upon the same limited and limiting objectives. In the process the sense of life, the meaning of person and family, the identity of persons and peoples, and the humane basis for public life and social cooperation atrophy.

Fortunately, the resulting sense of loss, emptiness and confusion which has increasingly pervaded personal and public life has now begun to generate a renewed awareness of the importance of that which had been forgotten. There is now a broadly shared consensus that the road ahead will be one of disaster and despair unless we are able, not merely to repeat, but to renew the missing dimensions of meaning found in our heritage. Preparation for the XXIst Century must consist in drawing creatively upon our cultural traditions in order: (a) to add over and above the ever more precise infinitesimal measurements the indispensable sense of innovation and freedom which is native to a life lived in terms of infinite truth; and (b) to humanize social, legal and political structures through deep commitment to a life of harmony with nature and with others inspired and empowered by infinite love.

The papers in this volume represent the beginnings of one effort in this direction. They were initially prepared for, and intensively discussed at, a symposium on the Chinese Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development. Its goal was to survey the resources available in the Chinese tradition and to lay more solid foundations for future work. In this the Chinese scholars were joined by a few participants in a parallel effort in North America. The resulting papers have been organized in three parts.

Part I concerns the resources of the classical Chinese philosophical heritage for moral education.

- In Chapter I, Professor Peter Kun-yu Woo surveys the Chinese tradition for a context for this work in the terms in which life is lived. With sophisticated sensibility he traces the pervasive impact and continued transformation of the popular religiosity of the Pre-Chin period through the great importance of harmony and order in later periods. By contrasting this with the limited popularity of the legalist approach he points to the deeper metaphysical dimensions present in Chinese culture and available as foundations for moral education.

- Professor Pei-jung Fu in Chapter II illustrates the properly moral implication of this foundation by showing how the resulting sense of human nature focuses upon the tendency toward goodness and implies a high sense of human conduct. This has carried Chinese life through many centuries and gives this people their special cohesion and diligence in facing the challenges of contemporary life.

- Professor Thaddeus T'ui-chieh Hang in Chapter III brings out the often forgotten psychological sensitivity of this tradition, concentrating upon Hsin-Techniques and Hsin-

Leadership. This makes it possible to integrate the spiritual resources of the Buddhist dimension of the Chinese heritage. It opens the way to concrete approaches to moral training which are integral to the culture and cohesive with the deeper meaning of the pattern of physical exercises practiced daily.

Part II turns to the philosophical resources in the Chinese and Western traditions for facing the problems of a technological age in which human life tends to be reduced to functions directed toward pragmatic goals. Meanwhile, the broad human aspirations and the democratic forms of public life call for responsible action by persons conscious of their dignity. There is need then to mobilize the resources of Chinese and Western philosophy in order to provide the foundations upon which to build such a self-understanding and a corresponding project of moral education in our day

- In Chapter IV Professor John Farrelly opens a new and properly contemporary route to the sense of the real and hence to metaphysical bases for the meaning of life. By looking intensively into the various learning theories he points the way to a discovery of a sense of reality which transcends mere human constructs and shows its role in the coordination and implementation of all our thought.

- The meaning of this for the development of a sense of the person and its implications for moral education is the subject of Chapter V by Professor George F. McLean. In view of the pluralistic character of our times it appeared helpful to trace a sequentially deepening and more dynamic sense of the person, including progressively that of one who plays a role in an enterprise or social structure, to a subject that is self-conscious, and finally to the responsible and freely creative person in his or her life with others.

- Professor Vincent Shen in Chapter VI applies this work by defining the character of present and future life in industrial and technological terms. He proceeds to suggest astutely some of the considerations which must be worked through in Chinese cultural areas. Given the impact of the East Asian region in the emerging pattern of world production and the important role being played by these peoples in the technological life of other countries, it can be expected that such reflections can yield important resources for efforts of all peoples to develop the value dimension of education.

Part III concerns the realization of moral education in our day. It treats the work of the programs in the schools and universities and their relation to teacher education to national policy and cultural evolution.

- Professor Tran van Doan in Chapter VII studies the way in which this sense of personal and social identity has been developed in the Chinese cultural areas. This directs attention to the articulation of the metaphysical basis for the moral person in the long development of the Confucian tradition and the related educational programs in Taiwan today. Professor Tran van Doan analyzes the nature of ideology in its positive and negative senses, employing the insights tools of Mannheim, Gadamer and Habermas, among many others. With these he reaches penetratingly into the Confucian tradition to renew the understanding of its dynamic social vitality and to point to the way in which this could be enabled to play a more creative role in the life of the Chinese people in our day.



- In Chapter VIII Professor Arnold Sprenger reflects upon both the Confucian resources and the difficulties being experienced in Higher Education in Chinese cultural areas. As its graduates will be depended upon centrally in the future his recommendations for effectively implementing moral education at this level have special importance.

- Finally, Professor Kevin Ryan in Chapter IX extends this challenge to teachers and future teachers at the secondary and primary level. The challenge he presents is great, but not out of proportion to the supreme importance of the task. Inspired in part by the seminar which elicited the work of this volume, and by the rich resources and deep concern of the Chinese tradition for moral training, he presents teachers and us all with a horizon of challenge, deeply grounded hope and high dedication.

This study extends the project on The Foundations of Moral Education and Character Development, previous volumes of which include: *Philosophical Foundations*; *Psychological Foundations*; and *Character Development in Schools and Beyond* described more fully at the end of this volume.

*George F. McLean*



**Part I**  
**Classical Chinese Resources for the Formation of Character**



1.  
**The Metaphysical Foundations of  
Traditional Chinese Moral Education**

*Peter Kun-Yu Woo*

It has been claimed that Chinese culture is oriented toward morality; that moral culture, in turn, is rooted in human nature; and that human nature is self-justifying (*causa sui*). This theoretical framework has been taken as the orthodox position in Chinese philosophical thought.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, it has been held also that the theoretical framework of Chinese philosophy is not grounded in human nature, that is, human nature is not *causa sui* in the ontological sense, but itself originates from God,<sup>2</sup> as is the case in Western metaphysics.

In general philosophical systems epistemology is often considered the entrance to wisdom, metaphysics the protoessence of philosophy, and ethics the results of practical thinking or the application of the principles obtained by metaphysical research. Moral education evidently belongs to this practical part of philosophy which, in turn, must have its metaphysical foundation. Is that foundation human nature, God, or something else?

In this paper we would like to seek an answer and will proceed in three main steps to study: the historical development, the essential content and its contemporary implications.

### **Historical Development**

In the history of Chinese philosophy there were several prominent schools in the pre-Chin Period (6th-3rd Centuries B.C.): the Confucian School originating from Confucius (551-479 B.C.) and developed by Mencius (372-289 B.C.) and Hsün-tzu (298-238 B.C.); the Taoist School originating from Lao-tzu (ca. 571-467 B.C.) and developed by Chuang-tzu (369-286 B.C.) and Lieh-tzu (ca. 500 B.C.); the Mohist School originating from Mo-tzu (479-381 B.C.) and the Yin-yang School; the Legalist School originating from Kuan-tzu (?-647 B.C.) and developed by Shen Pu-hai (?-337 B.C.), Shang Yang (?-338 B.C.), Shen-tao (300-230 B.C.) and Han Fei-tzu (280-233 B.C.).

Let us first take an overview of the historical development of these Schools as regards the metaphysical foundation of the theory of moral education.

In China, as in all other ancient cultures, the origin of education was remote and obscure, but philosophy of education seems to have been born along with the philosophical schools. In the pre-historical period of ancient China the practice of education seemed very simple: parents and elders served as the teacher. The content of teaching consisted mainly of skills for satisfying daily needs and means for maintaining proper interpersonal relations.<sup>3</sup> Since the beginning of philosophy in the Spring-Autumn period, and its flourishing in the period of Warring-States, Chinese scholars have been aware that mankind is situated between heaven and earth and among fellow human beings. It needs a norm or a directive principle for its own behavior and for the search for the meaning of life. In order to propagate their theories philosophers developed a training method or education whose essential content was the philosophical thought founded in a system to explain the meaning of life.

## *The Pre-Chin Period*

Philosophy flourished because of the social and cultural decay in the Spring and Autumn period (722-484 B.C.) and the period of Warring-States (403-221 B.C.). The decline of the Chou Dynasty (1122-256 B.C.) was described by Mencius:

Again the world fell into decay, and principles faded away. Perverse speaking and oppressive deeds waxed rife again. There were instances of ministers who murdered their sovereigns, and of sons who murdered their fathers.<sup>4</sup>

This meant that the reality no longer corresponded to the name. Thus, Confucius advocated the doctrine of "the rectification of names,"<sup>5</sup> which he explained as to "Let the ruler be ruler, the minister minister, the father, and the son son"<sup>6</sup> in order to restore social order. In interpersonal relationship Confucius and his disciples promoted "*Jen*" (human-heartedness, which consists in loving others)<sup>7</sup> as a guiding principle for both personal perfection and social order. The virtue of *Jen* enables man to become a *Chün-tzu* (gentleman) in cultivating himself, and to become *Shen-jen* (sage) in assisting others. *Chün-tzu* and *Shen-jen* are perfect men who are united with heaven (union with God). Therefore *Chung-Yung* (Doctrine of the Mean) said: "Who can give its full development to his nature . . . able to assist the transforming and nourishing powers of Heaven and Earth, he may with Heaven and Earth form a ternion."<sup>8</sup>

Human nature, according to Confucius, is changeable according to one's surroundings and training. His remark that "by nature, men are nearly alike; by practice, they get to be wide apart"<sup>9</sup> implies the need for education. According to Mencius, however, human nature is good<sup>10</sup> in its essence,<sup>11</sup> but because of outside influences and contamination the good nature of man must be protected and enlightened through education. Hsün-tzu, who held human nature to be evil,<sup>12</sup> in direct opposition to Mencius, advocated equally firmly the need of training with *Li* (rites) in order for one to become a sage.

The ideal personality to which the Confucian School aspired is therefore a twofold achievement: individual perfection and social order. In this regard Confucius and his followers seemed to have taken an anthropo-centric and humanistic position, considering human nature as the center-point and ultimate philosophical foundation, as many contemporary so-called Neo-confucianists have claimed.<sup>13</sup> But if we study the entire *Analects* with careful metaphysical insight, we can see that human nature evidently is not the ultimate reality or the moral foundation of human action. The ultimate foundation of human nature according to Confucians is *Tien-ming* (Decrees of Heaven). The *Chung-Yung* says: "What Heaven has conferred is called the Nature; and accordance with this nature is called the Tao of duty; the regulation of the Tao is called *Instruction*."<sup>14</sup>

The metaphysical sense of *Tien-ming* was used by Mencius no less than seven times, and the term *Tien* (Heaven) seventy five times. Mencius obviously followed Confucius' view of *Tien* as the ultimate reality of the universe and especially of man's ultimate concern.

Together with Hsün-tzu, the third generation Confucianist, the Legalists abandoned the metaphysical sense of *Tien*, and denied the existence of a personal God. As a consequence they lost the supernatural support for moral obligation. From the legalistic point of view there was no conscience to control individual human acts, nor were there moral principles for social order. In order to regulate the society what is needed is law, with its devices of reward and punishment,

which the people desire or fear. For the legalists the function of education, which the government provided for the people, was not ethical, but only pragmatic and utilitarian.

Where the Legalists aimed at the "Great State with a large population," the Taoist School took as its political aim "a little state with a small population."<sup>15</sup> From Lao-tzu, through Chuang-tzu, to Lieh-tzu the Taoists all desired to maintain the natural life-style without any cultural or artificial intrusion. Instead of engaging in human activities and efforts they spend all their strength on cultivating themselves so as to forget Confucian virtues, and mundane desires, and even to dissolve the connection with the body and its parts, leaving the material form through sitting and forgetting all things.<sup>16</sup> The metaphysical foundation of Taoist School consists in *Tzu-jen* (Spontaneity).<sup>17</sup> Negatively, this spontaneous spirit avoids many troubles by refraining from desires; positively, it possesses purity and sincerity of man's innermost mind. In this sense though the Taoists did not teach people how to live in a community with others, they did train each person to lead a preternatural life.

### *Chin and Han-dynasties*

The Confucian and Taoist Schools did not succeed in restoring the declining society in the Spring and Autumn and the Warring-States periods. The aggressive Legalist School was able eventually to put its ideology into practice. Adopting the theory of Li-ssu, a practical legalist, the Chin dynasty reunified the six states and fulfilled the political dream of a "Great state with a large population." But, because of lack of popular support, the Chin dynasty was very short-lived and the Han dynasty took its place. The Confucian School was revived and remained active during the Han dynasty and for a long time thereafter. The *Ta-Hsüeh* (Great Learning) was a famous book for education during this time. This book states three goals: manifestation of one's illustrious virtue, loving the people, and resting in the highest good. Its method is to begin from self-cultivation as the fundamental standpoint, and proceed to the regulation of the family, the order of the state, and finally the peace of the whole world as the ultimate aim.<sup>18</sup>

Tung Chung-shu's (179-104 B.C.) proposal to make Confucianism the orthodox doctrine at the expense of other schools of thought was accepted and apparently it became the official theory of education in the Han dynasty. In reality, the Taoist life-style, which stood in direct opposition to the Legalist theory, had attracted many emperors and scholars, such as Emperor Kao-tzu (reg. 206-195 B.C.), Queen Lü (reg. 188-180 B.C.), philosophers Lu-chia (260-170 B.C.), Chia-yi (200-168 B.C.) and the author of the *Huai-nan-tzu*, Liu An (179-122 B.C.), etc. Wu-ti (reg. 140-87 B.C.) himself accepted the orthodoxy of Confucianism, but in practice often used the Legalist method to promote his political aims. Thus in the Han dynasty there was an amalgamation of all schools, which had flourished in pre-Chin period. We may admit that in the schools in the Han period Confucian Ethics was taught, but in the society the mass learned all the traditional worldviews.

A very important factor in the Han dynasty was that scholars were very much interested in the *I-Ching* (*Book of Change*). *I-Ching* not only emphasizes a cosmological world-orientation, but also endorses the existence of a transcendental Divinity. Such philosophers as Tung Chung-shu, Liu An, Yang Hsiung (53 B.C.-18 A.D.) all have metaphysical as well as mystical views on the unity of the universe. *Tien-ming* (*Decrees of Heaven*) was held not only as the directive principle of all rulers, but also as the "arche" of the universe. Despite its elements of divination and superstition the theory of *Tien-jen-kan-ying* (the mutual interaction between heaven and man) was really a kings-highway through which human beings could reach their supernatural goal. This provided a metaphysical foundation for individual ethics and for social principles.

### *Sui (589-618 A.D.) and Tang (618-907 A.D.) Dynasties*

This was the time, in which the native Chinese wisdom, after study and comparison, finally mixed with the imported Buddhistic culture. At this time Chinese culture and religion flourished with the absorption of ideas from alien sources. A great achievement was the elevation of human nature to the level of "Nirvana." Similar to the Taoist School, the Buddhist religion considers the sensible world to be the lower, phenomenal, and unreal existence. The ultimate reality according to Buddhism lies in another world to come. As a part of this cosmological view the theory of human nature is also dualistic: man consists of soul and body. The bodily life is temporal and spatial; the spiritual life is eternal and infinite. The whole point of education in Buddhism was therefore to transcend the sensible and to reach the non-sensible, super-natural world, which meant transcending time, past, present and future. The concept of transmigration of the soul shows that there are rewards for good demeanor and retribution for evil during one's life-time. This was taught to the entire population. Buddhistic theory therefore supported the pre-Chin philosophers' view that "all must consider the cultivation of the person the root of everything."<sup>20</sup>

The idea of Samsara and retribution has the result of creating the moral motivation for, and the religious belief in, future life. From the cultural amalgamation of Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism a new world view was produced. People learned the religious respect for Heaven from Confucianism, the wisdom of life from Taoism, and the idea of self-cultivation from Buddhism. On this triple foundation the essential characteristics of Chinese philosophy were based and the ternion of the three philosophies became the common core of the Chinese life style.

### *Sung (960-1127 A.D.) and Ming (1368-1644 A.D.) Dynasties*

Scholars of this period stressed the rational approach to the study of the Classics and again advocated Confucian orthodoxy. On the surface they tried to free themselves from bondage to Buddhism, but in their philosophical theories traces of Buddhistic influence remain, especially in the theory of "Mind" and "Nature." Human mind became their main concern and was eventually taken to be the ultimate reality. Thus, the transcendental sense of cosmology disappeared, and in its place an immanent entity deeply rooted in human mind was posited. Whatever the philosophers of the pre-Chin period meant by heaven, the scholars in Sung and Ming dynasties called mind, and whatever the pre-Chin philosophers considered transcendental in this time was called immanent. So a humanism in the strict sense replaced the relative humanism of the pre-Chin Confucianism which, though accepting an anthropo-centric theory, did not exclude the possibility of the existence of external world and of the existence of God. The human being was taken to be self-sufficient or *causa sui*, autonomous not only in the epistemological order but also in the ontological one. One ought to do good not because of the decrees of Heaven, but because of the postulate of one's inner conscience.

One of the greatest philosophical achievements of the Ming scholar, Wang Yang-ming (1472-1528 A.D.), was the creation of Universism, which previously was seldom discussed by Chinese scholars. In his universistic project Wang Yang-ming unconsciously linked the traditional moral "praxis-orientation" with the Buddhistic religious "pistis-orientation" by means of "gnosis." Yang-ming's "preservation of the heavenly *Li* (principle), and removal of human passions" means the "unification of *gnosis* and praxis," and the "amalgamation of transcendence and immanence."

The result of the research of Sung and Ming scholars was the deepening of idealism, which belongs rather to Buddhism than to Confucianism.



## *The Ching Dynasty (1644-1911 A.D.)*

When China was ruled by the Manchus, philosophical creativity was rare and the scholars devoted much of their time and effort to covetousness. The formalistic utilitarian educational system corrupted the inner spirit of the ordinary people. During the last part of the dynasty China faced the challenge of Westernisation. The controversies between advocates of total westernisations and of selective adoption indicated that the Chinese tradition of moral education had to find a new way of expression. In 1867<sup>21</sup> Western educational methods were introduced and the essential content of education gradually changed from traditional to evolutionary, and from moral to technical. After Sun Yat-sen's revolution many thinkers tried to combine the moral and the technical, the theoretical and the practical in the schools, but because of the May-Fourth-Movement, which abandoned the Confucian tradition, the educational system moved more and more toward the pragmatic and the technical. Traditional moral education diminished in influence, especially after the 1949 communist revolution.

### **The Essential Content**

#### *Human Nature*

From this brief survey of the historical development of traditional Chinese philosophy of education, we find that the metaphysical foundation of educational theory lies in human nature. If human nature is 'good' then the training would be mild and the method of leading and persuasion would be practised, so that the good nature is preserved or even further developed, as Mencius and many other Confucians had maintained. If human nature is evil, then the training is rigorous and carried out with punishment, so that the evil nature would be transformed by force, as Hsün-tzu and his Legalist followers hold. If human nature is neutral and changeable, then it needs education to lead nature into becoming good.<sup>22</sup> The other point to be discussed is the relation between human nature and human life. A utilitarian thinker would maintain that in order for the life in this world to be meaningful we must live a happy life. An ascetic man, however, would recommend a pious life because of the sorrows and sufferings existing in this sensible world.

The aims of the philosophy of education are: a better life, the elevation of human nature, social order, and fulfillment of one's ultimate concern.<sup>23</sup> Every philosophical school tries to promote its theory in order to realize these aims, but each has to provide a philosophical foundation in order for its theory to be effective.

It is a common practice in philosophy for theories and arguments to be supported by an ultimate reason which in turn reposes on a self-sufficient ultimate substance or *causa sui*. This ultimate substance bears similarities to the Taoist *Tao* or the Christian God. In the Chinese tradition, the Pre-Confucian classics and the Confucian literature in the pre-Chin period have viewed *Tien* (Heaven) as ontologically the ultimate foundation of the universe, and *Tien-Ming* (decrees of Heaven) as ethically the ultimate substratum of human being. In *Shu-ching* (*Book of History*) *Tien* was thought to be conscious and personal, righteous in retributing goods and punishing evils. The Neo-Confucians from Sung and Ming Dynasties onward rejected the transcendental and personal God and held human nature to be absolute and eternal. This resulted in the deification of man and the inner moral postulate became the ultimate foundation of all ethical affairs.

The metaphysical foundation of 'Chinese traditional education' is then twofold: theo-centric and anthropo-centric.

*Theo-centric education* flourished in the Pre-Chin period. At that time the people, and especially the ruler, had to learn the "adoration of Tien," in which the religious ceremony of "sacrifice" took place. The sacrifice, however, was carried out on three different levels: the emperor (Tien-tzu, the son of Heaven) offers sacrifices to Heaven, the kings and officials to the gods of mountains and of rivers, and the ordinary men to their ancestors and the gods of the kitchen. Heaven, gods and ancestors are all benefactors of man.<sup>24</sup> In the Han dynasty this theo-centric education under political patronage went further in the style of Tung Chung-shu's doctrine of "the interaction between Heaven and man." The belief in Heaven has since become a popular view in Chinese folk religion, especially in religious Taoism after Han. For hundreds of years the Chinese people found in this religious sentiment the motive for all moral behavior. This philosophical teaching was passed on from generation to generation in each family.

*Anthropocentric theory* has two forms. The first neglects the transcendent God and holds human nature to be absolute in both the epistemological and the ontological sense. This type of educational theory maintains the supreme dignity of human beings. Neo-confucians are typical representatives of this theory. The second anthropocentric theory is alert to the changeable nature of man, and thinks that human beings through self-cultivation can be elevated to the status of the divine. Taoists, Buddhists and some Sung and Ming scholars take this position on the morality of individual conduct and interpersonal relation.

### *Social Nature*

Human nature, whether good or evil, possesses all the same characteristics of "Mit-sein" (Being-with), i.e., man is being with other men. This is the category of society and interpersonal relation. Hence morality consists in

Let the ruler be ruler, the minister minister, the father father, and the son son.<sup>25</sup>

To teach the relations of humanity: how, between father and son, there should be affection; between sovereign and minister, righteousness; between husband and wife, attention to their separate functions; between old and young, a proper order; and between friends, fidelity.<sup>26</sup>

Affection, righteousness, separate functions, order and fidelity in the relations of humanity, are considered by Mencius to be the differential criteria between man and beast. Confucian education starts with the cultivation of oneself, then the regulation of family, the order of the state and finally peace in the whole world.

Cultivation of oneself is required not only in family and school, but also in the praxis of the individual. "From the son of Heaven down to the mass of the people, all must consider the cultivation of the person the root of everything besides."<sup>27</sup>

Cultivation of oneself could be realized in a twofold manner: *Chiün-tzu* and *Shen-jen*. The former refers to personal perfection, and the latter to the order of community. *Chiün-tzu* and *Shen-jen* compose the concept of *Jen* (human-heartedness) which stands for the most perfect man. The order of community however begins with family. This is one of the most characteristic features of

Chinese moral culture: "Filial piety and fraternal submission! Are they not the root of all benevolent actions?"<sup>28</sup> Hence familial education is very effective throughout Chinese cultural history. In Mencius three of the five human relations belong to the category of family: the relations between father and son, husband and wife, and old and young. The familial virtue of affection, separate functions and order serve as the proto-type of the virtues of national society and of the whole world. Interpersonal relations begin with the mutual love of family members, is developed into the fraternal love of fellow-men, and finally into the unlimited love of all mankind.

Through interpersonal love and concern the Confucians believe that the whole world would be united in one. Thus in training as well as in the content of education the emphasis is upon interpersonal benevolence, especially upon the concrete social order in which sovereigns rule the people, not by means of law and punishment, but through their own virtue.

The ideal Confucian society consists in the order based on mutual love between father and son, between husband and wife, between old and young. While the essence of society according to the Confucians consists in familial and fraternal love, the Legalists see it in law and regulation. In the legalist society the ruler does not need moral virtue, but only the power and method to implement the law in order to maintain social order.

In our discussion of the metaphysical foundation of moral education it is obvious that, for the Confucianists the emphasis is on the familial or fraternal love rooted either in the decrees of Heaven, or in the good nature of man. For the Legalists, however, the emphasis is on law and punishment based on the evil nature of man.

The reason why, in the whole history of China, the legalist theory flourished only once--in the Chin dynasty (246-206 B.C.)--whereas Confucianism remained the predominant school for thousands of years, can perhaps be found in the difference between their respective views of the metaphysical foundation of morality. Adopting the Confucianist insight, ordinary Chinese people from generation to generation are inclined to believe in Heaven and in the goodness of human nature.

### *Heaven*

This belief originated first with Confucius, and second in Chinese folk religion. Confucius himself insisted many times in his ordinary teachings that he rejected the preter-natural beings, as the following quotations testify:

The subjects on which the Master did not talk, were extra-ordinary things, feats of strength, disorder, and spiritual beings.<sup>29</sup>

The Master's personal displays of his principles and ordinary description of them may be heard. His discourses about man's nature, and the *Tao* of Heaven, cannot be heard.<sup>30</sup>

These texts have been used frequently by the so-called Neo-Confucianists to support the anthropo-centric, or even the atheistic or anti-theistic worldview.<sup>31</sup>

In fact, Confucius referred often to these preternatural beings in explaining his religious attitude, when he considered the ultimate limits and innermost concerns. He said:

My praying has been for a long time--when very sick and his disciple Tzu-lu asked leave to pray the spirits of the upper and lower world for him.<sup>32</sup>

May heaven reject me! May heaven reject me!--after having visited Nan-tzu, the beautiful but not very clever woman and about which Tzu-lu was displeased.<sup>33</sup>

It is the appointment of Heaven, alas!--when his disciple Po-niu was seriously ill.<sup>34</sup>

Heaven is destroying me! Heaven is destroying me!-- when his beloved disciple Yen-yüan died.<sup>35</sup>

He who offends against Heaven has none to whom he can pray.<sup>36</sup>

He sacrificed to the dead, as if they were present. He sacrificed to the spirits, as if the spirits were present."<sup>37</sup>

Even Confucius in narrating his own biography used this sentence: "At fifty, I know the decrees of Heaven."<sup>38</sup> Many other passages with the same sense show that Confucius was a believer of Heaven, as was written in *Shu-ching*.

It is not unreasonable to suspect that the anthropocentric humanism of the Sung and Ming dynasties was influenced by Buddhism, and that the same theory in circulation today is affected by the western materialism, atheism or anti-theism.

### **Contemporary Implications**

Ordinary people in China believe in the existence of God, the retribution in the other world, and life after death. Among scholars and intellectuals, however, perhaps due to a lack of wholesome philosophical investigation or infatuation with the utilitarian life, the anthropo-centric orientation plays an important role. It is time to examine the meaning of life and to seek a sound metaphysical foundation to support one's worldview. Between popular consensus and philosophical sophistication, between our ultimate concern and temporary benefits, we must make a decisive choice and find a strong, effective motive for cultivating ourselves and becoming perfect in order to live an eternally happy life.

The social order seems gradually to have declined because of unlimited development and progress in technology and economy. These obviously are not the ultimate goals of human effort, but only means for human beings to obtain a better life. The beatitude of life should be the aim of all development and progress. How to make our life happier and to keep this happiness forever is the question which must be answered.

The problem of education lies not in comparing and clarifying various opposed theories of training, but in promoting action toward the achievement of the goal of education. Realizing the educational purpose is identical to becoming human, no matter how many different theories there are about moral education, the goal of teaching remains to become human.<sup>39</sup>

In education the teacher has not only to instruct students about the moral principles of good and evil, but also to show them why human beings have to do good and avoid evil. This is the *raison d'etre* of the metaphysical foundation of moral education.<sup>40</sup> At the same time, in the field of values we must let people test values for themselves and come to their own conclusions.<sup>41</sup>

The decline of the social order in China is undeniable. Unlike western society, in which institutionalized religion plays a salvific role when morality falls into decay, there would be no salvation for the Chinese social order after its decline should it be guided still by anthropocentric theory. It is extremely urgent, therefore, to reawaken the traditional and genuinely religious sentiments, especially the belief in Heaven, in these tumultuous times.

*National Taiwan University  
Taipei, Taiwan*

## NOTES

1. It is well known and very widely advertised in Chinese academic circles, that the representatives of the Sin-ya school of Neo-Confucianism such as Tang Chün-yi, Mou Tsung-san, Lau Ssu-kwong, etc., interpret Confucian theory as strictly anthropocentric.

2. This metaphysical reinterpretation of Confucian philosophy is now being constantly propounded and elaborated by many Catholic scholars in Taiwan, such as Stanislaus Lo-kuang, Albert Chao, John C.H. Wu, etc.

3. Yen Shi-sien, *A History of Chinese Educational Thought*, (Taipei: Shang-wu, 1981), p. 443.

4. *Mencius*, Bk III. Pt. II, Ch. IX, 7.

5. *Confucian Analects*, XIII, 3.

6. *Ibid.*, XII, 11.

7. *Ibid.*, XII, 22.

8. *The Doctrine of the Mean*, Ch. XX11.

9. *Confucian Analects*, XV11, 2.

10. *Mencius*, Bk. III, Pt. I, Ch. 2.

11. *Ibid.*, Bk. VI, Pt. I, Ch. 7.

12. *Hsün-tzu*, Ch. 23.

13. See 1.

14. *The Doctrine of the Mean*, Ch. 1,1.

15. *Tao-te-ching*, Ch. 80.

16. *Chuang-tzu*, Bk. VI, Ch. 14.

17. *Tao-te-ching*, Ch. 25.

18. *The Great Learning*, the text of Confucius.

19. Stanislaus Lo-kuang, *A History of Chinese Philosophical Thought: Han dynasties*. (Taipei: Hsüeh-shen Book Store, 1978), p. 16.

20. *The Great Learning*, the text of Confucius.

21. In 1867 Tung-wen-kuan was first established, in which the students learned several foreign languages in order to prepare themselves for translating foreign literature.

22. Cf. Steven M. Cahn, *The Philosophical Foundation of Education* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p. 180.

23. George F. Kneller, *The Philosophy of Education* (New York: Wiley, 1971), p. 5.

24. Cf. N.Z. Zia, *Philosophy of Religion* (Tai-chung, Taiwan: Tung-hai University Press, 1980), p. 72 seq.

25. *Confucian Analects*, XII, 11.

26. *Mencius*, Bk. III, Pt. I, Oh. IV.

27. *The Great Learning*, the text of Confucius.

28. *Confucian Analects*, I, 2.

29. *Ibid.*, VII, 20.

30. *Ibid.*, V, 12.

31. See 1.

32. *Confucian Analects*, VII, 34.

33. *Ibid.*, VI, 26.

34. *Ibid.*, VI, 8.

35. *Ibid.*, XI, 8.

36. *Ibid.*, III, 13.

37. *Ibid.*, III, 12.

38. *Ibid.*, II, 4.

39. Cf. John S. Brucacher, *Modern Philosophies of Education* (New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1950), p. 1.

40. Cf. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: Columbia University Press 1955), p. 375.

41. Cf. Harry Schofield, *The Philosophy of Education* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1977), p. 209.

## 2.

# Human Nature and Human Education on Human Nature as Tending Toward Goodness in Classical Confucianism

*Fu Pei-Jung*

By "Classical Confucianism" I mean a trend of thought initiated by Confucius (551-479 B.C.), developed by Mencius (c. 371-289 B.C.) and Hsün-tzu (c. 313-238 B.C.), and finally culminating in the *I-chuan* and the *Chung-yung*. To appreciate the world-view, moral ideals, and religious beliefs of the Chinese people, Classical Confucianism is the first school to be understood. In the hope of advancing this understanding, the present chapter will focus on the theory of human nature as expounded by this school. It will argue that early Confucians maintained a theory of "human nature as tending toward goodness." The discussion will contain three parts: (1) the presentation of this theory by Confucius, (2) the demonstration of this theory by Mencius and the *Chung-yung* in a direct and explicit way, and by Hsün-tzu and the *I-chuan* in an indirect and implicit way, and (3) the consequence of this theory, that is, the fact that the above Confucians all emphasized the obligation to perfect oneself and to bring others to attain their perfect state.

### The Theory of Confucius on Human Nature

Confucius' view on human nature was not clearly and distinctly supplied in the *Analects*. It is no surprise that one of his disciples complained that "one cannot get to hear his view on human nature" (A, 5:13).<sup>1</sup> In two passages of the *Analects*, Confucius classified men as belonging to three groups: "upper, middle and lower," but as this classification was made according to man's "learning ability" it had nothing to do with the common nature of man.<sup>2</sup> Another two passages expressed more directly Confucius' opinion in this respect.

(a) The Master said, 'That a man lives is because he is straight. That a man who dupes others survives is because he has been fortunate enough to be spared' (A, 6:19).

(b) The Master said, 'Men are close to one another by nature. They diverge as a result of repeated practice' (A, 17:2).

In passage (a), the meaning of "straight" (*chih*) is uncertain. Granted that it has moral implications, it shows only that one should follow the right way, but does not reveal what human nature is. Passage (b) informs us only that Confucius recognized that there exists a common human nature. Whereas many scholars readily connect it with goodness,<sup>3</sup> the present essay will establish that Confucius had in mind human nature as tending toward goodness. It will argue that otherwise some key passages of the *Analects* concerning politics and morality become incomprehensible.

First, Confucius described the marvelous effect of the virtuous man in the field of politics as follows:

(a) The rule of virtue can be compared to the Pole Star which commands the homage of the multitude of stars without leaving its place (A, 2:1).

(b) If there was a ruler who achieved order without taking any action, it was, perhaps, Shun. There was nothing for him to do but to hold himself in a respectful posture and to face the south (15:5).

(c) Just desire the good yourself and the common people will be good. The virtue of the gentleman is like wind; the virtue of the small man is like grass. Let the wind blow over the grass and it is sure to bend (12:19).

The above three passages would be pointless and meaningless if there were no common human nature and if this were not tending toward goodness. In other words, for Confucius the highest political ideal was the traditional ethiocracy which required that the most virtuous be the ruler because virtue was believed to be in line with human nature.<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, Confucius narrowed down the issue by emphasizing the inner relation of man's self with virtue. He said,

(a) Is *jen* really far away? No sooner do I desire it than it is here (A, 7:30).

(b) The practice of *jen* depends on oneself alone, and not on others (12:1).

(c) Is there anyone who has tried to practice *jen* for a single day? I have not come across such a man whose strength proves insufficient for the task (4:6).

A discussion of Confucius' concept of *jen* would require a more extended treatment than is possible here, but for present purposes it suffices to say that *jen* means both "the way of man" and "goodness." The above passages state that *jen* is man's inner tendency and that it is within man's ability to practice *jen*. Thus, there is solid foundation for claiming that Confucius regarded human nature as tending toward goodness.

### **Demonstration of the Theory**

On the basis of Confucius' teachings, Mencius and Hsün-tzu developed philosophies which sometimes were considered mutually complementary. As regards the theory of human nature, however, Mencius and Hsün-tzu obviously held incompatible views. The following discussion will try to show that Mencius' theory of "human nature as good" is in fact a theory of "human heart as good," and Hsün-tzu's theory of "human nature as evil" is actually a theory of "human desire as evil." These two theories are not necessarily contradictory, since they share the same underlying idea that human nature tends toward goodness. To clarify this point, we will lay more stress on the works of Mencius and the *Chung-yung* which directly elaborated on this idea than on those of Hsün-tzu and the *I-chuan* which accepted this idea in an implicit way.

#### *Mencius*

Etymologically, human "nature" (*hsing*) comes from "birth" or "to be born with" (*sheng*). The common understanding of this word in ancient China can be formulated as follows: "The inborn is what is meant by nature" (*M*, VI, A, 3).<sup>5</sup> However, this consideration of the origin of nature exhibits only what a thing has rather than what a thing is: it expresses at most the sameness rather than the difference of all things. In order to determine what a thing is, it is necessary to know its essence: the genus plus the difference of species. This rule, made familiar by Aristotle, was true also for Mencius.

First, Mencius was quite aware that in dealing with anything of the same kind, we must determine what this "same kind" means, and this is even more true when applied to man. Mencius said, "Now, things of the same kind are all alike. Why should we have doubts when it comes to



man? The sage and I are of the same kind" (*M*, VI, A, 7). The wicked, however, also belong to the same kind. Thus, in determining the essence of human beings, we should find the difference of species. Mencius said,

Slight is the difference between man and the brutes. The common man loses this distinguishing feature, while the gentleman retains it. Shun understood the way of things and had a keen insight into human relations. He followed the path of benevolence and righteousness. He did not need to pursue benevolence and righteousness (*M*, IV, B, 19).

Clearly, the essence or the distinguishing feature of man must be understood through the "slight difference" between man and the brutes. The statement about Shun is an example that benevolence and righteousness are the interior path of man, following which will have a great effect. The implication of this whole sentence is probably that benevolence and righteousness belong to the "slight difference."<sup>6</sup> Another paragraph will also help clarify the distinguishing feature of man. "A gentleman differs from other men in what he retains in his heart--namely, benevolence and propriety" (*M*, IV, B, 28).

Granted that the human essence of man can be described as benevolence, righteousness, propriety, etc., how can common people lose it? Can something be defined by a feature which can be lost? The key to the answer lies in the idea of "heart," which is to be understood here as neither bodily heart, nor soul, but mind with sensitivity. Concerning human nature, Mencius presents his famous theory of "the four germs of the heart," concluding as follows:

From this it can be seen that whoever is devoid of the heart of compassion is not human, whoever is devoid of the heart of shame is not human, whoever is devoid of the heart of courtesy and modesty is not human, and whoever is devoid of the heart of right and wrong is not human (*M*, II, A, 6).

These four states of heart are named, in turn, the germs of "benevolence, righteousness, propriety, and wisdom" (*M*, II, A, 6) within man's heart, which forms the difference of human beings. Human nature must be defined through this heart: Mencius said, "That which a gentleman follows as his nature, that is to say, benevolence, righteousness, propriety, and wisdom, is rooted in his heart" (*M*, VII, A, 21). Therefore the goodness of human nature resides in the goodness of the heart. A reservation, however, must be added, namely, that goodness exists only in the state of germ and needs to be retained, nourished, and developed. In this way Mencius demonstrated that human nature is tending toward goodness.

He did not stop at this point, but continued to examine the nature and origin of the heart. Mencius affirmed that there is a propensity for development within the heart which makes it an "evaluating heart." If this means an ability to be moral and human beings are moral agents,<sup>8</sup> does not its propensity for development imply in some sense a "commanding heart"?<sup>9</sup>

It must be the case, then, that the evaluating heart is at the same time the commanding heart, for otherwise how could Mencius honor as gentleman those who "retain" it? Only with this understanding does it become meaningful to say that "there is nothing better for the nurturing of the heart than to reduce the number of one's desires" (*M*, VII, B, 35). Only if the heart does more than evaluate can Mencius say, "The sole concern of learning is to go after this strayed heart. That is all" (*M*, VI, A, 11).

On the basis of this double character of the heart, we can look further at the heart in itself. Mencius used one word "thinking" to sum up the function of the heart. He said, "The organ of the heart can think. But it will find the answer only if it does think: otherwise, it will not find the answer. This is what Heaven has given me" (*M*, VI, A, 15). By thus explaining the source of the heart, especially its function of commanding, he bridges the gap between Heaven and man. Therefore, instead of stating that Mencius substitutes "self-legislation" for "external divine command," we prefer to say that man's self-legislation is bestowed on him by Heaven.<sup>10</sup> The relation between Heaven and man is another interesting topic in Mencius' thought, but is beyond the scope of the present essay. What we have established thus far is that the reason why human nature tends toward goodness consists in its relation with Heaven.

### *Hsün-tzu*

Hsün-tzu regarded human nature as that with which man is born (*H*, 4:39; 16:274).<sup>11</sup> He further claimed that "the nature is that which is given by Heaven; you cannot learn it, you cannot acquire it by effort" (23:290). This concept of human nature, based upon empirical observations, is of three kinds: the desire of sense organs, the ability of sense organs, and the plasticity of man's character.<sup>12</sup> Hsün-tzu seems to take man's instinct as his nature and that this in itself is neutral. How then could Hsün-tzu also affirm definitely that "man's nature is evil" (*H*, 23:289)?

The reason is that if everyone follows his instinctive tendency without restriction, the result inevitably will be "strife and rapacity, combined with rebellion and disorder, ending in violence" (*H*, 23:289). Undoubtedly this result can be defined as evil if compared with an harmonious society. Though Hsün-tzu's theory of human nature as evil cannot be understood without its background of moral and cultural idealism,<sup>13</sup> nonetheless, to define human nature through that which follows as a result is not the way it is usually defined or understood. Did not Hsün-tzu find a difference between man and the brutes, and if so why did he not use it to define the human essence?

According to Hsün-tzu, what makes the person truly human is the ability to make distinctions (*H*, 5:50), what makes the human person the highest being on earth is the sense of righteousness (*H*, 9:104). Thus, the ability to make distinctions and a sense of righteousness must belong to human nature. If well developed, there will result propriety (*li*) and righteousness (*i*), which are regarded as good. Had Hsün-tzu defined human nature through this approach, he would not have found any argument with Mencius.<sup>14</sup> Far from doing this, however, Hsün-tzu considered propriety and righteousness to be the result of artificial activity, a virtue acquired by human effort. The question then becomes: How did Hsün-tzu bridge man's evil nature and his artificial activities? To answer this question, we must take account of Hsün-tzu's concept of "heart."

Hsün-tzu's use of the concept of "heart" is not always consistent. First, the heart constitutes one element of man's emotional nature. In this sense, the heart always tends toward profit, just as ears to sound and eyes to color (*H*, 11:137, 141; 23:291): "If a man has no teacher or law, his heart is just like his mouth or belly" (*H*, 4:40). Second, the heart is higher than other senses: "The heart occupies the cavity in the center to control the five organs. This is called the natural ruler" (*H*, 17:206). This sense of heart is quite similar to that of Mencius. "The heart is the ruler of the body and the master of its god-like intelligence. It gives commands, but it is not subject to them" (*H*, 21: 265). Thus, the heart appears to have the function of distinguishing and commanding.

Since the heart also belongs to human nature, why did Hsün-tzu still insist on the evil of human nature? Further examination will show that Hsün-tzu did not consider the heart itself to be the

independent criterion of all things. He argued that in order to function, the heart must keep itself in a state of "emptiness, unity, and quiescence"; and that the condition for this is that the heart perceive the Way (*tao*) (*H*, 21:264). This third sense of the heart is central to Hsün-tzu's theory, whose key idea is that "the heart is the craftsman of the Way, and the Way is the foundation of good government" (*H*, 22:281).<sup>15</sup> Thus, there must be a close relation between the heart, representing human nature, and the Way, representing goodness. It is not inconceivable to say that Hsün-tzu also had in mind a view of human nature as tending toward goodness.

### *The I-chuan*

The *I-chuan* was designed to manifest how the sages exhibited the way of man by meditating on the way of Heaven. It focused upon clarifying the relation between Heaven and man and did not articulate any clear theory of human nature. What we may figure out in this regard is very limited. Under the 24th hexagram we read, "Do we not see in *fu* the mind of Heaven and Earth"? (*T'uan*, *Fu*, p. 233).<sup>16</sup> To clarify this hexagram, the Master (who in this context must be Confucius) said of his favorite disciple Yen Hui that "If anything he did was not good, he was sure to become conscious of that; when he knew it, he did not do the thing again" (*Hsi-tz'u*, II, p. 393). Thus, the mind (or better, the will) of Heaven and Earth is manifested in one's returning (*fu*) to one's original state, by which one discovers what one should and should not do. Consequently, the *I-chuan* affirms that "returning" presents "the root of virtue" (*Hsi-tz'u*, II, 397) and we may easily perceive that human nature is in line with goodness.

What is called the way operates incessantly with the rhythmic modulation of dynamic change and the static repose, thus continuing the creative process for the attainment of the Good and completing the creative process for the fulfillment of Nature which is Life (*Hsi-tz'u*, I, p. 355).<sup>17</sup>

This statement is especially meaningful for human beings. Again the *I-chuan* emphasized, "The perpetual continuance of fulfilled nature in life is the gate of the Way and Righteousness."<sup>18</sup> Therefore, it is understandable that the sages "exhibited the way of man under the names of benevolence and righteousness" (*Shuo-kua*, p. 423).

### *The Chung-yung*

The *Chung-yung* dealt incisively with the nature of man. First, it did not regard human nature as good in itself. "Hui made choice of the Mean, and whenever he got hold of what was good, he clasped it firmly, as if wearing it on his breast, and did not lose it" (*C*, 8:1).<sup>19</sup> If what is good can be held and lost, then it does not pertain to the nature of man.

Instead, human nature as seen by *Chung-yung* is always "tending toward" what is good, as is manifested in "knowing and practicing" the good. This includes the five duties and three virtues. The *Chung-yung* takes them as universal objectives of knowledge and action and relates them to the universal obligation of man:

Some (people) are born with the knowledge (of those duties); some know them by study; and some acquire the knowledge after a painful feeling of their ignorance. But the knowledge being possessed, it comes to the same thing. Some practice them with a natural ease; some from a desire for their advantages; and some by strenuous effort. But the achievement being, it comes to the same thing (*C*, 20:9).

This "same thing" at which human knowledge and action are aimed is goodness, which the sage "hits without an effort and apprehends without the exercise of thought" (C, 20:28). Thus, we may conclude that human nature is tending toward goodness.

The next question, whence does this kind of human nature come? The *Chung-yung* believes that human nature is conferred by Heaven (C, 1:1). The point of contact between human nature and Heaven is "sincerity" (C, 20:18): being sincere is the way of Heaven; becoming sincere is the way of man. To understand the implication of "becoming sincere," we need to ascertain what the *Chung-yung* thinks about the ordinary people. In dealing with the way of the gentleman, the *Chung-yung* notes that

Common men and women, however ignorant, may intermeddle with the knowledge of it (the way of the gentleman); . . . common men and women, however worthless, may carry it into practice. (C, 12:2)

In this passage two things are worth noting. First, to describe ordinary people as "ignorant" and "worthless" shows indirectly the dissatisfaction of the *Chung-yung* regarding the natural state of man. To be human, it is not sufficient simply to maintain one's natural life; one must follow the way of the gentleman by cultivating virtue (C, 13, 14, 15). Second, the undoubted capacity of ordinary people to know and practice the right way has something to do with our previous statement that human nature tends toward goodness.

Furthermore, if by "sincerity" is meant to be true to oneself, then the *Chung-yung* holds that when one is true to oneself one will find in one's nature "the tendency toward goodness." Instead of supplying any logical argument, the *Chung-yung* invites one to reflect upon oneself. Two passages are significant:

(a) There is nothing more visible than what is secret, and nothing more manifest than what is minute. Therefore the gentleman is watchful over himself, when he is alone (C, 1:3).

(b) He cultivates to the utmost the shoots (of goodness) in him. From those he can attain to the possession of sincerity (C, 23:1).

An inkling of mysticism can be perceived here. It seems that one is endowed with a "spark of light" in one's nature. Being true to oneself, one will naturally magnify this spark of light; thus, one carries out moral cultivation in order to be truly human.

Finally, it is impossible to repress "the expressions of sincerity" (C, 16:15). One is born with moral discrimination which distinguishes what is good from what is evil. This entails responsibility for ceaselessly "choosing what is good and firmly holding it fast." (C, 20:28) Once one possesses sincerity, one will not merely strive to complete oneself, but will extend this to other men and things (C, 25:3). This is the reason why the *Chung-yung* claims that when one attains the state of equilibrium and harmony, "a happy order will prevail throughout Heaven and Earth, and all things will be nourished and flourish" (C, 1:5).

### **Consequence of the Theory**

Three consequences of this theory were acceptable to all early Confucians:

1. All are capable of becoming gentlemen (*chiin-tzu*, the ideal personality set by Confucius). Confucius said that he never came across anyone whose strength was insufficient for practicing *jen*. Mencius expressly insisted that all can become a Yao or a Shun. Even Hsün-tzu, though without giving a satisfactory explanation, maintained that the person on the street can become a Yü. The *I-chuan* emphasized gradual cultivation which presupposes the possibility of perfecting oneself. The *Chung-yung* believed that if one chooses what is good and holds it fast, then "though dull, he will surely become intelligent; though weak, he will surely become strong" (C, 20:21).

2. All are obliged to become a gentleman. We perceive in Classical Confucianism an obligation which can be understood in terms of a "categorical imperative." To be human is to become virtuous; there is no other choice. The purpose of one's natural life is to realize one's moral ideal. Early Confucians all emphasized this categorical imperative. Both Confucius and Mencius held that man should sacrifice his life for the sake of *jen* or *i* (roughly, benevolence or righteousness). To our surprise, Hsün-tzu also declared, "A gentleman, though worrying about danger and misery, will face death for the sake of *i*" (H, 3:24). The *I-chuan* stated that a gentleman "will sacrifice his life in order to carry out his purpose (i.e., to follow the way of the sage)" (*Hsiang*, K'un, p. 325). The *Chung-yung* also claimed, "When bad principles prevail in the country, he (the gentleman) maintains his course to death without changing" (C, 10:5).

3. While becoming a gentleman, all are responsible for aiding others to attain their perfect state. A famous saying of Confucius reads, "A benevolent man helps others to take their stand insofar as he himself wishes to take his stand, and gets others there insofar as he himself wishes to get there" (A, 6:30). Mencius traced this responsibility back to Heaven, and announced,

Heaven, in producing the people, has given to those who first attain understanding the duty of awakening those who are slow to understand; and to those who are the first to awaken the duty of awakening those who are slow to awaken (MR, V, A, 7; V, B, 1).

Leaving the concept of Heaven aside, Hsün-tzu found no disagreement with Mencius's position that, "All creatures of the universe, all who belong to the species of man, must await the sage before they can attain their proper places" (H, 19:243). The *I-chuan* emphasized the status of the sages who "would give their proper course to the aims of all under the sky, would give stability to their undertakings, and determine their doubts" (*Hsi-tz'u*, I, p. 371). Finally, *Chung-yung* best expressed the highest ideal set for man by Classical Confucianism:

It is only he, being most truthful and sincere in all the world, who can completely fulfill his nature in the course of life. Being able to completely fulfill his own nature in the perfect way, he can, also, completely fulfill the nature of other men. Being able to completely fulfill the nature of other men, he can, furthermore, completely fulfill the nature of all creatures and things. Being able to completely fulfill the nature of all creatures and things, he can participate in the cosmic creation and procreation in the process of temporal transformation. Being able to participate in the transformation process of cosmic creation and procreation, he is a co-creator with Heaven and Earth (C, 22:1).<sup>20</sup>

*National University  
Taipei, Taiwan*

## Notes

1. For English translations, I will follow D.C. Lau, *Confucius, The Analects* (London: Penguin Classics, 1979).

2. These two passages are: (a) The Master said, "It is only the most intelligent and the most stupid who are not susceptible to change" (A, 7:3). (b) The Master said, "You can tell those who are above average about the best, but not those who are below average" (A, 6:21).

3. For example, see Takada Shinji, *Shina shiso no kenkyu* (Tokyo: Shunjyusha, 1942), p. 104; Hsü Fu-kuan, *Chung-kuo jen-hsing-lun shih* (Taipei: Commercial, 1977), p. 89.

4. Cf. Fu Pei-jung, "Shih-ching shu-ching chung ti t'ien-ti-kuan yen-chiu," *Che-hsüeh yü wen-hua*, Vol. 11, No. 7 (July, 1984), pp. 36-37.

5. For English translation, I will follow D.C. Lau, *Mencius* (London: Penguin Classics, 1970).

6. See Hsü Fu-kuan, p. 165.

7. Cf. Donald Munro, *The Concept of Man in Early China* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1969), p. 48.

8. Cf. D.C. Lau, "Theories of Human Nature in Mencius and Shyuntzzy," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol. 15, Pt. 3 (1953), p. 550.

9. I.A. Richards indicates that "the mind, for Mencius, is its own law-giver." See Richards, *Mencius on the Mind* (London: Kegan Paul, 1932), p. 79. This point is fully elaborated in Munro, p. 58f.

10. Lau, "Theories of Human Nature," p. 551. Furthermore, Julia Ching maintains that the heart represents both the symbol and reality of man's oneness with Heaven. See Ching, *Confuciansim and Christianity* (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1977), p. 91.

11. Here (4:39), the first number means the 4th chapter of the *Works of Hsün-tzu*, and the number of the page (39) is according to the edition of Wang Hsien-ch'ien's *Hsün-tzu chi-chieh* (Taipei: Shih-chieh, 1967). The English translation follows roughly Holmer Dubs, *The Works of Hsuntze* (London: Arthur Probsthain, 1928) and Burton Matson, *Hsün-tzi, Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University, 1963).

12. Hsü Fu-kuan, pp. 230-32.

13. T'ang Chün-i, *Chung-kuo che-hsüeh yüan-lun: yüan hsing pien* (Hong Kong: Jen-sheng, 1966), p. 49. However, Ch'ien Mu suggests that Hsün-tzu's theory remains on a utilitarian level. See Ch'ien, *Chuang-lao t'ung pien* (Hong Kong: Hsin-ya yen-chiu-so, 1957), p. 263.

14. Munro, p. 81, analyzes Hsün-tzu's concept of mind from several points of view and concludes that "none of these points conflicts basically with the view of *hsing* in the Mencius."

15. I translate the term "kung-tsai" as "craftsman" according to its context; Dubs's "master-workman" is also acceptable, but Watson's "supervisor" goes too far.

16. For English translation, I will follow James Legge, *The I Ching* (New York: Dover, 1963).

17. This is Thomé Fang's translation. See Fang, *Chinese Philosophy: Its Spirit and Its Development* (Taipei: Linking, 1981), p. 110.

18. Cf. Fang, p. 111.

19. For the English translation, see James Legge, *The Doctrine of the Mean*, in *The Chinese Classics*, Vol. I (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University, 1960).

20. This is Fang's translation, p. 113.

### 3.

## **Hsin-Techniques and Hsin-Leadership Psychological Aspects of Confucian Moral Philosophy**

*Hang Thaddeus T'ui-Chieh*

As a candidate for a doctorate in philosophy I was puzzled how C.G. Jung could make a psychological interpretation of such ancient Chinese books as *I Ching*<sup>1</sup> or "The Secret of the Golden Flower,"<sup>2</sup> an esoteric Taoist writing. Since depth-psychology is not a Chinese invention, an interpretation of Chinese ancient texts in terms of depth-psychology seemed at least suspect, if not downright spurious.

Since that time I have rediscovered in Chinese philosophy the term "Hsin-shu,"<sup>a</sup> which is no less amazing. Literally translated it means "heart-technique," but its real sense is something like "mind-technique," or today's behavioral technology. Of course, "hsin" does not designate only the physical heart. Most of the time it comprises all "subjective" or psychic phenomena: thinking, feeling, controlling, deciding, having conscious or unconscious attitudes, etc. In this sense "hsin" means much the same as the term "Seele" of Wilhelm Wundt, namely, "the sum of psychic processes or phenomena."<sup>3</sup> "Hsin-shu" means the way to regulate or influence all these psychic phenomena. If this concern was so lively two-thousand years ago, then it is no wonder that C.G. Jung could find such marvelous psychological insights in ancient Chinese texts.

Indeed, we could expect a fully developed Chinese psychology today. That this is not the case probably is due to an excessively practical orientation and the consequent lack of purely scientific interest, as well as to the lack of a differentiated psychological terminology. In fact, throughout more than two millennia the most frequently used psychological word is the term "hsin," whose vagueness necessarily posed limitations toward further elaborations. On the other hand, the undifferentiated use of the "hsin" perhaps has guarded Chinese from what could be called the psychological fragmentation and compartmentalization of the West. The Chinese experience just one psyche which has diversified functions; a differentiated psychological terminology would tend to fragment and compartmentalize this. Behaviorism has become a paradigm of this form of fragmentation by taking "hsin's" subordinate function of external sensation as the only one which counts.

In order to proceed step by step, we must choose some key-figures, who represent the psychological views of Confucianism regarding ethical problems, historically as well as substantially. These views were inspired, but not developed, by Confucius himself. Their development was by such followers of later generations as Mencius<sup>b</sup> (371-289 B.C.), Hsün Tzu<sup>c</sup> (314-238 B.C.), and the Ch'eng-Brothers, Ch'eng Hao<sup>d</sup> and Ch'eng I<sup>e</sup>, respectively (1032-1083 and 1033-1107). We have chosen just these four thinkers above all others because Mencius and Hsün Tzu were the first to elaborate key psychological concepts in treating moral problems and these concepts have been used throughout two millenia, while the Ch'eng brothers set the tone for Neo-Confucianism which has influenced Chinese thought ever since that time. This will become clearer as we consider each thinker individually.

### **Mencius**

One of the Ch'eng Brothers extolled Mencius as the one who best discussed the "hsin-technique."<sup>4</sup> Mencius not only was universally revered as a "holy man" second only to Confucius,

but also was the first to treat "hsin" thematically. According to him, a fully actualized "hsin" would proceed to realize "hsing"<sup>f</sup> or properly human nature.<sup>5</sup> Being seriously concerned to keep (ts'un)<sup>g</sup> and fully actualize (chin)<sup>h</sup> "hsin," Mencius was very interested in the "hsin-technique," though he never mentioned this term.

What precisely does "hsin" mean? As noted above, "hsin" literally means the physical heart. But curiously enough, in the more than two hundred times Mencius used this term, he meant it only in the derived sense of the very broad spectrum of subjectively experienceable phenomena from affection, attention and knowledge, up to the highest human aspirations. Mencius' example is followed mostly by later Chinese thinkers. Mencius especially used the term "hsin" to designate what he calls four innate and properly human aspirations: interhuman affection, righteousness, propriety and discernment of right and wrong.<sup>6</sup> According to him these four propensities belong to the "greater part" of the human being and are known only through the thinking function of "hsin." In comparison to them, all other sensitive or bodily propensities, such as those for good taste, beautiful color, pleasant sound and smell, body comfort, sexual desire and hunger, belong to the "lesser part" of human nature.<sup>7</sup> Since Mencius considers, among these four propensities of the "greater part," "hsin" to constitute true human nature, he does not hesitate to affirm the goodness of human nature.<sup>8</sup> He did so not because he considered evil to result from a lack in one's cultivation and the subsequent loss of "hsin."<sup>9</sup> In this strict sense the term "hsin" means exclusively the four noble and specifically human propensities. Using the term "hsin" mostly in this sense, Mencius thus invites one to actualize fully (chin), to keep (ts'un), to hold fast to (ts'ao),<sup>i</sup> to nourish (yang),<sup>j</sup> to extend (ch'ung),<sup>k</sup> not to lose (shih),<sup>l</sup> and, if lost, to search for (ch'iu)<sup>m</sup> the "hsin".<sup>10</sup> Since "hsin" in this strict sense constitutes truly human nature, to lose it means to be alienated from one's own humanness.<sup>11</sup>

This point is extremely important in order to understand the "Hsin-Hsing-Science,"<sup>n</sup> which was developed later during the Sung<sup>o</sup> (960-1279) and Ming<sup>p</sup> (1368-1644) Dynasties. This "science" aims at keeping or recovering the "hsin" or truly human nature (the word "hsing" means literally "nature" or "innate nature"). Judging from later developments one would not see any distinction between "hsin" and "hsing," because both designate what Mencius would call "the proper hsin" (pen-hsing)<sup>q</sup> or "hsin" properly so-called. But originally there existed a subtle difference between these two terms: "hsin" designates originally every kind of subjectively experienceable phenomena, and "hsing" all human propensities, from hunger and sexual desire up to interhuman affection.

Mencius understood the thinking function of the "hsin" as intuitive rather than objective knowledge, since by exercising its function it knows automatically what belongs to the "greater part" and the "lesser part" of human being. He saw no need for discursive reasoning<sup>12</sup> which was developed more by Hsün Tzu and, much later, by Chu Hsi.

Mencius insisted upon teaching how to keep "proper hsin" alive, i.e., on engaging in activities of intuitive thinking, on extending noble propensities from their original narrowness into ever wider spheres, and, last but not least, on having the fewest possible desires.<sup>13</sup> Thus he was actually an excellent teacher of "hsin-techniques," as the Ch'eng Brothers called him.

In exercising "techniques" upon one's own "hsin," this is invested necessarily with a certain passive character. In this connection we can mention briefly the problem of "ch'i"<sup>r</sup> in Mencius and in later thinkers. According to Mencius, a human being achieves true greatness by actualizing his "greater part" and thereby obtains a "magnificent ch'i." The commentators of later times were confused in identifying "pure ch'i" (ch'ing ch'i,<sup>s</sup> as a source of cleverness and moral goodness, and "murky ch'i" (cho ch'i)<sup>t</sup> as a source of foolishness and moral evil.<sup>15</sup> But this way of understanding



which takes "ch'i" in a purely material sense has no basis in the text of Mencius, who considers "magnificent ch'i" as the effect of the upright conscience of someone who knows he does what he has to do: "Without such a conscience one becomes timid and weak."<sup>16</sup> Hence, "ch'i" must be understood as the physiological effect of the activities of thinking and willing. Mencius makes a very subtle observation of psycho-physical interrelatedness in saying: "Whenever the will is unified it moves the `ch'i'; whenever the `ch'i' is unified it moves the will."<sup>17</sup> He advises: "The will is the leader of the `ch'i'; the latter is an awakened state of the body. The will is dominant, the `ch'i' is subordinate to it. Therefore I say: Firmly maintain the will, and do no violence to the `ch'i'".<sup>18</sup> In these wise and tactful words Mencius maintains the harmonious middle way between knowing and willing, on the one hand, and the autonomous, unconscious state of the psycho-physical system, on the other.

## Hsün Tzu

Very often Hsün Tzu is depicted as an antagonist to Mencius because he opposed Mencius's central teaching on the inborn goodness of human nature, affirming its inborn wickedness.<sup>19</sup> But the antagonism is more one of surface than of substance. As noted above, for Mencius both the propensities of "greater and lesser parts" belong to human inborn nature, but only those of the "greater part," attainable only through thought, specifically and truly constitute human nature.<sup>20</sup> In Hsün Tzu's view thought and knowledge acquire even greater importance in moral life, but they are regarded as pertaining to human industry, not as inborn nature. As Hsün Tzu sees it, human nature is made of cupidity and all sorts of lower, selfish desires; consequently it is wicked. Moral goodness comes only through human doing.<sup>21</sup>

In what exactly does human doing consist? Here "hsin" has a definite role to play. The word "hsin" is used by Hsün Tzu very often--more than 150 times--and in very different settings. Except in two cases, where it clearly designates the physical heart, Hsün Tzu's "hsin" comprehends the whole psychic sphere, as in Mencius. But there is a difference: Hsün Tzu stresses above all the self-reflective acts of the knowing, deciding and commanding functions of "hsin" in opposition to body (hsing).<sup>22</sup> Specifically the "hsin" commands the body, its five external senses and the whole psychic sphere including the knowing, deciding and commanding functions themselves.<sup>23</sup> "Hsin" knows and decides accordingly what is right or what corresponds to Tao.<sup>24</sup> If something is put in practice after the consideration and decision of the "hsin," Hsün Tzu would call it "human doing."<sup>24</sup> "Hsin" and "human doing" (wei)<sup>v</sup> are put to one side, "human nature" is put on the other side. Hence his most stringent advice: "When nature and human doing are united, the world is well governed."<sup>25</sup>

In spite of Hsün Tzu's attack against Mencius, substantially they agree on the following issues. Both stress "hsin's" thinking and leading functions, both extol the role of education and human effort in giving precedence to the thinking and leading functions of "hsin." The difference appears when Mencius regards the four propensities of the "greater part," which are attainable only through the thinking function of the "hsin," as belonging to true human nature; whereas Hsün Tzu regards them as the results of human effort. This difference is of minor practical importance, all the more as Tung Chung-shu<sup>v</sup> (c. 179-104 B.C.), a leading Confucian of the West-Han Dynasty, found the following eclectic solution: Human nature (being) has good seed in itself, but cannot be called good because it still needs education and cultivation, just as the seed of rice is not the fully developed rice plant.<sup>26</sup>

Most likely it was due to the influence of both Mencius and Hsün Tzu that the "Great Learning" (Ta-hsüeh)<sup>w</sup> put great emphasis upon the investigation of things and upon knowledge in striving for a morally good life. But neither Mencius and the Great Learning nor any other Chinese thinker went so far as Hsün Tzu in extolling the discriminating, decision-making and commanding functions of "hsin": "It is master of body and mind, it commands and does not receive any command; it inhibits and commands himself, deprives himself and takes back, moves himself and stops."<sup>27</sup> Hence his special "hsin-technique": not to try to do away with the natural desires (as did Lao Tzu), nor to diminish them (as did Mencius), but to cultivate the intellectual capacity of discriminating what is right from what is wrong, as well as to cultivate the capacity of deciding to do what is right in spite of many contrary desires.<sup>28</sup> According to Hsün Tzu, virtue consists in acquiring a strong habit, so that the "hsin" would not even consider--still less choose--anything wrong.<sup>29</sup>

However, Hsün Tzu has also a Taoistic influence, although he criticized Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu with vehemence, as I have tried elsewhere to prove.<sup>30</sup> His "hsin-techniques" are also Taoistically colored as he gives advice on "emptiness, oneness and stillness" (hsü-yi-erh-ching)<sup>x</sup> in order to sharpen the ability of "hsin" for knowing and deciding correctly.<sup>31</sup> Without going into details it could be pointed out that, though he uses taoistic terms of emptiness and stillness, Hsün Tzu's "hsin-techniques" are essentially different because he strongly opposes any idea of eliminating or even diminishing human desires. Even in advising techniques of "emptiness" and "stillness" he always pursues the aim of improving human nature through human action. Such an aim is considered preposterous by Chang Tzu, because doomed to "adulterate nature."<sup>32</sup>

Aside from metaphysics where Hsün Tzu went far left with Taoism, his psychological insights constitute a paradigm of a typically Chinese mind. He stressed the intellectual side of moral life without favoring intellectualism; he put strong emphasis on free decision-making without being voluntarist; he adopted taoistic views of letting nature go its own way without himself being fatalistic or passivist.

## **Ch'eng Brothers and Later Developments**

As Mencius and Hsün Tzu were the original thinkers in delineating psychological factors of moral life, we went into some details of their teachings. After this period the Sung Dynasty was the most important in producing the "Neo-Confucian" school, of which the Ch'eng brothers were key figures. It can be said without exaggeration that the Ch'eng Brothers set the tone and gave decisive direction to the "Hsin-Hsing-Science," which was designed to provide theory and practical techniques for achieving moral perfection.

The teachings of Mencius and Hsün Tzu include two basic features, for the manifold activities of "hsin" could be classified into two categories: the first plays an active, leading role in knowing, deliberating, deciding and commanding, while the other plays a passive role of being acted upon through "hsin-techniques."

While for Mencius the knowing function of "hsin" had a more intuitive character, it was definitely intellectual in Hsün Tzu where it was a matter of right knowledge as responsible for right deliberation, decision and action.

Though the younger brother Ch'eng I accepted and further developed the doctrine of the intellectual function of "hsin," the older brother Ch'eng Hao explicitly followed Mencius regarding the intuitive knowledge of "hsin," stressing its passive role and playing down its intellectual-objective aspect. Their different approaches gave birth to two different schools of "hsin-hsing-

science": one of a more intellectual-active direction (Chu Hsi, 1130-1200) and the other of a more intuitive-passive direction (Lu Hsiang-shan, 1139-93 and Wang Yang-ming, 1472-1529).

In order to avoid any misunderstanding, it must be said that both Ch'eng Brothers and their followers gave prominent place to the passive side of "hsin" in developing manifold "hsin-techniques." This probably was due in part to Buddhistic influences. Their copious dialogues with disciples bear the mark of spiritual directors towards their disciples and go into detail on particular situations. In other words, all neo-Confucian masters were convinced that "hsin" is changeable and that their techniques could cure moral, and even minor psychological disorders. In part this is the old tradition of Mencius and Hsün Tzu, reinforced through Taoism and Zen-Buddhism. In fact, those Neo-Confucian masters who stressed the intuitive and passive aspects of "hsin" were greatly inspired by Taoism and Buddhism, as were Chang Tsai<sup>y</sup> (1020-77) and Ch'eng Hao.<sup>33</sup> But other Neo-Confucian masters were also influenced by Taoism and Buddhism.<sup>34</sup> Even Ch'eng I, who seemed more appreciative of intellectual knowledge, was found to be sitting with closed eyes.<sup>35</sup> This practice was at least similar to the quiet sitting of Zen-Buddhism and the Taoistic "sitting and forgetting" (*tsuo-wang*).<sup>z</sup> There is an essential difference, however, because Ch'eng I's technique of "dwelling in reverence" (*chü-ching*)<sup>aa</sup> aims to make our mind "empty and silent," not through a real void in consciousness, but through the dominance of a unique thing (*chu-i*)<sup>ab</sup> so that our mind becomes dominated and filled by "heavenly order."<sup>36</sup> Emptiness and silence of mind mean silence of things other than "heavenly order" and come about as a result of dwelling in reverence, not vice versa. As in the case of Hsün Tzu, Ch'eng I adopted somewhat Taoistic techniques and terminology while actually emptying himself of preconceived knowledge and concentrating himself in a single idea.<sup>37</sup> The same was true of Ch'eng I.

A definitely anti-intellectual flavor is to be found in Ch'eng Hao. Since he was concerned only with acquiring moral perfection, which he considered achievable only through virtuous action, the noetic aspect appeared negligible to him. Ch'eng Hao still gave lip service to "ke-wu,"<sup>ac</sup> i.e., to reach or to research for things, but in reality his search for knowledge is hardly distinguishable from virtuous action itself.<sup>38</sup> His spiritual successors Lu Hsiang-shan and Wang Yang-ming spoke no differently: Lu's only concern is with preserving the goodness of "hsin" in avoiding desires; his search for knowledge is practically the same as "awareness of the good" (i.e., moral consciousness).<sup>39</sup> Wang Yang-ming's "ke-wu" is limited to research regarding a moral "hsin" in rectifying wrong.<sup>40</sup> In their view objective knowledge has nothing to do with moral life. There is a definite anti-intellectual flavor, as Professor Yü Ying-shih has pointed out.<sup>41</sup> This moral anti-intellectualism is rooted in part in the intuitive understanding of "hsin" of Mencius and in part in Taoistic and Buddhistic influences.

However, in the Neo-Confucian tradition this passive-intuitive attitude is tempered by the emphasis upon intellectual knowledge from Ch'eng I, Chu Hsi and the scholars of the Ch'ing Dynasty. For Ch'eng I the "searching and reaching for things" extends beyond the human, moral domain; it includes also the rational search for everything knowable, not excluding the rational grounds of fire and water.<sup>42</sup> Of course Ch'eng I separated "knowledge of hearing and seeing" from "knowledge of virtue."<sup>ad</sup> The latter, called "profound knowledge," would be dubbed "subjective truth" by Kierkegaard, namely, that which is inspired by a "passion of the infinite" and is effectively conducive to action.<sup>43</sup> In view of this distinction the "knowledge of hearing and seeing" must be considered as something superficial, like somebody generally knowing the fierceness of a tiger but never having confronted or been bitten by one, whereas the one pursued by a tiger can be said to have a profound knowledge of it.<sup>44</sup> Ch'eng I affirms that the knowledge of virtue does not result from hearing and seeing,<sup>45</sup> because something more is involved. Certainly he did not

repudiate the value of intellectual knowledge, indeed he rejected such a repudiation as a Taoistic or Buddhistic excess.<sup>46</sup> For him a genuine and objective search after knowledge, whether or not it belongs to virtue, is always worthwhile.<sup>47</sup> Chu Hsi, Ch'eng I's spiritual heir, further accentuates intellectual knowledge in moral life considering clear thinking and intellectual knowledge to be a *conditio sine qua non* of right action. Hence he criticizes Lu Hsiang-shan's reliance on a pure intuition of "hsin" as responsible for "reckless action" (hu-tso),<sup>48</sup> though he stresses also "real insight" (shih-li)<sup>49</sup> in applying general moral principles to every case.<sup>48</sup>

## **The Contemporary Relevance of Confucian Psychological Insights**

### *The Present Significance of Confucian "Hsin"*

Today the traditional Confucian insights about human "hsin" or psyché have very real significance. The Confucian "hsin," experienced both as passive-intuitive and as active-intellectual, occupies the middle road between the totally passive role assigned to it by Taoists and their followers, on the one hand, and the totally active role assigned to it by traditional Western psychology and philosophy, on the other.

As mentioned above, Taoists being concerned above all to keep nature "unadulterated," detest any human endeavor to "improve" nature.<sup>49</sup> But despite Chuang Tzu's indignation about the term "hsin-technique" he developed his own "hsin-technique": like "hsin-fasting"<sup>50</sup> (empty-mindedness) and "sitting and forgetting" (striving to achieve an unconscious state) in order to reach primordial nature.<sup>50</sup> Today such techniques with their underlying philosophy enjoy great favor in the Western world as it reacts against excessive activism and an ever growing technocracy. Psychoanalysis and Zen-Buddhism have contributed to this same trend.

There is another over-active current which, paradoxically, extols an almost completely passive character of the human psyché, or, as they prefer to call it, of human behavior. Of course, according to behaviorists, human behavior (since words like "psyché" or "hsin" are banished by them as "meaningless") is completely dependent upon, and manageable through "behavioral engineering."<sup>51</sup>

All this happened in reaction against an earlier overconfidence when the human intellect and free will were considered almost all-powerful in their active and leading role toward moral decision and action. In fact traditional Western psychology and philosophy either exalted the leading role of intellect and free will altogether, or singled out either the intellect or free will as the exclusive or dominant factor, and favored different grades of intellectualism or voluntarism. Such disputes go back to the most remote antiquity. The most famous example of intellectualism is to be found in Socrates and Plato, for whom the morally evil act is just an intellectual error or ignorance.<sup>52</sup> Aristotle was neither an intellectualist nor a voluntarist: he admits that at the beginning one becomes immoral (for instance in cases of injustice or intemperance) knowingly and voluntarily, and that after one has become so it is impossible for him to be otherwise.<sup>53</sup> In the Middle Ages Thomists favored a rather mild form of intellectualism and the Augustinians preferred a temperate voluntarism: but both recognized the leading role of the intellect and free will together. There are many relatively recent examples of extreme form of voluntarism, from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche to Heidegger and Sartre. Such extreme forms of voluntarism are prone to anti-intellectualism in extolling the dominant role of will or the "existential project."

The Confucian concept of "hsin" encompasses both the intuitive-passive and the active-leading characters of subjective experience, which constitutes the paradigmatic unity of

contrasting and complementary, *yin* and *yang*, components.<sup>54</sup> We will now see how the Confucian concept of "hsin," enhanced by the experiences and theories of other cultures, may provide a yet more comprehensive and adequate direction for future ethical theory.

### *The Need for Enhancement from Other Cultures*

*Moral Anti-intellectualism and Its Remedy.* Though the Confucian concept of "hsin" points in the right direction for the future, it needs enhancement from other cultures. Mencius showed that the "greater part" in human life should play the leading role and that through the intuitive thinking of "hsin" the four noble propensities (interhuman affection, righteousness, propriety and discernment of the right and the wrong) are known. The intuitive approach of Mencius predominated through two millenia. The supervenient influences of Taoism, Zen-Buddhism and parts of Neo-Confucianism strengthened the conviction that in moral life intuitive knowledge prevails and there is no room at all for rational objective knowledge.

Within this historical context it is understandable that moral anti-intellectualism has some predominance among the Chinese. Even today, where a rational mode of thinking dominates the scene in every other domain, there still prevails among Chinese the conviction that in moral education no rationally founded philosophical knowledge is needed. This moral anti-intellectualism has grave consequences. Of course, a detached moral knowledge or conviction does not necessarily lead us to action. Nevertheless there exists a connection between knowledge and practice, especially when human life is involved. If, for instance, we maintain that the human being is no more than an animal, or just an instrument for economic development, such initially detached thinking will inevitably affect one's action.

In the religious sphere Chinese history teaches a good lesson. During the period of Warring States Confucians did not believe in the real existence of spirits, but nevertheless complied with sacrificial rites as in a farce<sup>ah</sup> in order to attain political goals.<sup>55</sup> Slowly their religious spirit vanished and the traditional religion, which was still followed faithfully by Confucius and Mencius, lost its significance and inexorably was supplanted by an imported religion, Buddhism. In the process a serious blow was dealt the Confucian virtue of sincerity (ch'eng),<sup>ai</sup> which, according to the "Great Learning," consisted in conformity between knowing and willing: "(The Ancients) wishing to be sincere in their wills, first tried to get knowledge." Confucius was sincere as he revered spirits, because he believed deeply in their existence;<sup>56</sup> certainly he was not performing a farce as some today prefer to misinterpret the following text: "He did sacrifice to the spirits, as if the spirits were present."<sup>57</sup> Confucius' willing was in accord with his knowledge and conviction. Mo Tzu (479-438 B.C.) gave the Confucians of his time good advice: either go to sacrifice with sincere belief or do not comply with things in which you do not believe.<sup>58</sup> Unhappily, they did not take his alternative seriously and preferred a cheap compromise as solution. Having put up with insincerity in their worship, slowly a typically formalistic attitude set in which still persists today.<sup>59</sup>

The anti-intellectualistic trend is probably also the reason why in some forms of moral education no heed is paid to moral philosophy. The comic-tragedy lies in the fact that neglecting the role of moral philosophy gives to hedonistic moral philosophy a practical preference, which is inculcated through the modern novel, cinema, etc. Even within the circle of educational policy-makers, many still believe that moral education consists mostly in inculcating socially acceptable etiquette. Hsün Tzu's warning that "one who does not know the Tao<sup>aj</sup> would not approve and choose it, but instead approves and chooses that which is contrary to the Tao,"<sup>60</sup> is largely ignored.

According to Chung-yung, a treatise widely attributed to Tzu Ssu, master of Mencius, human nature finds its metaphysical foundation in "the mandate of Heaven."<sup>61</sup> For Hsün Tzu the Tao must have its foundation in itself. But all these problems are beyond the reach of a purely psychological concept of "hsin," and must be anchored in a solid metaphysics and epistemology. It is most unfortunate that today epistemology tends to be dominated by skepticism and scientism, and that such self-destructive epistemology has its followers among present-day Chinese philosophers. It is evident that with such an epistemology one cannot find the rational foundation for a solid metaphysics or ethics. Hence Chinese philosophy today must exercise discernment to separate the gold from the dross in the modern currents of thought.

*Cultivation of Moral Judgment and Decision.* Though Hsün Tzu defined magnificently the knowing and decision-making functions of "hsin" and their essential role in moral life,<sup>62</sup> he was never taken seriously by the Chinese--much to their disadvantage. No wonder that Taoistic passivity and anti-intellectualism became more and more the general trait also among Confucians who seemed inclined to rely greatly upon such "hsin-techniques" as sitting quietly, being empty-minded and so on. There is no awareness that "hsin-technique" presupposes necessarily "hsin-leadership," since someone through their cognitive and deciding functions of "hsin" must take the lead in employing "hsin-technique."

Thus, the crucial point remains whether every individual through one's own knowledge and decision takes leadership of oneself or is manipulated by somebody else through media, social pressures or other "behavioral technologies." The latter predicament is common in many totalitarian or less developed societies, but in free and more developed societies it is absolutely necessary that everyone take their own leadership through appropriate judgment and decision. This means that we should cultivate "hsin-leadership" by improving its knowing, deliberating and deciding functions. In doing so "hsin-techniques" become, not useless, but all the more urgent.

As noted above, Aristotle admitted that whenever somebody becomes immoral, for him in that condition it is not possible to be otherwise. If such individuals take their own leadership seriously and wish to recover their moral integrity, they must use "hsin-techniques" in order gradually to transform themselves. Pascal said appropriately in this connection, that we are automata as much as spirits.<sup>63</sup> Therefore Mencius advises us to "maintain firm the will and do no violence to `ch'i'." If we understand "ch'i" as psycho-physical state, it is obvious why "ch'i" is not manageable at command and why some "hsin-techniques are necessary here.

But even in terms of "hsin-techniques" Hsün Tzu developed a very practical method for sharpening our moral judgment and acquiring the habitual power to choose only what is in agreement with our right judgment, so that the "hsin" would not even consider what is not right. Ch'eng I's method of "chü-ching" proceeds along the same line and consists essentially in filling the "hsin" with "right attitudes inside"<sup>ak</sup> so that there would be no room for evilness.<sup>64</sup> Hsün Tzu's advice to cultivate right judgment is followed also by Chu Hsi, though he makes no mention of Hsün Tzu.<sup>65</sup>

Our generation should not be afraid of old experiences and insights provided their efficiency is verified in China as well as in the West. Such constant exercises of moral judgment and choice would very much enhance the power to do what is morally right, provided the active role of judgment and free choice are not excessively inflated, as occasionally has been the case in the West. But within its limits and right proportion, the active and leading function of "hsin," both in intellectual knowledge and in free decision, must be given a prominent place in moral education.

*Personal Dignity.* A final important value could be improved upon through judicious comparison with the Western tradition, which consistently gives high priority to personal dignity. Boethius (480-525) defined the person as an individual substance which is rational in nature. Aquinas asserted without hesitation that Person means that which is most perfect in all of nature.<sup>66</sup> The person is considered to be of absolute value because of freedom and moral responsibility.<sup>67</sup> In China Mencius saw the close connection between moral action and personal dignity: he regarded moral qualities as "Heaven's nobility" in opposition to the "nobility of man."<sup>68</sup> The "Great Learning" stresses the "cultivation of the person" (*hsiu-shen*)<sup>al</sup> as an essential precondition to the fulfillment of social duties. Mencius further clarifies that true human greatness and dignity lie in absolute faithfulness to moral duty. Here the two great traditions, Chinese and Western, really go hand in hand.

*National Chengchi University  
Taipei, Taiwan*

## Notes

1. *I Ching or Book of Changes.* The Richard Wilhelm translation rendered into English by Cary F. Baynes; foreword by C.G. Jung (New York: Pantheon Books, 1950).
2. *The Secret of the Golden Flower*, trans. and explained by Richard Wilhelm; European Commentary by C.G. Jung; translated into English by Cary F. Baynes (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1950).
3. Georg Anschütz, *Psychologie: Grundlagen, Ergebnisse und Probleme der Forschung* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1953), p. 486.
4. Chu Hsi, ed., *Opera Omnia of Ch'eng Brothers*<sup>am</sup> (Taipei, 1979), 2-19b.
5. Mencius 7A1.
6. Mencius 2A6, 6A6.
7. Mencius 6A14-15, 6A4, 7B24.
8. Mencius 6A10, 2A6, 6A6, 7A21.
9. Mencius 6A8.
10. Mencius 7A1, 7A18, 7B35, 6A11.
11. Mencius 2A6.
12. Mencius 6A15.
13. Mencius 7B31, 2A2.
14. Mencius 6A14-15, 2A2.
15. *Opera Omnia of Ch'eng Brothers*, 19-32b, 23-2ab, 19-77b.
16. Mencius 2A2.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*
19. Hsün Tzu, Book 23.
20. Mencius 6A15, 7B24.
21. *A Concordance to Hsün Tzu* (Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, Supplement No. 22; Taipei, 1966), 23/5.
22. *Opus cit.* 5/3.
- 22a. *Op. cit.*, 17/12, 21/44-46, 22/60-62.
23. *Op. cit.*, 21/32.

24. *Op. cit.*, 22/4.
25. *Op. cit.*, 19/77.
26. Tung Chung-shu, *Luxuriant Gems of the Spring and Autumn Annals*,<sup>an</sup> (Taipei, 1974), chapters 35 and 36, especially pp. 207-208, 212, 217-18.
27. *A Concordance to Hsiün Tzu*, 21/44-45.
28. *Op. cit.*, 22/60-62, 69-70.
29. *Op. cit.*, 1/47-48.
30. Thaddeus T'ui-chieh Hang, "Hsün Tzu, His Key-position in the History of Chinese Philosophy and His Contribution Today" (in Chinese), *Universitas Monthly*, IX (1982), 794-96.
31. *A Concordance to Hsiün Tzu*, 21/34-41.
32. *A Concordance to Chuang Tzu*, 10/39-40, 16/5.
33. Huang Tsung-hsi (ed.), *Philosophers of Sung and Yuan Dynasties*<sup>ao</sup> (Taipei, 1975), 5/5, 6/2.
34. Hsiung Yuan, *A Study on Neo-Confucianism and Buddhism of Sung-Dynasty* (in Chinese) (Taipei: Wen-ching Press, 1985), chapters 2 and 3.
35. *Philosophers of Sung and Yuan Dynasties*, 5/50.
36. *Opera Omnia of Ch'eng Brothers*, 16-9a, 19b.
37. *A Concordance to Hsiün Tzu*, 21/36-38.
38. *Opera Omnia of Ch'eng Brothers*, 12-8a, 15a, 20a.
39. *Opera Omnia of Lu Hsiang-shan* (Taipei: World Book Co., 1959), pp. 242-2.
40. *Opera Omnia of Wang Yang-ming* (Taipei: Cheng-chung Book Co., 1955), pp. 5, 21, 63.
41. Yü Ying-shih, *Historical Science and Tradition* (in Chinese) (Taipei: Shih-pao Press, 1982), p. 111.
42. *Opera Omnia of Ch'eng Brothers*, 19-9b, 20-1a.
43. Robert Bretall (ed.), *A Kierkegaard Anthology* (New York: The Modern Library, 1946), pp. 212-3.
44. *Opera Omnia of Ch'eng Brothers*, 19-9a.
45. *Op. cit.*, 28-3a.
46. *Op. cit.*, 16-35b.
47. *Opera Omnia*, 20-1a.
48. Li Ch'ing-teh (ed.), *Classified Speeches of Chu Hsi*<sup>ap</sup> (Taipei, 1979), Book 18, pp. 630, 642, etc.
49. *A Concordance to Chuang Tzu*, 10/39-40, 16/5, 22/8.
50. *Op. cit.*, 13/26, 4/26-28, 6/92-93.
51. B.F. Skinner, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971).
52. Meno 77e; Protagoras 345b.
53. *Nichomachean Ethics*, 1114<sup>a</sup> 12-22.
54. T. T'ui-chieh Hang, "Unity of Yin and Yang, A Philosophical Assessment," Shu-hsien Liu and R.E. Allinson (ed.), *Harmony and Strife* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1988), 211-224. Cf. Jolan Jacobi, *Die Psychologie von C.G. Jung*, (Zurich: Rascher Verlag, 1940), S. 39-40.
55. *A Concordance to Hsiün Tzu*, 17/38-40, 19/122.
56. *Confucian Analects*, 2/24, 6/6, 8/21.
57. *Op. cit.*, 3/12.
58. *A Concordance to Mo Tzu* (Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, Supplement No. 21; San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1974), 48/41-42.



59. In spite of many official injunctions, most Chinese today go to funeral rites without much inner participation, and find special difficulty in remaining reverently silent. For a Chinese religious believer, however, a reverent silence before a defunct person seems fitting because of the sincere belief that a dead person is just passing from this to another world.

60. *A Concordance to Hsün Tzu*, 21/30.

61. Th. T'ui-chieh Hang, "Vom himmlischen Mandat zum Fatum - Aspekte der chinesischen Religiosität," a paper delivered at "Wittgenstein-Symposium," Kirchberg/Wechsel, Austria, August 1983, *Forschungen für Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte* 21 (1985, Saarbrücken), 29-47.

62. *A Concordance to Hsün Tzu*, 21/30, 46, 22/60-61.

63. Pascal, *Pensées* (Paris: Garnier, 1951), n. 252.

64. *Opera Omnia of Ch'eng Brothers*, 16-35b, 16-36a.

65. *A Concordance of Hsün Tzu*.

66. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, 29, art. 3. c. (Torino: Marietti, 1940), I, 207.

67. Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (Stuttgart: Philipp Reklam Jun., 1961), S. 120, 233, 252.

68. Mencius 6A16.



**Part II**  
**Chinese and Western Philosophical Foundations for**  
**Contemporary Moral Education**



#### 4.

## Developmental Psychology and Knowledge of Being

*John Farrelly*

One of the most serious contemporary objections against philosophical foundations for moral education and character development is scepticism regarding our capacity to know with any degree of assurance reality as it is. There are many sources in the history of modern and contemporary philosophy for this scepticism. One prominent present source comes from an implication in the language analysis approach to philosophy. To many philosophers it seems that we cognitively construct the world about us through our culture's language: we see reality through the map or conceptual framework of our language, and restructure our view of the world by restructuring our language. What roots can the moral life of a society have if this be the case? Most probably they would come from no more than a consensus among those who have a major influence in shaping our culture on questions of what is just or good, unjust and morally evil.

In these circumstances, any study of the philosophical foundations of moral education must address the epistemological question. This is done in the present chapter from the perspective of one who initially accepted a classical view of our knowledge of reality as presented by Thomas Aquinas, and then studied major objections to this view in representative modern philosophers, including those from the Anglo-American language analysis approach to philosophy.

Philosophers and psychologists in the twentieth century who reflect on human knowledge--its scope and processes--generally deny to the human person the kind of metaphysical knowledge which St. Thomas ascribes to man. In such a situation those who share Thomas' view that human beings have a capacity for, and an orientation to, a metaphysical knowledge of reality as being, need to reflect on human knowledge in a way that is in close relation with contemporary thought. In this chapter I wish to do just that, to present an account of the psychogenesis of being, that makes central use of contemporary psychologies of knowledge and keeps in view contemporary objections against metaphysical knowledge. This is done only in an exploratory manner, more to suggest its significance than to develop my theme with the fullness it deserves.

To introduce this study we must review something of the Thomistic analysis of the human person's understanding of being. There is no one, universally accepted interpretation of Thomas' view on the way one knows reality as being. There is however widespread agreement that the existential judgment is proportioned to the knowledge of being as understood by Thomas, since for him being is *that which is*. Reality as being is reducible neither to substance nor to the act of being. If one accepts this, still there remains disagreement about the principles which account for such knowledge being present in man. The main Thomistic view is that knowledge of concretely existing sensible reality is primary in the genesis of such knowledge, and thus that both the concrete sensible reality and human knowledge of it through the senses, intellectual abstraction, and insight are the essential principles of this knowledge.

But for many interpreters this cannot fully account for the existential judgment, since sense knowledge and intellectual abstraction as such do not properly deliver *esse* or the act of being. In another place I have defended the view that for a full explanation of the existential judgment one has to recognize that the act of being is more properly the object of our affective inclination and volitional act than of our intellectual insight mediated by sense knowledge and abstraction.<sup>1</sup> In support of this view we may note that we place the infinitive form of the verb in a sentence as the direct object of a word or expression referring to our acts of love, desire, and hate; for example,

we say, "I want to live." We normally express the direct object of an act of knowledge by a noun or a noun clause. If *esse* is more properly the object of affectivity and desire than of intellectual knowledge, the existential judgment and the knowledge of being proper to metaphysics is dependent in part on the intellectual knowledge we have through participation in our affective inclination, act, and its object. That is, it is dependent in part upon our affective inclination to our own actualization or act of being as the good we seek, and upon other realities which are related to this or to which our actualization is related. The existential judgment then is not fully explained by direct intellectual knowledge of concrete sensible reality through sense and abstraction.

We need not review the major modern difficulties against this view of man's knowledge of being--such as those coming from Heidegger, on the one hand, or from an empiricism, rationalism, or constructivism, on the other--to recognize that we need something like a contemporary "phenomenology" of knowledge if we are to evaluate Thomas' view in a way that meets the problems of our time.<sup>2</sup> For such a contemporary analysis of man's knowledge I suggest major attention should be paid to the developmental psychology of Jean Piaget. I do this in spite of his strictures against a philosophy of knowledge,<sup>3</sup> for his is widely recognized to be the outstanding twentieth-century psychology of knowledge. He has an epistemological interest in showing how one comes to have the structures of knowledge exhibited in modern science; and his developmental approach provides a unique insight into the dynamism of human knowledge. Moreover, his study of knowledge has gone far beyond the reductionism of the behaviorists. By turning to Piaget we have a vast reservoir of experiments on, and observations of, human knowledge in its stages from infancy to adolescence with which philosophers of differing traditions must come to grips.

Yet Piaget's work, valuable as it is, needs to be supplemented by the work of some American psychologists with a different emphasis and interpretation from Piaget. In fact, it appears that the traditional dichotomy between empiricism and rationalism (or some form of idealism) is seen in a different way today in this divergence of some American psychologists such as Eleanor Gibson and Jerome Bruner (different as these are from one another) from Piaget and his associates. Their agreements are all the more significant for their differences, and both aid us to grasp the present state of the question. For a full study of the relevance of their work for the psychogenesis of being one would have to analyze their questions, methods, and evidence at much greater length than we can here. Our brief study can do no more than suggest the possibilities a larger study might contain.

To indicate how the findings of these contemporary psychologies of knowledge are related to the question of the psychogenesis of being, we will note, first in reference to Piaget and more briefly in reference to Gibson, their points of departure, their models of knowledge, and the stages evident in the evolution they study. Then, as we proceed, we shall suggest the relevance of their views to the question of the psychogenesis of being.

## **Points of Departure**

In the first place, Piaget's point of departure is to take the structures basic to scientific knowledge, e.g., the formation and systematic testing of hypotheses, and then study the evolutionary emergence of these structures in the epistemological subject. "The main aim of a theory of development is to explain the constitution of the operational structures of the integrated whole or totality, (*structure opératoire d'ensemble*)."<sup>4</sup> Reacting against the simple stimulus-response empiricist explanation of knowledge, Piaget has insisted that our knowledge of the world depends upon the structures we bring to bear upon it. His early biological work on the evolution of the mollusk gave him a genetic approach to the problem of explaining psychologically the

structures present in scientific knowledge. Experiments have shown, for example, that it is only in the child of 11 or 12 that hypothetico-deductive reasoning is found. Piaget seeks then to explain this emergence genetically.

He finds an analogy between the emergence of new psychological structures and the emergence of new biological structures. Among the evolutionary theories of the emergence of new biological structures he finds that of C.H. Waddington to be most consistent with his own previous psychological findings. Waddington gives great weight to the initiative and self-regulation of organisms in developing strategies to respond to challenges posed by the environment, the feedback from the environment and these strategies upon the organisms, and the emergence through this of successively new structures by which the organisms interact with the environment.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, in the process of the development of the infant into an adolescent Piaget finds that the epistemological subject in its cognitive interaction with the environment constructs a series or succession of structures which emerge from earlier ones and lead to those found in the pre-adolescent and adolescent. His analysis of the emergence of these structures is in part an explanation of mankind's progressively enlarged knowledge of its environment, since this knowledge is dependent upon these structures.

*Eleanor Gibson* places her more recent studies on perception within a developmental framework.<sup>6</sup> She works with an interpretation of perception defended by James Gibson and which is gaining wider acceptance. James Gibson reacted against the empiricist view that we initially sense only color as points or blotches, that perception of distance or depth is basically learned, and that this perception is the effect of one's interpretation of cues or clues and is thus a construction by a process of association. Against this he shows that the stimulus considered globally has correlates for one's perception of depth (e.g., in gradients of texture in the ground or setting of one's normal perceptions in the visual world) and that three-dimensional physical reality is given basically in perception rather than learned.

In continuity with this, Eleanor Gibson understands perception to be "action, but it is exploratory action, not executive action in the sense of manipulating the environment."<sup>8</sup> She writes:

Perception, functionally speaking, is the process by which we obtain firsthand information about the world around us. It has a phenomenal aspect, the awareness of events presently occurring in the organism's immediate surroundings. It has also a responsive aspect; it entails discriminative, selective response to the stimuli in the immediate environment.<sup>9</sup>

She is reacting against the behaviorist interpretation of perception or the view that learning occurs through association of objects with the behavior or response they evoke.

Gibson holds that differing behavior with differing objects (for example, the differing behavior of Pavlov's dog in the presence of a circle that signaled the presence of food, and an elliptical figure that had ceased to signal food's presence) is a *sign* that the subject has discriminated the different objects. It is not the discrimination itself, nor does it mediate this discrimination. She studies perceptual learning, understood as "an increase in the ability of an organism to get information from its environment, as a result of practice with array of stimulation provided by the environment."<sup>10</sup> Here the context is the child's development within its natural environment.

These basic approaches reflect the fact that the current psychological investigation of knowledge is primarily developmental: knowledge is studied as a process of interaction between

an enlarging environment and a developing subject. We suggest that this approach has value also for the question of the psychogenesis of being. In asking the question of the emergence of human understanding of reality as being we should ask how the interaction of subject and environment gives rise to this understanding. In studying this we should give as much attention to the activity of the subject and its structure as to the object known in virtue of this activity and structure, as much attention to the physical world as to the cognitive activity and structure that it evokes. If Piaget's analysis of knowledge as development from egocentrism to objectivity (as we shall recall it below) is valid, self-knowledge appears to be as essential to this genesis as knowledge of the physical world. Through this approach, metaphysics will appear as a further stage of this interaction (when compared to the sciences) both in reference to the scope of the environment opened up to the subject and in reference to the cognitive structure centrally involved. It will appear to be, not only beyond science in a hierarchical order, but postscientific in the order of man's cognitive development.

### **Models of Knowledge**

In the second place, Piaget and Gibson take different aspects of knowledge and develop their analyses of the subject's interaction with his environment primarily in reference to these.

*Piaget's* analysis of the neonate's cognitive interaction with his immediate environment begins with an examination of the infant's sucking reflex and how its use mediates knowledge. By assimilating objects to this action scheme or schema, and by accommodating this structure to the variety of objects sucked, the infant can differentiate among them. For example, the infant sucks the breast, and knows it through this act; but he also sucks a coverlet, a toy, and a thumb, and all are sucked differently! Knowledge by the infant is through assimilation of its environment to a primitive structure and by the accommodation of this structure to its environment. Piaget considers assimilation to be "the fundamental fact of psychic development."<sup>11</sup> Assimilation is a process common to human behavior considered physiologically and psychologically. It explains the basic psychological fact of repetition, for it shows how repetition can have functional meaning for the subject. Moreover,

the concept of assimilation from the very first embodies in the mechanism of repetition the essential element which distinguishes activity from passive habit: the coordination of the new with the old which foretells the process of judgment. In effect, the reproduction characteristic of the act of assimilation always implies the incorporation of an actual fact into a given schema, this schema being constituted by the repetition itself.<sup>12</sup>

Initially the child's knowledge is really limited to the most superficial aspects of its environment and is marked by egocentrism--that is, an awareness of the environment only as it is related to the self, without distinguishing the one from the other.

At the beginning of assimilatory activity, any object whatever presented by the external environment to the subject's activity is simply something to suck, to look at, or to grasp; such assimilation is at this stage centered solely on the assimilating subject.<sup>13</sup>

Objectivity is a term of the child's development, occurring when assimilation and accommodation are in balance. It is mediated not only by the child's knowledge of the environment, but by his growing self-awareness of what he contributes and how it distorts the world.<sup>14</sup> The emergence of new and more fully developed structures by which the child cognitively



interacts with his or her environment occurs through the initiative of the child, the feedback of the environment and of the child's activity upon his structures, and the effect of this feedback upon an adjustment of these structures. What is basic here is an equilibration process evoked by the discrepancy between the environment and the subject.

*Gibson's* analysis of the interaction that accounts for development is much simpler. Basically, she holds

that there is a structure in the world and structure in the stimulus, and that it is the structure in the stimulus--considered as a global array, not punctate--that constitutes information about the world. That there is structure in the world is self-evident to the physical scientist who uses elaborate tools and methods to discover it.<sup>15</sup>

There are discriminable aspects of this environment that at any particular point in time have not yet been discriminated. Development of perception is in the direction of specificity of discrimination; it is a development from perception of gross features of objects to greater specificity, rather than a process of synthesis toward structured wholes. She examines this development in reference to aspects of the child's natural environment, such as objects, space, events, representations of these and coded sources of stimulation (e.g., speech and writing). Principles or processes operative in perceptual learning or differentiation that she particularly stresses are:

abstraction of differential properties of stimuli, filtering out of irrelevant variables of stimulation, and selective attention of the kind described as exploratory activity of sense organs.<sup>16</sup>

What is the significance of this difference of emphasis regarding man's knowledge of his environment for the psychogenesis of being that grounds metaphysics? Much could be said, but we want particularly to note that the differing interpretations of knowledge in these two views correlate with the primacy given in the one to touch, and in the other to visual perception. In the first, motor activity as mediating knowledge of the world is more emphasized, while in the second, emphasis is placed on the stimulus present in the environment. The difference in emphasis can in part be due to the difference in the questions asked by these psychologists. Piaget is interested in the emergence of cognitive structures, and particularly the scientific structure with the place it accords to mathematics; while Gibson is interested in the emergence of one's perception of the physical world.

It seems that these two initially unintegrated aspects or forms of knowledge are present in the infant. We shall see some examples below indicating that both are operative in later stages of knowledge and that one cannot be reduced to the other; both are essential principles of man's developing knowledge of the world. Moreover, in the knowledge of reality as being, both of these forms of knowledge are likewise involved. We saw that knowledge of being, according to Thomas' understanding of it, is essentially dependent, not only upon the physical reality of the environment, but also upon two modes of knowledge. The one mediated by sense knowledge, intellectual abstraction, and insight is more in continuity with what Gibson emphasizes. The other, called participative knowledge, i.e., knowledge of our *esse* and what is related to it through participation in our affective inclination and its object is more in continuity with the dimensions Piaget emphasizes.

The infant's motor activity emerges from its affective inclination. The knowledge this activity mediates is not only that of the physical environment, but also that of the self (though at this age it is not distinguished) since these actions are directed to the need or good of the self. If we take account of the contributions of both Piaget and Gibson, despite their mutual tensions, we find in the infant's knowledge an anticipation of, or a point of departure for, the emergence of metaphysical knowledge as understood by St. Thomas. Of course, there are quite a few stages through which the infant must pass before becoming a metaphysician!

## **Stages of Knowledge**

In the third place, the major successive periods of cognitive growth that Piaget discovers in the child's evolution from infancy to adolescence are the sensori-motor period (from birth until about 18 months), the concrete operatory period (beginning about the age of 7 and preceded by a pre-operatory stage), and the period of formal operations (beginning about the age of 12). We will note some central characteristics of these successive periods, indicate some variants in the work of Gibson, and suggest some implications of these psychologies of knowledge in reference to our question.

### *Sensori-motor Period*

*Piaget*, in the sensori-motor period, studies the succession of action schemes or patterns which emerge from such primitive patterns as the sucking reflex. He analyzes the emergence of patterns such as sensory coordinations (e.g., between sight and hearing, between prehension and sight), the infant's progressive efforts to discover objects that have been hidden near him, and his use of means for an end. Piaget's observations and analyses bring out the gradual construction of action patterns in the infant. These contribute later to the construction of internalized actions (e.g., deferred imitation, symbolic play, formation of mental images, and verbal evocation of events), and still later to the formation of concrete logical operations of the school-age child and the interpropositional thought patterns of the pre-adolescent.

These early action patterns also have great importance for the way in which the world comes to be constructed cognitively by the child. For example, Piaget finds that objects near the infant do not initially have the character of permanently existing objects which they have for us; the construction of the permanent object is a process that occurs in stages over the first year. Piaget notes "how phenomenalistic (is) this primitive universe"<sup>17</sup> of the neonate. The infant initially appears to be interested in objects about it only as these are occasions for its actions--e.g., sucking and looking. Until these objects are regarded as independent of the infant's action they are not considered as permanently existing substances. Concerning an intermediate stage in the process of constructing the permanently existing object, i.e., when the infant coordinates sight and hearing by looking toward the origin of sound, Piaget writes:

the space involved here is still only a space dependent on the immediate action and not precisely an objective space in which things and actions are placed in relation to each other in groups that are independent of the body itself. In short, intersensory coordinations contribute to solidifying the universe by organizing actions but they do not at all suffice to render that universe external to those actions.<sup>18</sup>

There is a certain recognition of objects by the neonate, but this can be accounted for by the infant's recognition of the reaction these objects set up in him or her; it does not of itself indicate the infant's recognition of objects as independently existing. It takes the infant a similarly long process of construction to become aware of a space in which his or her own body is not the absolute center, but rather is an object together with other objects.

*Gibson's* study of the same early period shows marked differences from Piaget's. She holds that the objects about the infant and the stimulus array can account for the child's perception of space and the permanent object. Growth here is due to the infant's gradual discrimination of this global stimulus array, not to the child's motor activity or synthetic construction, save in a very subordinate sense. For example, in an experiment called "The Visual Cliff" she helped to show that infants just able to crawl had depth perception; this occurs earlier than Piaget's analysis can account for.<sup>19</sup> In this experiment the infant is placed on a board that extends across plate glass. Under the glass to one side of the board there is a texture pattern quite close to the bottom of the glass, and the same texture pattern is placed more deeply under the glass to the other side of the board. Infants move to the apparently shallow side rather than to the perceptual cliff side, thus indicating that they have depth perception due to gradients of texture or motion parallax. Perception of object permanence, similarly, can be explained by the global array of stimulus:

Object permanence and perception of an event are reciprocal phenomena. One quite literally implies the other. If the ball rolls behind a chair, is temporarily occluded, and then rolls out again, we do not see it as a different ball and a new event. . . .

A concept of permanence would indeed be an intellectual achievement, but invariants over time in a stimulus sequence may provide a basis for the perception of an object's permanence (like the ball rolling behind a chair and out again).<sup>20</sup>

In these two explanations of infant knowledge of the environment there is a definite theoretical divergence that has not been resolved by psychologists. Yet, without trespassing on their field, it is legitimate to conclude that neither approach taken as such is a fully adequate account of the child's cognitive growth. Both taken together--without our being able to resolve the differences--contribute to an explanation of knowledge that offers a starting point for the kind of knowledge we indicated at the beginning of this chapter to be involved in the knowledge man has of being.

With Gibson we must admit that there is in the stimulus, as a global array, information that can account for one's perception of the permanent object and space. But with Piaget we must admit that after the first year there are elements in the infant's knowledge of permanent objects and space that previously were not present. There is a sense in which, partially dependent upon the child's action on the object, the object becomes disengaged from his action and acquires for him a permanent existence it did not possess earlier. Similarly, due in part to a development of the infant's motor activity into more complex action patterns, there is a growth in organization not only of the infant's behavior, but also of the space about him. There seem here to be two central principles of the infant's developing knowledge. One begins from the object perceived visually, but not exactly related to the self. The other begins from the child's executive action depending on his needs and interests and the significance this has for his knowledge of self and the environment, which are differentiated only gradually.

With reference to the child's growth after the sensori-motor period, we should note at least that both Piaget and Gibson view language as having a subordinate, though very important role.<sup>21</sup> Language is not the source of the child's image, concept, or logic. But when the child does

begin to develop speech, language has a feedback function promoting perceptual discrimination (Gibson). It "enables thought to range over vast stretches of time and space, liberating it from the immediate" (Piaget).<sup>22</sup>

### *Concrete Operatory Period*

A central period in the child's cognitive development, and one in which the divergence between Piaget's and Gibson's interpretations is quite clear, occurs about the age of 7. Around this time the child develops a series of concepts organizing the concrete environment about him. This enables him to escape the distorting influence of perceptual cues to which he was earlier subject. For example, the concept of the conservation of quantity is developed. If in front of a child an experimenter pours water from a wide, short beaker into one that is tall and narrow, and then asks the child whether there is more in the first beaker or the second, or whether there is the same amount in both, the child of 5 will often say that there is more in the second, being confused by the perceptual cue of height. At times he may concentrate on width and say that there is more in the first. He may vary his answers, but these are subject to the perceptual cues upon which he is concentrating. About the age of 7 (or earlier for some children, but still in a definite sequence of stages), the child will say that there is the same amount in each beaker. This shows that he recognizes the conservation of quantity, a concept he will not lose. Similarly the child gradually becomes aware of conservation with other subject matters, such as number, area, space and volume.

*For Piaget*, this achievement is due to what he calls a "reflective abstraction,"

which does not derive properties from *things* but from our ways of *acting on things*, the operations we perform on them; perhaps, rather, from the various fundamental ways of coordinating such acts or operations.<sup>23</sup>

The knowledge of conservation that exists in the object is due to the child's assimilation of the object to an action scheme somewhat as the infant comes to know the nipple or thumb by assimilating it to the action scheme of sucking. Between the sensori-motor period and the period called that of "concrete operations," the child interiorizes the actions he performs on things; the action of pouring water from one beaker to the other leads by a process of reflective abstraction to an operation, or an interiorized structure, of inversion. By the operation of inversion and by that of negation (e.g., negating the height of the flask and adding proportionately to the width, or vice versa) the child gains an insight into the conservation of quantity. Piaget finds support for this interpretation in the intermediate stages through which the child moves in this achievement.

Another influence on Piaget's interpretation here is the success of the group concept in mathematics, where a property is arrived at, not by abstraction from the thing, but by an abstraction from an operation performed on it. Piaget holds that we cannot adequately explain the function of mathematics in physics unless we acknowledge that by reflective abstraction a person reaches structures in the world that are independent of him.

The isomorphism between intellectual structures and physical structures existing in the world is owed to the fact that our intellectual structures are constructed through the push and pull of the environment upon us: the formation of our external action patterns as a response to the environment, and the interiorization of these patterns through reflective abstraction.<sup>24</sup> One characteristic of such concrete operations and conservation concepts that can be accounted for only

by reflective abstraction is their necessity: the child who has come to recognize the conservation of quantity will say that there *has* to be the same amount of water in both beakers. But

if the logico-mathematical laws of "being" are discovered from without, in the manner of physical laws, they are then no longer 'necessary' in the deductive and axiomatic meaning of the term, and nothing proves that the selection was sufficient for our adaptation being complete in their regard rather than simply approximating, as in other domains (perception, etc.).<sup>25</sup>

*Eleanor Gibson* interprets the same case differently. She holds that "conservation is invariance over time and over event sequence. . . . The perception of sameness over change is what is critical."<sup>26</sup> Some evidence supports this. For example, the majority of children tested give as their reason for the conservation judgment the identity of the water in both beakers. Moreover, in an experiment where a screen is placed between the beakers and the children, thereby shielding them from perceptual differences, they judge more quickly that there is the same amount of water in each. This judgment seems then to come not from interiorized actions such as negation or compensation, but from perception of sameness over change. So for Gibson it is a matter of physical abstraction from the objects. In the conservation judgment she does not recognize a qualitatively higher stage of knowledge, as compared with perception, whereas Piaget does affirm such a qualitative difference between these forms of knowledge.

The problem of what accounts for the child's awareness of conservation has a bearing on how other concepts are developed, including some used in metaphysics. Without being able here to treat this question as it deserves, we would point out that whether conservation comes to be known by reflective abstraction or by simple abstraction, there is a structure or property in the physical thing that is known (contrary to Hume), and that the basis for one's judgment is the physical object as well as his cognitive structure (contrary to Kant). Perhaps we must agree with Piaget that reflective abstraction does at times give access to a structure or property of physical reality, since modern physics reaches such structures. As Piaget says, mathematics is not simply a language in physics--at times it predicts. Moreover, it would seem we must agree with Piaget that the conservation judgment, when compared with pre-operatory perception, is a qualitatively higher form of knowledge of the environment. Yet Piaget's view that necessity cannot properly derive from simple abstraction may show a lingering influence of empiricism in his own work; it has not met with as much agreement as other aspects of his studies on conservation.

Gibson's view that conservation is due to the perception of sameness over change has much to support it. But it seems excessively wary of admitting any distinction of stages in knowledge, and it does not give sufficient account of the subject's structures that may be involved. Perhaps at times the subject's structured activity is the *conditio sine qua non* and the physical object and simple abstraction from it the more direct source of a valid concept. At other times the subject's operation may be the source and the physical object and experience of it the *conditio sine qua non*. In any case, one can see the relevance of developmental psychology's conservation studies to the question of the psychogenesis of philosophical concepts, specifically that of being.

### *Formal Operatory Period*

A further stage of the child's cognitive growth is found in pre-adolescence (from age 11 or 12 to 15), a period Piaget calls that of formal operations. To relate this to our question we shall note an observation which in part exemplifies this period, discuss what accounts for the knowledge

distinctive of this period, and then inquire whether the knowledge found here is implicitly metaphysical.

A central characteristic of the formal operatory period may be seen in the following experiment. Five flasks are set before subjects taken from middle childhood and pre-adolescence. Each flask has a chemically different liquid, which may be designated as 1, 2, 3, 4, and *g*. The experimenter tells each subject that a yellow liquid can be made by combining *g* with one or more of the other flasks' contents; the subject's task is to produce the yellow color. A younger child (7;1) takes *g* and pours it into several of the other flasks without achieving the desired result, and then into some combinations of the other flasks, but reaches only a few of the possible combinations. The pre-adolescent begins otherwise. One subject (13;0) says

You have to try with all the bottles. I'll begin with the one at the end (from 1 to 4 with *g*). . . . It doesn't work any more. Maybe you have to mix them (he tries  $1 + 2 + g$ , then  $1 + 3 + g$ ). . . . It turned yellow . . . But are there other solutions? I'll try.<sup>27</sup>

This example illustrates the actual transcendence in the pre-adolescent's cognitive structure and operation when compared to the younger child's. The child at the concrete operatory level is not unsystematic, but what characterizes his approach to the problem is that he begins immediately by attempting an empirical correspondence with the experimenter's results. He is oriented to the actual concrete rather than to the possible. This is true generally of his level of operations, as the earlier example of the conservation of quantity showed. Connected with this limitation is the fact that the child of the concrete operatory period forms operational concepts one by one for very limited areas. His organization of the world about him proceeds by his development of "more or less separate islets of organization,"<sup>28</sup> not interlocking to form the integrated systems found in adolescents.

The pre-adolescent begins his consideration of the problem by a systematic recognition of all the possibles, and only then proceeds to look for the real or actual by an examination of the different variables. He thus clearly distinguishes the actual from the possible in the problem.

Other characteristics are associated with this basic property of the formal operatory period. The preadolescent proceeds in the problem by a hypothetico-deductive method, systematically trying all the possible situations. This approach depends upon what the concrete operatory child has achieved, but the pre-adolescent puts these achievements into the form of propositions and reflects on the propositions rather than simply on the concrete data. Piaget notes that this interpropositional thinking is an approach sufficiently disengaged from centration on the concrete to allow a separation of form from content, and of possibilities from the actual. The greater scope and possibilities of the preadolescent's knowledge are based upon this more advanced structure. Piaget describes this structure and relates it to the adolescent's growth in affective and social interest in the following passage:

The subject succeeds in freeing himself from the concrete and in locating *reality* within a group of *possible* transformations. This final fundamental decentering, which occurs at the end of childhood, prepares for adolescence, whose principal characteristic is a similar *liberation from the concrete* in favor of interest oriented toward the *non-present and the future*. This is the age of great ideals and of the beginning of theories, as well as the time of simple present adaptation to reality. This affective and social impulse of adolescence has often been described. But it has not always been understood that this impulse is dependent upon a transformation of thought that permits the

handling of hypotheses and reasoning with regard to propositions removed from concrete and present observation.<sup>29</sup>

We have not followed Piaget's analysis of the development of moral reasoning in the younger child--an area not as central to Piaget's interests as the knowledge that leads to scientific reasoning. Nevertheless, we should at least note, as the above passage indicates, that Piaget associates the adolescent's moral idealism and interest in the non-present and future with the cognitive development characteristic of the formal operatory period. The value orientation of the adolescent shows a development over that of the younger person similar to that found in his cognitive development. In both the affective and the cognitive areas the adolescent, while retaining the operation characteristic of the younger child, is capable of going beyond this by systematically considering what is possible and centering on the actual in its relation to the possible.

There is a correlation between stages in cognitive development and in socialization or moral reasoning. To take an example from an earlier stage, it is only when the child is entering the concrete operatory period that he is capable of playing games with other children in a way that calls for all of them to observe equally a set of rules independent of themselves. During the concrete operatory period the child's moral awareness mainly centers on an organization of his concrete behavior in virtue of rules given him and his affective relation to parent figures that makes the assimilation of rules possible. This period is marked by a moral realism that does not make much room for differences between intentional and accidental wrongdoing. The scope of the adolescent's interest, however, is much greater. This is due not simply to sociological factors, but to an inner growth toward an ability to center on possibilities for oneself and society, to experience their value and seek their realization, frequently, indeed, in a utopian manner.<sup>30</sup>

In continuity with his approach to earlier stages of the child's cognitive interaction with the environment, Piaget stresses that in the period of formal operations knowledge is gained more through the mediation of the subject's operations than through discrimination of the structure given in the environment. While not denying the latter, he emphasizes the former because he is showing the genesis of the knowledge and structure that underlies physical science, and particularly physics. He is interested in the child's quantitative knowledge, because that is what is characteristic of physics and of the interrelation of mathematics and physical experience found in that science.

The logic whose genesis he examines is modern logic closely related to mathematics. The development from the child's concrete operatory period to his formal operatory period is for him a matter of reflective abstraction. A new and more adequate cognitive structure is generated within one due to the objective situations the child faces in his or her environment (physical, but also social and academic, because these can facilitate or retard the child's growth), the inadequacy of the child's present structures to meet the problems presented to the situation, and the feedback from the situation and one's own cognitive interaction with it. The pre-adolescent who tries to find the combination that gives the yellow color achieves his solution by way of an operation that orders his action and the environment in accordance with a mathematical logic more advanced than that of the concrete operatory child:

Without knowing any logical formula, or the formal criteria for a mathematical 'group' . . . the adolescent of twelve to fifteen is capable of manipulating transformations according to four possibilities: *I* (identical transformation), *N* (inverse transformation), *R* (reciprocal transformation), and *C* (correlative transformation) . . . combining inversions and reciprocities into a single system, and thus achieving a synthesis of the hitherto partial structures.<sup>31</sup>

At a deeper level the operation of the pre-adolescent is seen as an application of the schemes of the possible and actual in accord with the hypothetico-deductive method. Similarly, Piaget sees the adolescent's new awareness of values as knowledge mediated by one's activity, one's development of the structure of the formal operatory period, and one's orientation to a wider horizon than in middle childhood.

In our analysis of earlier periods of the child's cognitive development we have suggested that Piaget's account must be supplemented by that of some Anglo-American psychologists who stress the subject's discrimination of the features of the environment to explain cognitive growth. We have indicated that in the infant's achievement of knowledge of the permanently existing object the knowledge present is not only that mediated by the child's activity, but also (and just as centrally) that mediated by his or her perceptual discrimination. In the concrete operatory child achieving awareness of conservation we have suggested that what is operative is not only knowledge mediated by internalized activity or operations, but also a qualitative knowledge through what Piaget calls "simple abstraction." That is, for example, discrimination of the attribute of quantity from that of height or width in the case of the flasks of water, by abstraction of the one from the other over a process of change. Similarly, we now suggest that in the formal operatory period there is also this qualitative knowledge that is basic to the increased scope evident in the young person's knowledge. At times Piaget acknowledges this, though he denies its centrality. For example, in explaining one of his experiments with pre-adolescents (a pendulum experiment), he notes that the child gains knowledge of metrical or quantitative proportion only by beginning with qualitative proportion.<sup>52</sup>

Psychologists who emphasize cognitive development through discrimination rather than through operation do not extend their studies into adolescence in the way that Piaget does. But in continuity with what we have said earlier, we suggest the following. The pre-adolescent's knowledge of the distinction between the actual and the possible, which is applied in the hypothetico-deductive reasoning that Piaget studies, is mediated by a process of discrimination as well as by a process of operation or adjustment. It is mediated by what Piaget calls simple abstraction as well as by reflective abstraction.

We acknowledge the presence of the latter. That is, the knowledge is in part the result of: (a) the growing child's adjustment to his environment (including here both his physical environment and his value horizon), (b) his experience that this environment is larger than that to which he previously adjusted himself and that the adjustment made in middle childhood is no longer adequate, (c) the feedback both of environment and of his earlier adjustment to it upon him as cognitive subject, and (d) his action (by reflective abstraction) to adjust to this environment, now within the context of the actual and the possible.

But in part it is due also to a kind of intellectual discrimination between the actual and the possible, which discrimination was not central for the younger child. It is made through a negation: the real is distinct from the simply possible. This involves a simple abstraction of what actually is from all the possibilities relating to a specific experiment (e.g., that of making the yellow color by a combination of flasks). It is involved in areas of qualitative knowledge that Piaget does not investigate. It is a matter of natural logic that questions why things are the way they are, rather than otherwise. Making this discrimination seems to require a higher order of abstraction than the abstraction of this (e.g., quantity as an attribute) from that (e.g., height or width as attributes), which underlay the child's grasp of conservation in his earlier period of cognitive growth. While



depending genetically on the earlier discrimination of the child, this later growth makes possible the greater scope of the adolescent's knowledge.

What is the relevance of these remarks on the formal operatory period to our question about the psychogenesis of being? I suggest that this type of knowledge found in the adolescent, which is basic to scientific knowledge as well as to his self-direction in preparing himself for the adult world, is made possible through knowledge that is implicitly metaphysical. The basis for this suggestion is that what enables the pre-adolescent to interact cognitively with his environment in a way surpassing that of middle childhood is his knowledge of being. His approach to many problems offered him by his environment is based on his adjustment to this environment in the context of what is actual and what is possible, and on his discrimination of the actual from the possible.

This is what liberates him from the limited focus and method of the concrete operatory period and enables him to test systematically the varied possible answers to a problem such as that of the flasks. This liberates him also from centering his value orientation on adaptation simply to present circumstances. His knowledge does reach a structure in his environment and is not simply a knowledge of language or concept, for only a knowledge of the actual in the environment (as distinct from the possible) enables him to operate as he does in realistically forming and testing hypotheses. Similarly, this knowledge reaches a dimension of the value to which he is oriented, since the life that is possible for him is not restricted to an adjustment within his current situation or circumstances.

The actualization of his own possibilities and those of the society of which he is a part engages his interests. A sense of responsibility for such an actualization is a growth beyond the orientation of his childhood, and is as central to the development of the young person as his more directly cognitive growth. As we indicated at the beginning of this chapter, however, this entire achievement is what is meant by the word "being": what actually is, as distinct from what is merely possible, is nothing more than reality as being. In his orientation to the actualization of his own possibilities and those of his society the individual is oriented to *esse*, since the actualization of his being is *esse*.

Moreover, in his action and knowledge a double ground is evident for the adolescent's knowledge of being, as was called for by a Thomistic understanding of the psychogenesis of being. One ground is, as we said, a discrimination of the actual from the possible; this recalls the Thomistic position that being is known through sense knowledge, abstraction, and intellectual intuition or insight into the concrete existing reality of one's physical environment. The other ground is the initiative of the subject shown in his adjustment to an ever enlarging environment, an adjustment that his own being (*esse*) elicits from him. This is explainable by the Thomistic association of the good with *esse*, and the dependence of the subject's organization of his own activity and his environment upon his orientation to this actualization of himself and others.

We suggest, then, that the adolescent's distinctive knowledge is explainable by his orientation to being. On this account, his knowledge is implicitly metaphysical in that it is possible only through his knowledge of being. But it is merely implicitly so, for this knowledge is not possessed reflectively and systematically, as it is in metaphysics.

## Conclusion

We have attempted to evaluate St. Thomas' assertion of man's orientation to, and capacity for, a knowledge of being that validly bases a metaphysics. This knowledge is mediated both by

intellectual insight into being as concretely existing in the sensible individual and by man's affective orientation to, and action for, the good. We have sought to do this in view of modern objections deriving from one or another aspect of modern sciences against ascribing such a metaphysical scope to human knowledge.

To base our evaluation on modern experience and on a modern interpretation of knowledge, we turned to the developmental psychology of Jean Piaget and some American psychologists to study their analysis of the subject's cognitive interaction with his or her environment in a progressive manner, and to the observations on which they base their interpretations. We have presented evidence to support Piaget's assertion of a limited transcendence in this knowledge through the sensory-motor period, the concrete operatory period, and the formal operatory period. The dimension of the environment that the child adjusts to and knows enlarges throughout this development, as do the structures that he brings to bear in his knowledge. The development is provoked both by dimensions of the environment not assimilable to earlier structures and by the activity of the cognitive subject.

The activity of the subject stressed by Piaget is behavior that leads by reflective abstraction to a more adequate and interior organization and construction of operations and environment. The activity the other psychologists stress is exploratory and discriminating perceptual activity. For the latter the environment is discriminable structure, whereas, for the former it is more a principle to which one adjusts one's behavior and which has a feedback influence on his changing cognitive structures. The action Piaget emphasizes is central not only for the subject's organization of the physical world, but also for enlarging his value awareness and moral knowledge.

With the aid of developmental psychology we have uncovered knowledge experiences for which many adversaries of metaphysical knowledge cannot account. For example, Hume's phenomenalism cannot account for the infant's grasp of the permanent object; only a realism can account for this. Linguistic philosophers who give primacy to language use cannot account for the emergence of language in the infant and young child, nor can they account for the relation of this emergence to the child's earlier cognitive interaction with his environment. Only a recognition of the dependence of language on knowledge can do this. Those who, in accord with the analytic-synthetic distinction, deny any knowledge of necessity in nature that is objectively based cannot account for the child's development into the concrete operatory period, nor, for that matter, for science itself. And those who deny man's knowledge of reality as being, in continuity with Thomas' understanding of this, cannot explain the pre-adolescent's enlargement of knowledge or the distinctive structure of his knowledge, shown both in his or her primitive scientific approach and in his or her value orientation and knowledge.

The development of these insights can help to show the human orientation to, and capacity for, a knowledge of being which bases a metaphysics. More than that, it can help save modern science from itself, for those who would restrict man's knowledge and interest to the level of science and to the technology it makes available deny the context that alone makes possible science and technological progress. To thus restrict cognitive growth and adjustment to one's environment is to deny the meaning of scientific knowledge as well as the fully human context in which the use of technology can be properly evaluated. This would also deny also a foundation for any morality that is more than a particular culture or a pragmatism.

*St. Anselm's Abbey  
Washington, D.C.*

## Notes

1. See "Human Transcendence and Thomistic Resources," in J. Farrelly, *God's Work in a Changing World* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1985), pp. 228-286.

2. I examined a number of modern and contemporary objections against the possibility of metaphysical knowledge, and suggested some approaches to dialogue with these objections in "Religious Reflection and Human Transcendence," *op. cit.*, pp. 161-227. In reference to current objections against realism and answers to these, see also, *Realism* (Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association), 59 (1985).

3. These criticisms are expressed in J. Piaget, *Insights and Illusions in Philosophy* (New York: N.A.L., 1971). I have commented on several of them in *op. cit.*, pp. 200-204.

The philosophical relevance of Piaget's work is discussed in Theodore Mischel, ed., *Cognitive Development and Epistemology* (New York: Academic Press, 1971). One of the discussants (D. W. Hamlyn) discounts such relevance: "My own opinion is that the mixture of philosophical and empirical issues involve in each case a muddle, that the philosophical and psychological questions which are at stake are different from each other, and that there are no grounds for the belief that philosophical questions can be answered by appeal to empirical evidence or vice versa," p. 19. Other contributors, Stephen Toulmin and Bernard Kaplan, differ from this position.

4. Jean Piaget, "Piaget's Theory," *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology*, 3rd ed., ed. Paul H. Mussen (New York: Wiley, 1970), p. 722. Of Piaget's many books we can cite here particularly his summary work, J. Piaget and Bärbel Inhelder, *The Psychology of the Child* (New York: Basic, 1969). He discusses his own intellectual development in *Insights*. Among works on Piaget, I have been particularly helped by J. H. Flavell, *The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget* (Princeton: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1963), and Hans G. Furth, *Piaget and Knowledge* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969).

5. See C.H. Waddington, "The Theory of Evolution Today," in *Beyond Reductionism*, ed. Arthur Koestler and J.R. Smythies (Boston: Beacon, 1969), pp. 357-395.

6. Eleanor J. Gibson, *Principles of Perceptual Learning and Development* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969). This book represents not only Gibson's work but also that of many psychologists, mainly Anglo-American, whose work she reports on and uses. Also see D. Elkind and J. Flavell, eds., *Studies in Cognitive Development* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969).

7. See James J. Gibson, *The Perception of the Visual World* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1950), and Herbert L. Pick, Jr. and Anne Pick, "Sensory and Perceptual Development," in Mussen, ed. *op. cit.*, I, 849-938.

The philosophical relevance of J. Gibson's work is brought out by R. Harré and E.H. Madden in "Natural Powers and Powerful Natures," *Philosophy*, 48 (1973), 209-230. In this article the authors show that a non-Humean philosophy is needed to account for what science is doing in relation to our knowledge and concepts of natural powers, natural kinds, and natural agency. The authors show that Gibson's work undercuts a philosophical presupposition of those who accept Hume's event-ontology: "Finally the powerful psychological work of J.J. Gibson has shown that there is no empirical basis for the tacit assumption, shared by many philosophers, that as a matter of fact percepts are organized groups of sensations," p. 217. Also see R. Harré and E.H. Madden *Casual Powers: A Theory of Natural Necessity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975).

8. E. Gibson, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

9. *Ibid.* p. 3.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 77. "The criterion of perceptual learning is thus an increase in specificity. What is learned can be described as detection of properties, patterns, and distinctive features" not previously registered.

11. Jean Piaget, *The Origins of Intelligence in Children* (New York: Intl. University Press, 1963), p. 42.

12. *Loc. cit.*

13. J. Piaget, *The Construction of Reality in the Child* (New York: Basic, 1954), p. xi.

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 354-357.

15. Gibson, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 117.

17. Piaget, *Construction*, p. 11.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

19. See E.J. Gibson and R.D. Walk, "The Visual Cliff," *Scientific American*, 202 (1960), 64-71, and *op. cit.*, ch. 17, "The Development of Perception in the Individual: Perceiving Space and Events," pp. 369ff. For supporting studies see T.G.R. Bower, "The Visual World of Infants," *Scientific American*, 215 (1966), 80-92, and "The Object in the World of the Infant," *Scientific American*, 225 (1971), 30-38. Bower develops ingenious experiments to defend for the infant what J.J. Gibson defended for the adult, namely, that perception of size, distance, shape, and solidity is not due to an inference based on association of visual or tactile cues with the infant's perception of the *projected* object. It is rather due to the infant's perception of the *real* object with its size, distance, shape, and solidity. It is however questionable whether Bower undermines Piaget's view on the amount of time it takes the infant to construct the permanently existing object.

20. Gibson, *op. cit.*, pp. 381, 384.

21. For example, see Piaget, *The Psychology of the Child*, p. 90: "These data . . . indicate that language does not constitute the source of logic but is, on the contrary, structured by it." See also Piaget, "Language and Intellectual Operations," in Furth, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-130; and Gibson, *op. cit.*, pp. 154ff.

22. Piaget, *Psychology*, p. 86.

23. J. Piaget, *Structuralism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p. 19. Piaget acknowledges a qualitative abstraction from things as a factor in our knowledge of the world: "There is what we call *physical experience*, which consists of extracting information from the objects themselves through a simple process of abstraction. This abstraction reduces to dissociating one newly discovered property from the others and disregarding the latter. Thus it is physical experience that allows the child to discover weight while disregarding the object's color, etc., or to discover that with objects with the same nature, their weight is greater as their volume increases, etc." in Mussen, *op. cit.*, I, p. 721.

24. See *Structuralism*, pp. 37-43, 62. That there is a construction at the foundation of mathematical concepts is a view very widely held in the 20th century, though this construction is interpreted in different ways. See Charles Parsons, "Mathematics, Foundations of," *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. P. Edwards (New York: Macmillan, 1967), V, 188-213, particularly his discussion of two types of constructivism, namely, "intuitionism" (Brouwer) and "formalism" (Hilbert). For a brief survey of how widespread the constructivist view of mathematics has become, see M. Vignano, "La matematica e ancora vera?", *Gregorianum*, 54 (1973), 61-89. While studies of the foundations of mathematics and of modern logic associated with mathematics are generally axiomatic and not anchored in the child's cognitive interaction with

the world, Piaget relates the development of some primitive mathematical concepts and an elementary modern logic to the matrix of the child's natural cognitive development.

25. J. Piaget, *Biologie et Connaissance* (Paris: Gallimard, 1967), p. 361; also see Piaget's analysis of the meaning of structure, e.g., in *Insights*, p. 109: "The notion of 'structure' is not at all reducible to a simple formalization due to the observer's mind; it expresses, on the contrary, through its formalizations to which, moreover, it lends itself, properties of the structured 'being'." Piaget acknowledges that some of his collaborators have differed from him on the source of necessity. *Ibid.*, pp. 31f.

It is very informative to compare Piaget's views with those in the excellent book by Henry Veatch, *Two Logics. The Conflict Between Classical and Neo-Analytic Philosophy* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969). The logic whose genesis Piaget investigates is what Veatch calls a "relating-logic," and the logic associated with Piaget's "simple abstraction" is called by Veatch a "what-logic." The representatives of neoanalytic philosophy and "relating-logic" whom Veatch studies deny that by this logic we reach structures, causality, and necessity in the world. Piaget, however, considers that by this logic and the physical experience it organizes we do indeed reach quantitative structures in the physical world and their necessity and causal relations. On the other hand, Piaget denies that we reach a necessity in nature by qualitative knowledge or "simple abstraction," whereas Veatch argues effectively that we do. Veatch denies that the category "analytic proposition" does justice to our "what statements," and he shows that these statements are basic to our ordinary discourse, the humanities, and parts of science. While these are necessary truths if they are true at all, in principle they can be proved false by experience. The following is one summary of this in Veatch's book:

"For example, such statements as 'Hydrogen is an element,' or 'Human beings are a species of animal,' or 'Motion is a transition of something from something to something else' are clearly what-statements, in that each merely attempts to state in the predicate what its subject is. If this is so, then it would seem that the evidence for the truth of such statements would have to be self-evidence--i.e., it is only through a consideration of hydrogen itself that we come to know what it is. On the other hand, for all of their seeming self-evidence, we also noted that such statements might well turn out to be false. Chemists might decide that hydrogen was not an element after all, or motion might turn out to be an entirely different sort of thing than the Aristotelians had thought it was, etc.," pp. 216-217.

26. Gibson, *op. cit.*, pp. 388-389. She is here dependent upon experiments cited by Jerome Bruner in "On the Conservation of Liquids," in J. Bruner, *et al.*, *Studies in Cognitive Growth* (New York: Wiley, 1966), pp. 183-207, although she, together with Piaget, differs from Bruner on the question of the dependence of conservation on language.

Also see L. Wallach, "On the Bases of Conservation," in Elkind and Flavell, eds., *op. cit.*, pp. 191-219. Wallach gives positive value to both experience or perception, on the one hand, and to cognitive structure and operation, on the other, in the genesis of conservation, though more to the former than to the latter. See, in the same book, D. Elkind, "Conservation and Concept Formation," pp. 171-189. Elkind compares Piaget's study of concept formation with studies of concept formation by way of discrimination. He judges that the discriminative studies reflect more an Aristotelian mode of concept formation, while Piaget's reflects more a Galilean mode of concept formation. He concludes: "Taken singly, either approach provides only a partial understanding of the concept as we know it in the behaving and thinking subject and in the history of scientific enquiry. Taken together, however, these two versions of the concept can provide a comprehensive

view of the concept that will account for the modes of conception in both the individual and science," p. 188.

27. B. Inhelder and J. Piaget, *The Growth of Logical Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence* (New York: Basic, 1958), p. 117.

28. Flavell, *op cit.*, p. 204.

29. Piaget and Inhelder, *Psychology*, pp. 130-131. Emphasis added. Flavell comments as follows: "The most important general property of formal-operational thought, the one from which Piaget derives all others . . . concerns the *real* versus the *possible*." Flavell, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

30. See Piaget, *Psychology*, pp. 114-127, 149-151.

31. *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 142.

## 5. **The Person and Moral Growth**

*George F. McLean*

For the last half century, from John Dewey's emphasis upon socialization to the more recent emphasis upon the person, education has retained one general goal, namely, to get beyond providing information in order to focus upon the development of the person. Though the need for content has often required reaffirmation, the time is long passed when schools were considered to be only repositories of knowledge upon which students might draw. The ancient respect and even veneration of one's teacher as one who creatively affected the student's life and personality is being reborn in the conviction that, along with information and even knowledge in its broadest sense, real education must promote the development of the student's powers to examine and evaluate, to create and communicate, to feel and to respond.

Nowhere is this more true, or more specifically intended, than in programs of moral education. Values clarification programs aim at bringing students to a greater consciousness of the values they possess; cognitive-developmental programs are directly concerned with the growth of the student's ability to make moral judgments. Further progress through identifying more adequate goals and enriching the content of such moral education programs depends upon improving our understanding of the nature of moral growth.

This, in turn, requires clarifying both the place of moral development in the life of the person and the nature of the person as a distinct and responsible agent in the community. Such understanding is not, of course, fabricated upon the moment, but is derived from the long experience of humankind. Hence, we should review our heritages for answers to three crucial questions about the person as the subject of a moral life and of moral education.

(a) Is the person only a set of roles constituted entirely in function of a structure or system in which one plays a particular part? If so, one could not refuse to do whatever the system demanded or tolerated. Or is the person a subject in his or her own right, with one's proper dignity, heritage, goals and standards?

(b) Is one merely a stream of consciousness, who becomes a person only upon the achievement of a certain level of self-awareness? If so, it is difficult to integrate the experiences of early childhood and the emotions of adult life which play so central a role in moral maturity. Or is the person an essentially free and responsible psycho-physical subject?

(c) Finally, does a person's freedom consist merely in implementing a pattern of behavior encoded in one's nature. If so, there would be little place for the anguish of decision, the pains of moral growth, or the creativity of a moral life. Or is this free subject a creative center whose basic dynamism consists in realizing a unique inner harmony and outer community, for which moral education should contribute both form and content?

To respond to such basic concerns those who are involved with education must have available the full resources of their heritages. At the same time, because the task of self-creation on the part of the student will reflect one or more of the multiple modes of our contemporary self-understanding, it can be expected that not everyone will subscribe to all the possible dimensions

of the meaning of the person--certainly not in the same mode or to the same degree. Hence, one involved in the moral education of others in a pluralistic society must be clear about the potential dimensions of the person: what they are,<sup>1</sup> how they are rooted in our cultural heritages, how they affect the aims and methods of moral education, and how they can be interrelated in a mutually reinforcing manner toward the development of a more integrated person and a more cohesive society. Indeed, there may prove to be a certain correlation of the above-mentioned questions both with the dimensions of the subject as a distinct-yet-related responsible moral agent and with the progressive development of the person throughout life.

For orientation in this task let us begin by delineating the meaning of person by contrasting it to a number of other notions. These contrasts will serve subsequently as guideposts for a series of positive and progressively deepening insights regarding the nature of the person, their moral growth, and self-fulfillment.

First and most notably, persons are contrasted to possessions. We object most strongly to any suggestion, whether in word, gesture, or deed, by which a person is treated as a commodity subject to manipulation or as a mere means by which others attain their goals. This, indeed, has become a litmus test for acceptable behavior.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, persons are considered to be irreducible to the community. Any structures or situation which considers only the whole without taking account of the individual and his/her concerns is rejected precisely as depersonalizing. Thirdly and conversely, those who are so individualistic as to be insensitive to the concerns of others are themselves considered impersonal. These exclusions direct our search for the meaning of the human person toward a responsible self which is neither reducible to, nor independent of, the physical and human context in which one abides.

This positive notion of the person has not always had an identical or unchanging meaning. By natural growth, more than by mere accretion, the notion has managed to incorporate the great achievements of human self-discovery for which, in turn, it has been both the stimulus and the goal. This continuing process has been central to philosophy from its earliest days. Like all life processes, the search for the person has consisted in a sequence of important steps, each of which has resulted in a certain equilibrium or level of culture. In time each has been enriched and molded by subsequent discoveries. Indeed, it may not be incorrect to say that a parallel search is the dynamism at the heart of our personal life as well.

To look into this experience it will be advantageous to study the nature of the person through reflection on a series of paired and progressively deeper dimensions: first, as a role and as the one who lives out this role; second, as free self-consciousness and as the subject of that freedom; and third, as moral agent and as searching for one's moral development and fulfillment. The first member of each pair is integral to an understanding of the human person and of moral growth, but each of these members, in turn, requires its corresponding dimension and evokes the pair on the level that follows.

## **Role and Individual**

### *Role*

One means for finding the earliest meaning of a particular notion is to study the term by which it is designated. As earliest, this meaning tends to be more manifest and hence to remain current. The major study<sup>3</sup> on the origins of the term 'person' concludes that, of the multiple origins which have been proposed, the most probable refers to the mask used by actors in Greece and



subsequently adopted in Rome. Some explain that this was called a *persona* because by 'sounding through' (*personando*)<sup>4</sup> its single hole the voice of the wearer was strengthened, concentrated, and made to resound more clearly. Others see the term as a transformation of the Greek term for the mask which symbolized the actor's role.<sup>5</sup> Hence, an original and relatively surface notion of person is the assumption of a character or the carrying out of a role. As such it has little to do with one's 'self', it is defined rather in terms of the set of relations which constitutes the plot or story-line of a play.

This etymology is tentative; some would document an early and more rich sense of person in Homeric literature.<sup>6</sup> There can be no doubt, however, that the term has been used broadly in the above ethical sense of a role played in human actions. Ancient biblical literature described God as not being a respecter of persons, that is, of the roles played by various individuals.<sup>7</sup> The Stoics thought of this in cosmic terms, seeing the wise person either as writing their role or as interpreting a role determined by the Master. In either case, to be a wise person was to be consistent, to play out one's role in harmony with oneself and with reason as the universal law of nature. From this ethical sense of person as role it was but a short step to a similar legal sense. This generally is a distinct and characteristic relation, although, as Cicero noted, it could be multiple: "Three roles do I sustain . . . my own, that of my opponent, that of the judge."<sup>8</sup>

Far from being archaic,<sup>9</sup> the understanding of person as the playing of a role seems typical of much modern and American thought. John Dewey, in *Reconstruction in Philosophy*, characterized the essence of the modern mentality in just these terms: in the case of ancient or classic usage "we are dealing with something constant in *existence*, physical or metaphysical; in the other [modern] case, with something constant in *function* and operation."<sup>10</sup> The social and psychological sciences focus upon these roles or functions and in these terms attempt to construct, through operational definitions, their entire conceptual field.

This undergirds much of the progress in the social and behavioral sciences. As the same individual can play multiple roles, even in the same circumstances, studying the person in terms of roles makes it possible to identify specific dimensions of one's life for more precise investigation and to analyze serially the multiple relations which obtain in an interpersonal situation. William James, for example, distinguishes in this manner the self shown to family from that which one shows to professional colleagues or to God. Further, determining to pursue this exclusively on the basis of data which is subject to empirical verification<sup>11</sup> has made possible an immense collaborative effort to achieve a scientific understanding of human life.

Though much has been accomplished through understanding the person in terms of roles, there may have been a distant early warning of the limitations of this approach in Auguste Comte's (1798-1857) *Cours de philosophie positive*. By rejecting psychology as a scientific discipline and reducing all data concerning the person to either biology or sociology he ignored introspection and the corresponding dimensions of the individual's conscious life. The person was not only one who could play a role, but one whose total reality consisted in playing that role.

More recently Gabriel Marcel has pointed up a number of unfortunate consequences which derive from considering the person only in terms of roles or functional relations. First, no account can be then taken of one's proper self-identity. If only "surface" characteristics are considered, while excluding all attention to "depth,"<sup>12</sup> the person is empty; if the person can be analyzed fully in terms of external causes and relations one becomes increasingly devoid of intrinsic value. What is more, lack of personal identity makes it impossible to establish personal relations with others. Even that consistency between, or within, one's roles--which the Stoics as early proponents

of this understanding of person considered to be the essence of personal life--is left without foundation. Life would be reduced "in the words of Shakespeare `to a tale told by an idiot'".<sup>13</sup>

### *The Individual*

These difficulties suggest that attention must be directed to another level of meaning if the person is to find the resources required to play its roles. Rather than attempting to think of a role without an actor, it is important to look to the individual who assumes the role and expresses him or herself therein. Caution must be exercised here, however, lest the search for the subject or the self appear to reinforce the excesses of self-centeredness and individualism. This could be a special danger in the context of cultures whose positive stress on self-reliance and independence has been rooted historically in an atomistic understanding of persons as individuals, single and unrelated. This danger is reflected, for example, in the common law understanding of judicial rulings, not as defining the nature of interpersonal relations, but simply as reducing violence through resolving conflicts between individuals whose lives happen to have intersected.

In this context it is helpful to note that when Aristotle laid the foundations for the Western understanding of the person he did so in the context of the Greek understanding of the physical universe as a unified, dynamic, quasi life process in which all was included and all were related. Indeed, the term `physical' was derived from the term for growth and the components of this process were seen always with, and in relation to, others. (Similarly, modern physical theory identifies a uniform and all-inclusive pattern of relations such that any physical displacement, no matter how small, affects all other bodies). Within this unified pattern of relations the identification of multiple individuals, far from being destructive of unity, provides the texture required for personal life. Where individuals are differentiated by the moral tenor of their actions which, in turn, make a difference to other persons distinctiveness becomes, not an impediment to, but a principle of, community.<sup>14</sup>

In order better to appreciate the members of a community it is helpful to consider them on three progressively more specific dimensions, first as instances of a particular type, that is, as substances; secondly as existing, that is, as subsisting individuals; and thirdly as self-conscious, that is, as persons. The order in which these three will be considered is not accidental, for while it is necessary to be of a certain definite type, it is more important to exist as an individual in one's own right; for the person, finally, it is important above all that one be self-conscious and free. Hence, our exposition begins with substance and the subsisting individual in order to identify some general and basic--though not specific or exclusive--characteristics of the person. What is distinctive, namely, self-awareness and freedom, will be treated in the following sections.

1. *Substance*. It was Aristotle who identified substance as the basic component of the physical order; his related insights remain fundamental to understanding the individual as the subject of moral life. His clue to this basic discovery appears in language. Comparing the usage of such terms as "running," and "runner" we find that the first is applied to the second, which, however, is not said, in turn, of anything else.<sup>15</sup> Thus, one may say of Mary that she is running, but one may not say that she is another person, e.g., John. This suggests the need to distinguish things that can be realized only in another (as running is had only in a runner, e.g., in Mary) whence they derive their identity (the running is Mary's and distinct from any running that John might do), from those which have their identity in their own right (e.g., Mary and John).

A first and basic characteristic of the moral subject, and indeed of any substance, is that it has its identity in its own right rather than through another. Only thus could a human being be responsible for one's action. Without substances with their distinct identities one could envisage only a structure of ideals and values inhabited, as it were, by agents without meaning or value. In this light the task of moral education would be merely to enable one to judge correctly according to progressively higher ideals. This, indeed, would seem to be the implicit context of Kohlberg's focus upon moral dilemmas which omits not only the other dimensions of moral development but this personal identity as well. Aristotle points instead to a world of persons realizing values in their actions. In their complex reality of body, affections and mind they act morally and are the subjects of moral education.

Secondly, as the basic building blocks in the constitution of a world, these individuals are not merely undetermined masses. As the basic points of reference in discourse and the bases for the intelligibility for the real world these individuals must possess some essential determinateness and be of one or another kind or form. The individual, then, is not simply one unit indifferently contrasted to all others; he or she is a being of a definite--in this case a human--kind,<sup>16</sup> relating in a distinctively human manner to other beings each with their own nature or kind. Only thus can one's life in the universe have sense and be able to be valued.

Thirdly, being of a definite kind the individual has its own proper characteristics and is able to realize a specific or typical set of activities. These activities derive from, or are "born of" (from the latin, *natus*), the specific *nature* of the thing. The determination of what activity is moral will need to include not only the good to be derived from the action, but respect for the agent and his or her nature.

In the search for the subject of moral education, the work of Aristotle has made an essential contribution by directing our attention to three factors, namely: (a) individual beings, (b) who are particular instances of a definite kind, and hence (c) capable of specific types of activities. It should be noted that all three are concerned with the kind or type of the agent.<sup>17</sup> This is important, but it is not enough for moral education. One can know well enough what kind of thing a unicorn is but, as none has ever existed, they have never acted or entered the field of activity in which morality is found. Similarly, one might know what kind of musician is needed in order to complete an orchestra, but this does not mean that such a musician is available to be engaged for a concert. In sum, in order to consider the field of moral action it is important to take account not only of the nature or kind of agent involved, but also of his or her existence and actions.

2. *Subsisting Individual*. Something of the greatest importance was bound to take place, therefore, when the mind expanded its range of awareness beyond the nature of things to what Shakespeare was to call *the* question: "to be or not to be." At that point the mind became able to take explicit account not only of the kind, but of the existence of the individual, by which it is constituted in the order of actual, and hence of acting, beings.

From this there followed a series of basic implications for the reality of the person. It would no longer be considered as simply the relatively placid distinct or autonomous instance of some specific type. Rather, it would be understood in the much more dynamic manner as existing. This means not only being in its own right or, as is said, "standing on its own two feet" (sub-sisting), but bursting in among the realities of this world as a new and active center (ex-isting). This understanding incorporates all the above-mentioned characteristics of the individual substance, and adds three more which are proper to existence, namely, being (a) complete, (b) independent, and (c) dynamically open to actions and to new actualization. Since existing or subsisting

individuals include not only persons but rocks and trees, these characteristics, though fundamental, still will not be exclusive to the person.

First, a person must be whole or complete. As regards its nature it must have all that is required to be of its distinctive kind (just as by definition a three digit number cannot be made up of but two digits). Hence, if humans are recognized to be by nature both body and mind or body and soul, then the human mind or soul without the body would be neither a subsisting individual nor, by implication, a person for it would lack a complete human nature. This is of special importance in view of the tendency of some to reduce the human person to only the mind, soul, or consciousness or to consider the person to be adequately protected if these alone are cared for. In fact, the inclusion of body in the human person is as central to education as the issue of torture is to human rights. The same is true of the mind or spirit in view of the tendency, described by William James,<sup>18</sup> to reduce the person to "nothing but" the inert by-products of physiology, or to functions of the structure of the production and distribution of goods.

Further, the existing individual requires not merely a complete nature, but his or her proper existence. As existing, the individual is not merely an instance of a specific nature or kind, but a concrete reality asserting oneself and dynamically struggling to achieve one's fulfillment. In the person this goes beyond merely walking a course whose every step is already charted; it includes all the unique, fully individual choices by which a life is lived. It is subject then to combinations of the precarious and the stable, of tragedy and triumph in its self-realization. These are described by the American pragmatists and Continental existentialists as the very stuff of life, and hence by Dewey as the very stuff of education.

Secondly, as subsistent the person is independent. Being complete in its nature it is numerically individual and distinct from all else. In accord with this individual nature, one's existence is, in turn, unique, and establishes the subject as a being in its own right, independent of all else. This does not imply that the human or other living subject does not need nourishment, or that it was not generated by another: people do need people and much else besides; there is no question here of being self-sufficient or absolute. What is meant by independence is that the needs it has and the actions it performs are truly its own.

In turn, this means that in interacting with other subsistent individuals one's own contribution is distinctive and unique. This is commonly recognized at those special times when the presence of a mother, father, or special friend is required, and no one else will do. At other times as well, even when, as a bus driver or a dentist, I perform a standard service, my actions remain properly my own. This understanding is a prerequisite for education to responsibility in public as in private life. It is a condition too for overcoming depersonalization in a society in which we must fulfill ever more specialized and standardized roles.

Another implication of this independence is that, as subsisting, the human person cannot simply be absorbed or assimilated by another. As complete in oneself one cannot be part of another: as independent in existence one is distinct from all else. Hence, one cannot be assumed or taken up by any other person or group in such wise as to lose one's identity. In recent years awareness of this characteristic has generated a strong reaction against the tendencies of mass society totally to absorb the person and to reduce all to mere functions in a larger whole called the state, the industrial complex, the consumer society, cult, etc.

As noted above it is perhaps the special challenge of the present day, however, to keep this awareness of one's distinctive independence from degenerating into selfishness, to keep individuality from becoming individualism. The individual existent, seen as sculpted out of the flow and process of the physical universe, cannot be rightly thought of as isolated. Such an existent

is always *with* others, depending on them for birth, sustenance and expression. In this context, to be distinct or individual is not to be isolated or cut off, but to be able to relate more precisely and intensively to others.

This can be seen at a series of levels. My relation to the chair upon which I sit and the desk upon which I write is not diminished but made possible by the distinction and independence of the three of us. Their retention of their distinctness and distinctive shapes enables me to integrate them into my task of writing. Because I depend still more intimately upon food, I must correlate more carefully its distinctive characteristics with my precise needs and capacities. On the genetic level it is the careful choice of distinctive strains that enables the development of a new individual with the desired characteristics. On the social level the more personable the members of the group the greater and more intense is its unity.

Moving thus from instruments such as desks, to alimentation, to lineage, to society suggests that, as one moves upward through the levels of beings, distinctness, far from being antithetic to community, is in fact its basis. This gives hope that at its higher reaches, namely, in the moral life, the distinctiveness of autonomy and freedom may not need to be compromised, but may indeed be the basis for a community of persons bound together in mutual love and respect.

The third characteristic of the subsistent individual to be considered is this openness to new actualization and to interrelation with others. The existence by which one erupted into this world of related subjects is not simply self-contained; it is expressed in a complex symphony of actions which are properly one's own: thus, running can be said only of an existing individual, such as Mary, who runs. What is more, actions determine their subject, for it is only by running that Mary herself is constituted precisely as a runner. This will be central to the last part of this study: the person as moral agent.

It is important too for our relations to, and with, others. For the actions into which our existence flows, while no less our own, reach beyond ourselves. The same action which makes us agents shapes the world around us and, for good or ill, communicates to others. All the plots of all the stories ever told are about this; but their number pales in comparison with all the lives ever lived, each of which is a history of personal interactions.<sup>19</sup> The actions of an individual existent reflect one's individuality with its multiple possibilities, and express this to and with others. It is in this situation of dynamic openness,<sup>20</sup> of communication and of community that the moral growth of persons takes place. As subsistent therefore the person is characteristically a being, not only in him/herself, but *with* other beings. About this more must be said below.

To summarize: thus far, we have seen the early derivation of the notion of person from mask. For this to evolve into the contemporary notion of person a strong awareness both of the nature and of the existence of independent individuals needed to be developed. The first was achieved by the Greeks who identified within the one physical process basically different types of things. Substances are the individual instances of these specific types or natures. This provides the basis for one's consciousness of one's own nature and for relating to others in its terms within the overall pattern of nature(s).

There were limitations to such a project, for in its terms alone one ultimately would be but an instance of one's nature; in the final analysis the goal of a physical being would be but to continue one's species through time. This was true for the Greeks and may still be a sufficient basis for the issues considered in sociobiology. It does not allow for adequate attention to the person's unique and independent reality. This required the development subsequently of an awareness of existence as distinct from nature or essence, and as that by which one enters into the world and is constituted

as a being in one's own right. On this basis the subsisting individual can be seen to be whole and independent, and hence the dynamic center of action in this world.

Still more is required, however. The above characteristics, while foundational for a person, are had as well by animals and trees: they too are wholes, independent and active in this world. In addition to what has been said above about substance and subsisting individual, therefore, it is necessary to identify that which is distinctive of the human subsistent and constitutes it finally as personal. This is self-consciousness and freedom.

### **The Person: A Self-Conscious and Free Subject**

Self-consciousness and will had been central to philosophies of the person in classical times; indeed, at one point Augustine claimed that men were nothing else than will. After Descartes' reformulation of metaphysics in terms of the thinking self, however, the focus upon self-consciousness by John Locke and upon the will by Kant brought the awareness of these distinctive characteristics of the person to a new level of intensity and exclusivity. This constituted a qualitatively new and distinctively modern understanding of the person. It is necessary to see in what these characteristics consist and how they relate to the subsisting individual analyzed above.

#### *Self-Consciousness and Freedom*

John Locke undertook to identify the nature of the person within the context of his general effort to provide an understanding which would enable people to cooperate in building a viable political order. This concentration upon the mind is typical of modern thought and of its contribution to our appreciation of the person. By focusing upon knowledge Locke proceeded to elaborate, not only consciousness in terms of the person, but the person in terms of consciousness. He considered personal identity to be a complex notion composed from the many simple ideas which constitute our consciousness. By reflection we perceive that we perceive and thereby are able to be, as it were, present to ourselves and to recognize ourselves as distinct from all other thinking things.<sup>21</sup> Memory, which is also an act of consciousness, enables us to recognize these acts of consciousness in different times and places. Locke saw the memory, by uniting present acts of awareness with similar past acts, not merely as discovering but as creating personal identity. This binding of myself as past consciousness to myself as present consciousness constitutes the continuing reality of the person. Essentially, it is a private matter revealed directly only to oneself, and only indirectly to other persons.

Because Locke's concern for knowledge was part of his overriding concern to find a way to build social unity in a divided country he saw his notion of the self as the basis of an ethic for both private and public life. As conscious of pleasure and pain the self is capable of happiness or misery, "and so is concerned for itself."<sup>22</sup> What is more, happiness and misery matter only inasmuch as they enter one's self-consciousness as a matter of self-concern directing one's activities. He sees the pattern of public morality, with its elements of justice as rewarding a prior good act by happiness and as punishing an evil act by misery, to be founded upon this identity of the self as a continuing consciousness from the time of the act to that of the reward or punishment. 'Person' is the name of this self as open to public judgment and social response; it is "a forensic term appropriating actions and their merit."<sup>23</sup>

This early attempt to delineate the person on the basis of consciousness locates a number of factors essential for personhood such as the importance of self-awareness, the ability to be

concerned with and for oneself, and the basis this provides for the notions of responsibility and public accountability. These are the foundations of his *Letters Concerning Toleration* which were to be of such great importance in the development of subsequent social and political structures in many parts of the world.

There are reasons to believe, however, that, while correct in focusing upon consciousness, he did not push his analysis far enough to integrate the whole person. Leibniz, in his *New Essays Concerning Human Understanding*, was quick to point out some of these reasons in a detailed response. Centering personal identity in consciousness, Locke distinguished it from the notion of the person as that which could be identified by a body of a particular shape. This led him to admit that it is conceivable that the one consciousness, self or person could exist in different bodies a thousand years remote one from another<sup>24</sup> or, conversely, that multiple selves could inhabit the same body.

This is more than an issue of "names ill-used";<sup>25</sup> it is symptomatic of the whole cluster of problems which derive from isolating human consciousness from the physical identity of the human self. These include problems not only regarding communication with other persons for which one depends upon physical signs, but regarding the life of the person in a physical world in whose unity and harmony one's consciousness has no real share, indeed, in relation to which it is defined by contrast.<sup>26</sup> Recently, existential phenomenologists have begun to respond to the perverse, desiccating effect which this has had even upon consciousness itself, while environmentalists have pointed up the destruction it has wrought upon nature.

This implies a problem for personal identity. Locke would claim that this resides in the continuity established by linking the past with the present in one's memory.<sup>27</sup> But, as there is no awareness of a substantial self from which this consciousness proceeds,<sup>28</sup> what remains is but a sequence of perceptions or a flow of consciousness recorded by memory.

Finally, Leibniz would question Locke's claim to have provided even that public or forensic notion of the self by which he sought to provide a sufficient basis for legal and political relations. Memory can deal with the past and the present, but not with the future; planning and providing for the future is, however, the main task of a rationally ordered society. Further, Locke's conclusion, that since the self is consciousness the same self could inhabit many bodies of different appearances, would undermine the value of public testimony, and thereby the administration of justice.<sup>29</sup> Though self-consciousness is certainly central and distinctive of the person, more is required for personhood than a sequence of consciousness, past and present.

Another approach was attempted by Kant whose identification of the salient characteristics of the person has become a standard component for modern sensitivity. Whereas Locke had developed the notion of the person in terms of consciousness predicated upon experience, Kant developed it on the requirements of an ethics based upon will alone. Both the strengths and the weaknesses of this approach to the person lie in his effort to lay for ethics a foundation that is independent of experience. He did so because he considered human knowledge to be essentially limited to the spatial and temporal orders and unable to explain its own presuppositions. Whatever be thought of this, by looking within the self for a new and absolute beginning he led the modern mind to a new awareness of the reality and nature of the person.

For Kant the person is above all free, both in oneself and in relation to others; in no sense is the person to be used by others as a means. From this he concluded that it is essential to avoid any dependence (heteronomy) on anything beyond oneself and, within oneself, on anything other than one's own will. The fundamental thrust of the will is its unconditional command to act lawfully;

this must be the sole basis for an ethics worthy of man. In turn, "the only presupposition under which . . . (the categorical imperative) is alone possible . . . is the Idea of freedom."<sup>30</sup>

As free the person must not be legislated to by anyone or on the basis of anything else; to avoid heteronomy one must be an end-in-oneself. Kant's self-described goal was to awaken interest in the moral law through this "glorious ideal" of a universal realm of persons as ends-in-themselves (rational beings).<sup>31</sup> The person, then, is not merely independent, as is any subject; he is a law-making member of society. This means that the person has, not only value which is to be protected and promoted, but true dignity as well, for he is freely bound by and obeys laws which he gives to himself.<sup>32</sup> As this humanity is to be respected both in oneself and in all others, one must act in such wise that if one's actions were to constitute a universal law they would promote a cohesive life for all rational agents.

This "glorious ideal" has been perhaps the major contribution to the formation of the modern understanding of ourselves as persons. At the minimum, it draws a line against what is unacceptable, namely, whatever is contrary to the person as an end-in-him-or-herself, and sets thereby a much needed minimal standard for action. At the maximum, as with most *a priori* positions, it expresses an ideal for growth by pointing out the direction, and thereby providing orientation, for the development of the person. In Kohlberg's schema of moral development it constitutes the sixth or highest stage, and hence the sense and goal of his whole project--though he notes rightly that this is not an empirically available notion.

Further, this bespeaks a certain absoluteness of the individual will which is essential if the person is not to be subject to domination by the circumstances he encounters. If one must be more than a mere function of one's environment--whether this be one's state, or business, or neighborhood--then Kant has made a truly life-saving observation in noting that the law of the will must extend beyond any one good or particular set of goods.

Nevertheless, there are reasons to think that still more is needed for an understanding of the person. In Part I of his *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* Kant correctly rules out anything other than, or heteronomous to, human freedom and will as an adequate basis for ethics, at least as far as using one's own ability to think and to decide are concerned. Nor does he omit the fact that these individuals live their lives with others in this world. As the good is mediated by *their* concrete goods, however, a role for experience must be recognized if right reason is to conform to the real good in things. Further, there is need to know more of the reality of the person in order to understand: (a) not only how will and freedom provide the basis for ethical behavior, but (b) by what standards or values behavior can be judged to be ethical, and (c) how ethical behavior is integral to the project of the person's self-realization. Something more than a postulation of freedom (along with the immortality of the soul and God) is essential to enable the development of the person to be guided throughout by his "glorious ideal."

In sum, Locke and Kant have contributed essentially to delineating the nature of the person for the modern mind. Both have pointed up that which distinguishes the person from other subjects. Focusing upon knowledge, Locke showed the person to be an identity of continuing consciousness which is self-aware and "concerned for itself." Focusing upon the will and its freedom, Kant showed the person to be an end-in-itself.

By attending directly to consciousness and freedom, however, both left problems which are similar and of great importance to the present project. The first regards the way in which consciousness and freedom are realized in the person as a unique identity with a proper place in society and indeed in reality as a whole. It is true, as Locke says, that the term person expresses self-awareness and continuing consciousness, as well as its status in the public forum. But, for



moral education one needs more than an isolated view of that which is most distinctive of man; one needs to know what the person is in his or her entirety, how one is able to stand among other persons as a subject, and how in freedom one is to undertake one's rightful responsibilities. One educates not consciousness or freedom, but conscious and free subjects or persons. Further, it is necessary to understand the basis of the private, as well as the public, life of the person, for one is more than a role, a citizen, or a function of state. The second problem regards the way in which the person can attain his or her goal of full self-awareness, freedom, and responsibility, namely, how the person can achieve his or her fulfillment through time and with others.

In sum, what Locke and Kant discovered about the person by considering self-awareness in the abstract and for the political arena needs now to be integrated with what was seen regarding the individual in the first section of this chapter in order to constitute the integral person as a rational and free subject.

### *The Self-conscious and Free Subject*

While it has been said that ancient thinkers had no concept of the person, a very important study by Catherine De Vogel<sup>33</sup> has shown that there was indeed a significant sense of person and of personality among the ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as a search for its conditions and possibilities. It will be helpful to look at this in order to identify some of the cultural resources for understanding the way in which self-consciousness and freedom are rooted in the subject and constitute the person with which moral education is concerned. Above, we saw a certain progression from the Greek philosophical notion of the individual as an instance of a general type to a more ample existential sense of the subject as an independent whole, which nonetheless shares with others in the same specific nature. It is time now to see how this relates to self-consciousness and freedom.

The Greeks had a certain sense for, and even fascination with, individuals in the process of grappling with the challenge to live their freedom. T.B.L. Webster notes that "Homer was particularly interested in them (his heroes) when they took difficult decisions or exhibited characteristics which were not contained in the traditional picture of the fighting man."<sup>34</sup> In the final analysis, however, the destiny of his heroes was determined by fate, from which even Zeus could not free them. Hence, an immense project of liberation was needed in order to appreciate adequately the full freedom of the moral agent.

This required establishing: (a) that the universe is ruled by law, (b) that a person could have access to this law through reason, and (c) that the person has command of his relation to this law. These elements were developed by Heraclitus around 500 B.C. He saw that the diverse physical forces could not achieve the equilibrium required in order to constitute a universe without something which is one. This cosmic, divine law or Logos is the ruling principle of the coherence of all things, not only in the physical, but in the moral and social orders. A person can assume the direction of his life by correcting his understanding and determining his civil laws and actions according to the Logos, which is at once divine law and nature. In this lies wisdom.<sup>35</sup>

This project has two characteristics, namely, self-reflection and self-determination. First, as the law or Logos is not remote, but within man--"The soul has a Logos within it"<sup>36</sup>--the search for the Logos is also a search for oneself: "I began to search for myself."<sup>37</sup> Self-reflection is then central to wisdom. Second, the attainment of wisdom requires on the part of man a deliberate choice to follow the universal law. This implies a process of interior development by which the Logos which is within "increases itself."<sup>38</sup>

A similar pattern of thought is found in the Stoic philosophers for whom there is a principle of rationality or "germ of logos" of which the soul is part, and which develops by natural growth.<sup>39</sup> A personal act is required to choose voluntarily the law of nature, which is also the divine will.

These insights of Heraclitus, though among the earliest of the philosophers, were pregnant with a number of themes which correspond to Kant's three postulates for the ethical life: the immortality of the soul, freedom and God. The first of these would be mined by subsequent thinkers in their effort to explore the nature of the person as a physical subject that is characteristically self-conscious and free. As the implications of Heraclitus' insight that the multiple and diverse can constitute a unity only on the basis of something that is one gradually became evident, the personal characteristics of self-consciousness and freedom were bound to the subject with its characteristics of wholeness, independence and interrelatedness. The first step was Plato's structure for integrating the multiple instances of a species by their imitation of, or participation in the idea or archetype of that species.<sup>40</sup> This, in turn, images still higher and more central ideas, and ultimately the highest idea which is inevitably the Good or the One.

Aristotle took the second step by applying the same principle to the internal structure of living beings. He concluded that the unity of their disparate components could be explained only by something one, which he termed the soul or *psyche*--whence the term 'psychology.' The body is organized by this form which he described as "the first grade of actuality of a natural body having life potentially in it."<sup>41</sup> For Aristotle, however, the unifying principle of a physical subject could not be also the principle of man's higher mental life, his life of reason. Hence, there remained the need to understand the person as integrating self-consciousness and freedom in one subject which is nonetheless physical.

Over one-thousand years later Thomas Aquinas took this third step, drawing out of Heraclitus' insight its implications for the unity of the person with its full range of physical and mental life. He did not trace the physical to one form or soul and the higher conscious life to another principle existing separately from the body as had the Aristotelian commentators, nor did he affirm two separate souls as did Bonaventure. Rather, Thomas showed that there could be but one principle or soul for the entire person, both mind and body. He did this by drawing out rigorously, under the principle of non-contradiction, the implications of the existence of the subject noted above. One subject could have but one existence--lest it be not one but two. This existence, in turn, could pertain to but one essence or nature--again lest it be and not be of that nature; for the same reason the one essence could be of but one form. Hence, there could be only one formal principle or soul for both the physical and the self-conscious and free dimensions of a person. This rendered obsolete Aristotle's duality of these principles for man and founded the essential and integral humanness of both mind and body in the unity of the one person.<sup>42</sup>

This progression of steps leading to the one principle, which enables that which is complex to constitute nonetheless a unity, points in the person to the one form which is commonly called the soul. By this single formal principle what Locke articulated only as a disembodied consciousness and Kant as an autonomous will are able to exist as a properly human subject. This is physical truly but not exclusively, for it transcends the physical to include also self-consciousness and freedom. Similarly, it exists in its own right, yet does so in such wise that it exists essentially with others as a person in society.

There are pervasive implications for education in such an integration of the physical with the self-conscious dimensions of the person through a single principle. One does not become a person when one is accepted by society; on the contrary, by the form through which one is a person one

is an autonomous end-in-oneself and has claim to be responded to as such by others. Hence, though for his or her human development the person has a unique need for acceptance, respect and love, the withholding of such acceptance by others--whether individuals, families or states--does not deprive them of their personhood. One does not have to be accepted in order to have a claim to acceptance. (Hence, even in circumstances of correction and punishment, when a person's actions are being explicitly repudiated, they cannot be treated as a mere thing.) Thus, the right to an education is based within the person and needs to be responded to by family and society.

Similarly, it is not necessary that the person manifest in overt behavior signs of self-awareness and responsibility. From genetic origin and physical form it is known that the infant and young child is an individual human developing according to a single unifying and integrating principle of both its physical and its rational life.<sup>43</sup> The rights and the protection of a human person belong to a person by right prior to an ability consciously to conceive or to articulate them. Further, the physical actions of young children through which they express themselves in their own way and respond to others are truly human. Indeed, though the earlier the stage in life the more physical the manner of receiving and expressing affection, the earliest months and years appear to be the most determinative of one's lifetime ability to relate to others with love and affection.

Finally, attempts to modify the behavior of a person must proceed according to distinctively human norms if they are not to be destructive. Despite at earlier life stages greater operational similarities to some animals, only by an abstraction can infants and very young children be said to be small animals. They are, in fact, human persons and integrally so in each of their human actions and interactions. Not to attend to this is to fail to realize who in fact is being educated to the detriment and dishonor of both the person and the educative process.

There is a second insight of great potential importance in the thought of Heraclitus. When he refers to the Logos<sup>44</sup> as being very deep he suggests multiple dimensions of the soul. Indeed, it must be so if human life is complex and its diverse dimensions have their principle in the one soul. Plato thought of these as parts of the soul; in these terms the development of oneself as a person would consist in bringing these parts into proper subordination one to another. This state is called justice, the "virtue of the soul."<sup>45</sup> Both the *Republic* and the *Laws* reflect amply his concern for education, character formation, and personal development understood as the process of attaining that state of justice. The way to this is progressive liberation from captivity by the objects of sense knowledge and sense desires through spiritual training, as described in the *Phaedo* and the *Republic*. All this prepares the way for what is essential, namely, the contemplation of the transcendent Good. This alone establishes that inner harmony of soul through which the person is constituted as free and responsible, both in principle and in act. Because this vision, not only of some goods, but of the transcendent Good, cannot be communicated by teaching but remains "an extremely personal interior vision,"<sup>46</sup> the uncalculating and unmeasured love shared in family, Church and other communities has special importance for moral education.

By the human form or soul the human individual as a person is open in principle, not only to particular states of affairs or events, but to the one source, Logos and goal of all. Through this, in turn, one is able to take account of the full meaning of each thing and freely to relate oneself to others in the coordinating virtue of philanthropia, the love of all mankind.<sup>47</sup> As it is of foundational importance for a truly moral life to have not merely access to some goods, but an ability to evaluate them in terms of the Good, the form or soul as the single organizing and vivifying principle of the person is the real foundation for the person as an end-in-oneself.

Correlatively, recent thought has made crucial strides toward reintegrating the person into his or her world. The analytic process of identifying the components of the world process initiated by

the Greeks was inherently risky, for as analytic any imperfection in the understanding of personal identity would tend toward individualism and distract from the unity of persons and peoples through their grounding in the One. Cumulatively, the intensive modern concentration upon freedom in terms of self-consciousness would generate an isolating and alienating concentration upon self.<sup>48</sup>

Some developments in recent thought have made important contributions to correcting this individualist--even potentially solipsist--bias. One is the attention paid recently to language and to the linguistic character of the person. Our consciousness is not only evoked, but shaped, by the pattern of the language in which we are nurtured. In our highly literate culture--many would say in all cultures--the work of the imagination which accompanies and facilitates that of the intellect is primarily verbal. Hence, rather than ideas being developed and then merely expressed by language, our thought is born in language. As this language is not one's private creation, but that of our community and over a long period, conscious acts, even about ourselves, involves participation in that community. To say that our nature is linguistic is to say that it is essentially "with others."

A similar point, but on another level of insight, was developed by Martin Heidegger and laid the basis for the stress among many existential thinkers on the importance of considering the person as being in community. As conscious and intentional, one essentially is not closed within oneself, but open to the world; one's self-realization depends upon and indeed consists in one's being in the world. Therefore it is not possible to think of persons in themselves and then to add some commerce with their surroundings; instead, persons exist and can be conceived only as beings-in-the-world. Here the term 'in' expresses more than a merely spatial relation; it adds an element of being acquainted with or being familiar with, of being concerned for, and of sharing. At root this is the properly personal relation.<sup>49</sup>

From what was said of being-in-the-world it follows that the person is also being-with-others, for one is not alone in sharing in this world. Just as I enter into and share in the world, so also do other persons. Hence, as essentially sharing-in-the-world, our being is also essentially a sharing-with-others; the world of the person is a world in which we are essentially with-others. In this light a study of the existence of the rational subject with its hopes and its efforts toward self-realization with others must center ultimately upon understanding the moral development of the person through education.

## **Moral Agent and Moral Growth**

Recent advances in this project are being made by interweaving two main streams of thought regarding the person: one considers the subject as existing in his own right as conscious and free; the other situates this consciousness and freedom in the person as acting in the world with other persons. Together they provide a context for understanding the development of the moral awareness of the person.

### *The Person as Moral Agent*

In Aristotle's project of distinguishing the components of the physical process actions and attributes were found to be able to exist and to be intelligible only in a substance which existed in its own right--there could be no running without a runner. Actions, as distinct from the substantive nature or essence, could appear to be added thereto in a relatively external or "quantitative"

manner. Subsequent developments in understanding the subject in terms of existence have provided protection against this externalism. In relation to existence, essence does not merely specify the specific nature or kind of the thing; it is rather the way in which each thing is, the way in which each living being lives. Hence, for a person it implies and calls for the full range of activities of a human being. Indeed, essence is often termed nature precisely as that from which these life acts derive.<sup>50</sup> These actions, in turn, cannot be mere additions to the person; they are the central determinants of the quality of one's very life. It is not just that one can do more or less, but that by so doing one becomes a more or less kind, more or less loving, or more or less generous person.

A person should be understood also in terms of his or her goals, for activities progressively modify and transform one in relation to the perfection of which one is by nature capable and which one freely chooses. Thus, though infants are truly and quite simply human beings, they are good only in an initial sense, namely, as being members of the human species. What they will become, however, lies in the future; hence they begin to be categorized as good or bad people only after and in view of their actions. Even then it is thought unfair to judge or evaluate persons at an early age before it can be seen how they will "turn out" or what they will "make of themselves," that is, what character and hence constant pattern of action they will develop.

Further, one's progress or lack thereof can be judged only in terms of acting in a manner proportionate to one's nature: a horse may be characterized as good or bad on the basis of its ability to run, but not to fly. One must be true to one's nature, which in that sense serves as a norm of action. In this new sense I am a law to myself, namely, I must never act as less than one having a human nature with its self consciousness and freedom. Below we shall see a way in which being true to this nature implies constituting both my self and my world.

Boethius classically defined the person as "an individual substance of a rational nature,"<sup>51</sup> within which Locke focused upon self-consciousness. But conscious nature can be understood on a number of levels. First, it might be seen as a reflection or passive mirroring in man of what takes place around him. This does not constitute new being, but merely understands what is already there. Secondly, if this consciousness is directed to the self it can be called self-knowledge and makes of the subject an object for one's act of knowledge. Thirdly, consciousness can regard one's actions properly as one's own. By concerning the self precisely as the subject of one's own actions, it makes subjective what had been objective in the prior self-knowledge; it is reflexive rather than merely reflective.

This self-conscious experience depends upon the objective reality of the subject with all the characteristics described above in the section on the self conscious and free subject. This, in turn, is shaped by the reflexive and hence free experiences of discovering, choosing, and committing oneself. In these reflexive acts the subject in a sense constitutes him or herself, being manifested or disclosed to oneself as concrete, distinct, and indeed unique. This is the distinctively personal manner of self actuation of the conscious being or person.

The result for the person is a unique realization of that independence which above was seen to characterize all subsistent individuals. Beyond the mirroring of surrounding conditions and of those things that happen to one, beyond even the objective realization of oneself as affected by those events, the person exists reflexively as their subject and as a source of action. As a person one has an inward, interior life of which they alone are the responsible source. This implies for the person an element of mystery which can never be fully explicated or exhausted. Much can be proposed by other persons and things, much can even be imposed upon me. But my self-

consciousness is finally my act and no one else's. How I assess and respond to my circumstances is finally my decision, which relates to, but is never simply the result of, exterior factors.

Here finally lies the essence of freedom, of which the ability to choose between alternatives is but one implication. What is essential for a free life is not that I always retain an alternative, but that I can determine myself and carry through with consistency the implications of my self-determination--even, and at times especially, in the most straightening of circumstances. In this the personal finally transcends that growth process originally called the *physis* or the physical, and hence has been considered rightly to be spiritual as well.

This, of course, is not to imply isolation from one's physical and social world; rather it bespeaks in the world a personal center which is self-aware and self-determining. More than objective consciousness of oneself as acting, the inward reflexion at the origin of my action is that according to which I freely determine<sup>52</sup> and experience myself as the one who acts in freedom. The bond of consciousness with action as deriving from self-determination is crucial for a full recognition of subjectivity. It protects this from reduction to the subjectivism of an isolated consciousness which, being separated from action, would be finally more arbitrary than absolute.

Self-determination in action has another implication: in originating an action the person's experience is not merely of that action as happening to or in him, but of a dynamism in which he participates efficaciously. As a self I experience myself immanently as wholly engaged in acting and know this efficacy to be properly my own, my responsibility. Hence, by willing good or evil action, I specify, not only the action which results, but myself as the originator of that action.

Finally, I am aware of my responsibility for the results of my actions which extend beyond me and shape my world. The good or evil which my actions bring about is rooted in good or evil decisions on my part. In making choices which shape my world I also form myself for good or evil. By their subjective character actions become part of the person's unique process of self-realization.<sup>53</sup>

Action then manifests an important dimension of the person.<sup>54</sup> On the one hand, the need to act shows that the person, though a subject and independent, is not at birth perfect, self-sufficient or absolute. On the contrary, persons are conscious of perfection that they do not possess, but toward which they are dynamically oriented. Hence, the person is essentially active and creative.

On the other hand, this activity is marked characteristically by responsibility. This implies that, while the physical or social goods that one can choose are within one's power, they do not overpower one. Whatever their importance, in the light of the person's openness to the good as such one can always overrule the power of their attraction. When one does choose them it is the person--not the goods--who is responsible for that choice.

Both of these point to two foundations of the person's freedom, and hence of one's ability to be a self-determining end-in-oneself. First, one's mind or intellect is oriented, not to one or another true thing or object of knowledge, but to Truth Itself and hence to whatever is or can be. Second and in a parallel manner, the person's will is not limited to--or hence by--any particular good or set of goods. Rather, because oriented to the Good Itself, it is freely open to any and all goods.

### *The Person and Moral Growth*

In view of this it is time to look more closely into the relation of the person to the good, for it is there that one finds the drama of the self-realization of the person and the development of one's moral life. In one's experience the good is first manifest as the object of desire, namely, as what is sought when absent. This implies that the good is basically what completes a being; it is the "per-

fect," understood in its etymological sense as that which is completed or realized through and through. Hence, once the good or perfection is achieved it is no longer desired or sought, but enjoyed. This is reflected in the manner in which each thing, even a stone, retains the being or reality it has and resists reduction to non-being or nothing. The most that we can do is to change or transform a thing into something else; we cannot annihilate it. Similarly, a plant or tree given the right conditions grows to full stature and fruition. Finally, an animal protects its life--fiercely if necessary--and seeks out the food needed for its strength. Food, in turn, as capable of contributing to animal's realization or perfection, is in this regard an auxiliary good or means.

In this manner things as good, that is, as actually realizing some degree of perfection by which they are perfective of others, are the basis for an interlocking set of relations. As these relations are based upon both the actual perfection which things possess and the potential perfection to which they are thereby directed, the good is perfection both as attracting when it has not yet been attained and as constituting one's fulfillment upon its attainment. Goods then are not arbitrary or simply a matter of wishful thinking; they are rather the full development of things and all that contributes thereto. In this ontological or objective sense all beings are good to the extent that they exist and thereby can contribute to the perfection of others.

The moral good is a more narrow field; it concerns only one's free and responsible actions. This has the objective reality of the ontological good noted above, for it concerns real actions which stand in distinctive relation to our own perfection and that of others, and indeed to the physical universe and to God as well. Hence many possible patterns of actions could be objectively right because they promote the good of those involved. Others, precisely as inconsistent with the real good of persons or things, are objectively disordered or misordered.

Because the realm of objective relations is almost numberless whereas our actions are single, it is necessary not only to choose in general between the good and the bad, but in each case to choose which of the often innumerable possibilities one will render concrete. However broad or limited the options, the act as responsible and moral is essentially dependent upon its being willed by a subject. In order to follow the emergence of the field of concrete moral action, it is important to examine therefore more than the objective aspect, namely, the nature of the persons, actions, and things involved. In addition one must consider the action in relation to the subject, namely, to the person who in the context of their society and culture appreciates and values the good of this action, chooses it over its alternatives, and eventually wills its actualization.

The term 'value' here is of special note. It was derived from the economic sphere where it meant the amount of a commodity by which it attained a certain worth. This is reflected also in the term 'axiology' whose root means "weighing as much" or "worth as much." It requires an objective content--the good must really "weigh in" and truly make a difference. But the term 'value' expresses this good especially as related to wills which actually acknowledge it as a good and as desirable.<sup>55</sup> Thus, different groups of persons or individuals, and at different periods, have distinct sets of values. They are sensitive to and prize a distinct set of goods or, more likely, establish a distinctive ranking in the degree to which they prize various goods. By so doing they delineate among the limitless order of objective goods a certain pattern of values which, to an extensive degree, mirrors their corporate free choices and constitutes a basic component of their culture.

By giving shape to the culture this constitutes as well the prime pattern and gradation of goods which persons born into that culture experience from their earliest years. It is in these terms that they interpret their developing relations. Young persons peer out at the world through a lens, as it were, formed by their family and culture and reflecting the pattern of choices made by that community throughout its history, often in its most trying circumstances. Like a pair of glasses it

does not create the object, but focuses attention upon certain of the goods involved rather than others. This becomes the basic orienting factor for one's affective and emotional life. Over time it encourages and reinforces certain patterns of action which, in turn, reinforce this pattern of values.

Martin Heidegger describes a process by which the field of moral action is gradually shaped by a subject. It consists in the person's transcending oneself or breaking beyond mere self-concern. In this one projects outward as a being whose very nature is to share with others for whom one cares and is concerned. In this process one constitutes new purposes or goals for the sake of which action is to be undertaken. In relation to these goals certain combinations of possibilities, with their natures and norms take on particular importance and begin thereby to enter into the makeup of one's world of meaning. In this light freedom becomes more than mere spontaneity, more than choice, and more even than self-determination in the sense of causing oneself to act as described above in the present chapter. It shapes--the phenomenologist would say even that it constitutes--my world as the ambit of my human decisions and dynamic action.<sup>56</sup> This is the making of myself as a person in a community.

To see this it is necessary to look more closely at the dynamic openness and projection which characterize the concrete person--not only in his or her will, but in his or her body and psyche as well. In order to be truly self-determining the person must not merely moderate a bargaining session between these three, but must constitute a new and active dynamism in which all dimensions achieve their properly personal character.<sup>57</sup>

Bodily or somatic dynamisms, such as the pumping of blood, are basically non-reflective and reactive. They are implemented through the nervous system in response to stimuli; generally they are below the level of human consciousness, from which they enjoy a degree of autonomy. Nonetheless, they are in harmony with the person as a whole, of which they are an integral dimension. As such they are implicit in my conscious and self-determined choices regarding personal action with others in this world.

Dynamisms of the psyche are typified by emotivity. In some contrast to the more reactive character of lower bodily dynamism and in a certain degree to the somatic as a whole, these are based rather within the person. They include, not only affectivity, but sensation and emotions as well, which feelings range from some which are physical to others which are moral, religious and aesthetic. Such emotions have two important characteristics. First, they are not isolated or compartmentalized, but include and interweave the various dimensions of the person. Hence, they are crucial to the integration of a personal life. They play a central role in the proximity one feels to values and to the intensity of one's response thereto. Secondly, they are relatively spontaneous and contribute to the intensity of a personal life. This, however, is not adequate to make them fully personal for, as personal, life is not only what happens in me, but above all what I determine to happen. This can range beyond and even against my feelings.

It is necessary, therefore, to distinguish two directions or dimensions of one's personal transcendence. The first relates to one's world as the object of either one's knowledge or one's will. This might be called horizontal as an activation of a person inasmuch as he or she relates to other things and especially to other persons. Such a relation would be poorly conceived were it thought to be merely an addition to a fully constituted person. On the contrary, the person as such is essentially transcendent, that is, open to others. One requires this interaction with others in order to have a language and all that this implies for the formation of thought, to have a moral code to assist one in the direction of one's will, and above all to have a family and community, and thus the possibility of sharing in the hope and anguish, the love and concern, which gives meaning to life.



The other, or vertical dimension of transcendence follows the sequence of levels of personal reality. Personal actions are carried out through a will which is open and responsive to The Good and as such able to respond to, without being determined by, any particular good or value. Thus, it is finally up to the person to determine him/herself to act. One is able to do this because personal consciousness is not only reflective of myself as an additional object of knowledge, but reflexive or self-aware in its conscious acts.

If such actions derived merely from my powers or faculties of knowledge or will, in acting I would determine only the object of my action. Instead, these actions derive from my self as subject or person; hence, in acting I determine equally, and even primarily, myself. This is self-determination, self-realization and self-fulfillment in the strongest sense of those terms. Not only are others to be treated as ends in themselves; in acting I myself am an end.

This process of deliberate choice and decision manifests a dimension of the person which transcends the somatic and psychic dynamisms. Whereas the somatic was extensively reactive, the person through affection or appetite is fundamentally oriented to the good and positively attracted by a set of values. These are not merely known by the mind, but evoke an active response from the psychic dynamisms of the emotions in the context of a responsible freedom.

It is in the dimension of responsibility that one encounters the properly moral dimension of life. For in order to live, oneself and with others, one must be able to know and choose what is truly conducive to one's good and that of others. To do this the person must be able to judge the true value of what is to be chosen, that is, its objective worth both in itself and in relation to others. This is moral truth: the judgment whether the act makes the person good in the sense of bringing true individual and social fulfillment or the contrary.

In this I retain that deliberation and voluntary choice whereby I exercise my proper self-awareness, self-possession, and self-governance. By determining to follow this judgment I am able to overcome determination by stimuli and even by culturally ingrained values, and to turn these instead into openings for free action in concert with others. This vertical transcendence in one's actions as willed enables the person to shape his or herself, as well as one's physical surroundings and community.

This can be for good or for ill, depending on the character of one's actions. By definition only morally good actions contribute to the fulfillment of the person, that is, to one's development and perfection as a person. As it is the function of conscience as man's moral judgment to identify this character of moral good in action,<sup>57</sup> moral freedom consists in the ability to follow one's conscience. This must be established through the dynamisms within the person, and must be protected and promoted by the related physical and social realities. This is a basic right of the person--perhaps *the* basic social right--because only thus can one transcend one's conditions and strive for fulfillment. Moral education is directed particularly at capacitating the person affectively to exercise this right.

The work of conscience is not a merely theoretical judgment, but the development and exercise of self-possession through one's actions. In this one's reference to moral truth constitutes one's sense of duty, for the action that is judged to be truly good is experienced also as that which I ought to do. As this is exercised or lived patterns of action develop which are habitual only in the sense of being repeated. These patterns are modes of activity with which we are familiar; in their exercise--along with the coordinate natural dynamisms they require--we are practiced; and with practice comes facility and spontaneity. Such patterns constitute the basic, continuing and pervasive shaping influence of our life. For this reason they have been considered classically to be

the basic indicators of what our life as a whole will add up to or, as is often said, "amount to." Since Socrates the technical term used for these specially developed capabilities is virtues.

*Personal Convergence of Values and Virtues.* It is possible to trace abstractly a general table of virtues required for particular circumstances in order to help clarify the overall terrain of moral action. As with values, however, such a table would not articulate the particulars of one's own experience nor dictate the next steps in one's project toward personal realization with others in relation to The Good or God. This does not mean, however, that such decisions are arbitrary; conscience makes its moral judgments in terms of real goods and real structures of values and virtues. Nevertheless, through and within the breadth of these categories, it is the person who must decide, and in so doing enrich his or her unique experience of the virtues. No one can act without courage and wisdom, but each exercise of these is distinctive and typically one's own. Progressively they form a personality that facilitates one's exercise of freedom as it becomes more mature and correlatively more unique. This often is expressed simply as 'more personal.'

A person's values reflect then, not only his/her culture and heritage, but within this what he has done with its set of values. One shapes and refines these values through one's personal, and hence free, search to realize the good with others in one's world. They reflect, therefore, not only present circumstances which our forebears could not have experienced, but our free response to the challenges to interpersonal, familial and social justice and love in our days.

In the final analysis, moral development as a process of personal maturation consists in bringing my pattern of personal and social virtues into harmony with the corresponding sets of values along the vertical pole of transcendence. In this manner we achieve a coordinated pattern of personal capabilities for the realization of our unique response to The Good.

Though free and hence properly personal, as was seen above, this is done essentially with others. For this reason the harmony sought within oneself for moral development must be mirrored in a corresponding harmony between modes of action and values in the communities and nations in which persons live. (Thus, Aristotle considered his ethics of individual moral action to be an integral part of politics.) If that be true then the moral development of the person as a search for self-fulfillment is most properly the search for that dynamic harmony, both within and without, called peace.

*The Catholic University of America  
Washington, D.C.*

## Notes

1. An integrated study of the person as moral agent is found in G. McLean, F. Ellrod, D. Schindler and J. Mann, eds., *Act and Agent: Philosophical Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development* (Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy and The University Press of America, 1986), from part of whose concluding chapter the present paper has been drawn.

2. For a psychological reconstruction of the person see Richard Knowles, ed., *Psychological Foundations of Moral Education and Character Development: An Integrated Theory of Moral Development* (Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy and The University Press of America, 1986).

3. Adolf Trendelenburg "A Contribution to the History of the Word Person," *The Monist*, 20 (1910), 336-359. This posthumously published work is now over 100 years old. See also "Persona" in *Collected Works of F. Max Muller* (London, 1912), vol. X, pp. 32 and 47; and Arthur C. Danto, "Persons" in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), VI, 110-114.
4. This was pointed out by Gabius Bassus. See Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* V, 7.
5. *Prosepeion*. This explanation was given by Forcellini (1688-1769), cf. Trendelenburg, p. 340.
6. C. J. De Vogel, "The Concept of Personality in Greek and Christian Thought," *Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy*, ed. John K. Ryan (Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963), II, 20-60.
7. "That accepteth not the persons of princes." *Job* 3 4: 19. See also *Deut* 10:17; *Acts* 10:34-35; *Rom* 2:10-11.
8. Cicero, *De Officiis*, I, 28 and 31; *De Orator*. II, 102; and Epictetus, *Enchiridion*, ch. 17.
9. A. Danto. See n. 2 above.
10. (Boston: Beacon, 1957), p. 61.
11. Rudolf Carnap, Hans Hahn, and Otto Neurath, "The Scientific World View: The Vienna Manifesto," trans. A. E. Blumberg, in *Perspectives in Reality*, eds. J. Mann and G. Kreyche (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966), p. 483.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Gabriel Marcel, *The Philosophy of Existence*, trans. Manya Harari (New York: Citadel Press, 1956), p. 14.
14. See Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Harper, 1959); Wilfrid Desan, *The Planetary Man* (New York: Macmillan, 1961).
15. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics* I, 4 73 a 3-b 25.
16. René Claix "La statut ontologique du concept de sujet selon le metaphysique d'Aristot. L'aporie de *Metaphy.* VII (Z) 3," *Revue philosophique de Louvain*, 59 (61), 29.
17. *Metaphysics*, VII 4-7.
18. William James, *Pragmatism* (New York: Meridian Books, 1955), ch. I.
19. See also Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 181ff.
20. Gabriel Pastrama, "Personhood and the Burgeoning of Human Life," *Thomist*, 41 (1977), 287-290.
21. John Locke *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Book II, ch. 27, n. 11 and 9-10, ed. A. C. Grassier (New York: Dover, 1959), Vol. I, 448-452. The person is "a thinking, intelligent being, that has reason and reflection and can consider itself as itself."
22. *Essay*, n. 17.
23. *Ibid.* nn. 18 and 26.
24. *Ibid.* n. 20.
25. *Ibid.*, n. 29.
26. G. W. Leibniz *New Essays Concerning Human Understanding*, Bk. II, ch. 27, 9, trans. A. G. Langley (Chicago: Open Court, 1916).
27. Locke, *Essay*, ch. 27, n. 15.
28. Leibniz, *New Essays*, II, ch. 27, n. 14. This consequence was recognized and accepted by Hume who proceeded to dispense with the notion of substance altogether.
29. *New Essays*, nn. 20-66.

30. Immanuel Kant, *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*, III, trans. Lewis White Beck (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1959), p. 80.
31. *Foundations* III, p. 82.
32. *Foundations* II, pp. 53-59.
33. C. J. De Vogel, 20-60.
34. T.B.L. Webster, *Greek Art and Literature, 700-530 B.C.* (London, 1959), pp. 24-45 (cited by C. De Vogel, p. 27, fn. 17a).
35. Heraclitus, fns. 2, 8, 51, 112 and 114 (trans. by C. De Vogel).
36. Heraclitus, fn. 115 (trans. by C. De Vogel, p. 31). See also fn. 45.
37. Heraclitus, fn. 101 (trans. by C. De Vogel, p. 31).
38. Heraclitus, fn. 115 (trans. by C. De Vogel, p. 31).
39. Diog. L. VII 136; Marcus Aurelius IV 14, VI 24.
40. Plato, *Republic*, 476, 509-511: *mimesis*.
41. Aristotle, *De Anima* II, 2 412 a 28-29.
42. George F. McLean, "Philosophy and Technology," in *Philosophy in a Technological Culture*, ed. G. McLean (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1964), pp. 14-15. The same Heraclitean line of reasoning is reflected by structuralist insights regarding the need which structures have for a single coordinating principle. Inasmuch as the structure is continually undergoing transformation and being established on new and broader levels this principle must be beyond any of the contrary characteristics or concepts to be integrated within the structure. It must be unique and comprehensive in order to be able to ground and to integrate them all. Jean Piaget, *Structuralism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 139-142. Cf. also George F. McLean, *Plenitude and Participation* (Madras: University of Madras, 1978), pp. 12-15.
43. For a detailed consideration of the first weeks after conception and of the point at which an individual life is clearly present see André E. Helligers, "The Beginnings of Personhood Medical Consideration," *The Perkins School of Theology Journal*, 27 (1973), 11-15; and C. R. Austin, "The Egg and Fertilization," in *Science Journal*, 6 [special issue] (1970).
44. Heraclitus, fn. 45.
45. Plato, *Republic* I 353 c-d; IV 43 d-e, 435 b-c, and 441 e-442d.
46. *Republic*, VI 609 c. See De Vogel, pp. 33-35.
47. De Vogel, pp. 38-45.
48. Different cultures, of course, are variously located along the spectrum from individualism to collectivism.
49. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 52-57 and 118; see Joseph J. Kockelmans, *Martin Heidegger* (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Duquesne University Press, 1965), pp. 24-25 and 56-57.
50. H. Rousseau, "Etre et agir," *Revue Thomiste*, 54 (1954); Joseph de Finance, *Etre et agir dans la philosophie de Saint Thomas* (Rome, P.U.G., 1960).
51. Boetius, *De duabis naturis et una persona Christi*, c. 3.
52. Karol Wojtyla, *The Acting Person* (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1979), pp. 48-50; "The Person: Subject and Community," *Review of Metaphysics*, 33 (1979-80), 273-308; and "The Task of Christian Philosophy Today," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association*, 53 (1979), 3-4.
53. Wojtyla, pp. 32-47.
54. This goes beyond Piaget's basic law that actions follow needs and continue only in relation thereto. Jean Piaget, *Six Psychological Studies* (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), p. 6.

55. Ivor Leclerc, "The Metaphysics of the Good," *Review of Metaphysics*, 35 (1981), 3-5.
56. *Mehta*, pp. 90-91.
57. Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, p. 197.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 156.



6.  
**Anthropological Foundation of Moral Education in  
a Technological Era**

*Vincent Shen*

**The Meaning of Moral Education in a Technological Society**

The problem of the anthropological foundation of moral education has taken on new urgency due to the rapid development of science and technology in modern society. Technological development has now become universal, not only socially as the main focus of economic and political decisions in all countries, but philosophically as the consciously or unconsciously accepted destiny of contemporary world history. Martin Heidegger is right, especially regarding this scientific and technological era, when he reads *Geschichte* as *Geschick*, and says that metaphysics, as the essence of technology, is the necessary destiny of the West and the condition of its domination over the whole world.<sup>1</sup> With the universal extension of technological civilization, it has become evident that, not only Western, but non-Western countries have begun to be determined by this common destiny. In occupying themselves with the development of science and technology, they are now carried along by the whirlwind of occidentalization, which sometimes unfortunately is seen as a form of domination by the West. Deeper reflection shows that in reality it is the process of rationalization of the world's history, accelerated by rapid technological development.

In this rapid and universal shaping of the world by science and technology, *moral education* has the essential task of assuring humankind of its own humanity and thereby rendering it capable of being the master rather than the slave of science and technology. The meaning of the term "moral" will be clarified in relation to another term "ethical" below. For now it is sufficient to point out that the term "education" is understood here not merely in its strict sense as an institutionalized process of teaching and learning, but especially in its broad sense as the formation of persons, either by themselves or with the help of others, towards the full realization of their human nature. This is similar to the notion of *Bildung* in the Hegelian sense of a process toward the universal. Moral education is a kind of practical *Bildung* or way of promoting the full realization of the universal in oneself, namely, one's humanity. "Promotion to the universal," as Gadamer has said, "is not something that is limited to theoretical *Bildung* and does not mean only a theoretical attitude in contrast to a practical one, but covers the essential determination of human rationality as a whole. It is the universal nature of human *Bildung* to constitute itself as a universal rational being."<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, as the process of realization of universal education it must be based in human nature as well as in the metaphysical structure of reality. As the Confucian classic, the *Doctrine of the Mean*,<sup>3</sup> affirmed, "What Heaven imparts to man is called human nature. To follow our nature is called the way (*Tao*). Cultivating the way is called education." This means that education has also a metaphysical basis, though here our principal concern is only the anthropological foundation of moral education.

Let us now distinguish the term "moral" from another relevant term, "ethical." Although both terms sometimes have the same usage,<sup>4</sup> their specific meanings are distinguished in both Western and Chinese philosophy. Following Kant, German philosophers have often distinguished *Ethik* and *Moral*. For Schelling, the "moral" directs the individual and demands a personal response, whereas

"ethics" directs society and protects the person. For Hegel, "moral" is concerned more with subjective intentions, while "ethics" concerns more the *Sittlichkeit* or objective spirit as manifested in the family, civil society and the state. In Chinese philosophy *Tao Te* is distinguished from, though related to, *Lun Li*. *Tao Te* refers to what *The Great Learning* calls "making the will sincere," "rectifying the mind" and "cultivating personal lives." On the other hand, *Lun Li* refers to what the *Great Learning* calls "regulating the family," "bringing order to the state" and "manifesting clear character to the world."<sup>5</sup> Or, Chuang Tzu's terms, the former represents the way to "Sageness within," whereas the latter represents the way to "Kingliness without."<sup>6</sup>

On the whole, ethics consists in the code of behavior according to which people interact one with another in a certain society; it concerns the interrelation of social actors who must realize themselves socially and historically. Morality concerns rather the subjective intention and how one realizes one's own subjectivity; it is the process by which a person raises his or her own subjectivity to the universal, and the result of this process. In other words, *Tao Te* designates the process and eventual achievement of the effort of a moral agent to realize his or her human nature. Subjectivity is its central reference, though its realization must take place in the context of ethical relationships. In short, morality concerns the promotion of human nature on the basis of, and in the development of, ethical relationships.

It is now evident that both morality and ethics are based on human nature; one concerns its subjective aspect, the other its intersubjective aspect. Anthropologically, human nature has the following characteristics.

The human being has its own specificity which the scholastics understood as "rational animal". Because of this specificity Mencius considers the differentiation between the human and the animal to be an important theme in his philosophy which sees it as consisting in moral consciousness. Martin Heidegger tries to avoid theoretical or practical onesidedness in saying that the human is *Da-sein*, one who quests for and manifests Being. Although these philosophers differ among themselves in underlining the rational, practical, or ontological aspect, all agree that the human has something irreducible to other beings.

The human remains related to other beings: to the whole cosmos, even while retaining one's specificity. Confucianism views the cosmos as a living connected whole. In this sense one's self realization is related to the whole cosmic process. Wang Yang-ming's notion of "I Ti Tzi Zen" is the best representation of this universal relativity.

Human nature has its own dynamic relation to development. It contains an unfathomable dynamism for developing a fuller realization of its own potentiality. This dynamism could take two directions: the promotion of one's own specificity or *Dasein*, and the development of relations with other beings.

Morality concerns more the code and process of promoting the specificity of human nature--one's autonomy; ethics concerns especially enlarging the relatedness of human nature. The contrast of the two constitutes the structure and the dynamism of human nature.<sup>7</sup>

Moral education then is a process of formation, either by the moral agent self or with the aid of a teacher's modelling, of the interaction of human autonomy and relativity toward the highest human realization.

But what is the moral and ethical situation of the modern person under the impact of rapid technological development; what contents must be added to moral education in such an era? Ultimately these questions concern anthropological foundations, but before tackling these, we must look at the moral and ethical situation of man under the worldwide influence of science and technology.



## **The Impact of Rapid Technological Development on the Moral and Ethical Situation**

The development of science and technology has brought about an overall change in social structure, that is, in the manner in which persons interact one with another. This, in turn, modifies their ethical relationship, and thence the situation of moral praxis. Thus, the modern person's moral praxis is changed under the impact of science and technology by means of the changes these have brought about in ethical relations. People often neglect the double sense of ethical relation. In fact, an ethical relation has both a social and a moral sense. Socially speaking, it represents the social structure in which the members of a society interact one with another. But in its moral sense, an ethical relation means the norm of social interaction under which a person has to realize moral values. As objects of social sciences, social structure and its change are not our present concern. Moral philosophy studies only the moral aspect of ethical relations and the person's moral praxis.

Due to the impact of rapid technological development, the moral-ethical situation of modern man has the following prominent characteristics.

### *Human Interrelation*

Technological development has reinforced the interconnection and multiplied the interaction between persons and with other beings, thus rendering the ethical relation more complicated and rigorous. Science and technology are now united in a systematic whole which mediates between persons, nature and society. As a result, they are so interdependent upon each other and interact with each other to such a degree that pulling one hair might move the whole body.

First, through the mediation of science and technology, the interaction between persons and nature becomes more frequent, and is accompanied by various forms of exploitation and manipulation. Nature no longer is considered as a mass of passive matter, but as the possibility for new combinations and novel transformations. Nature becomes an invitation to human creativity and a field for its realizations. But the ultra-exploitation and abuse of nature has provoked urgent environmental problems, even to the point of depriving mankind of the biological space in which it lives. Because this results from free decisions, it has created a new domain of ethics, namely, environmental ethics.

Second, the development of science and technology has rendered more detailed and more complicated the division of work in modern society. It has created also quick and easy transportation so that people can interact one with another more frequently: more people have contact with more different people in a shorter period of time. This can make what originally were personal and effective relations more impersonal and institutional. Relations of contract, competition and--even worse--domination and violence have replaced the personal and affective ones. Professional ethics has outweighed person-to-person and family ethics. More seriously, in everyday life more and more we meet "strangers of acquaintance." The feeling of alienation is everywhere.

Third, one interacts increasingly with scientific and technological objects and, through their mediation, with nature and society. Mankind now lives among signs and machines; its life-world has become a world of techné rather than of *phusis*, a world of organization rather than of organism.<sup>8</sup> Science and technology become the synonyms of rationality. The human essence is defined in terms of its rationality, which in turn is reduced to what Max Weber calls the "instrumentally rational" (*zweckrational*). Value rationality (*Wertrationalität*)<sup>9</sup> appears pale and

weak. Having been reduced to instrumental rationality, the rational is defined in terms of its efficacy as an instrument to attain calculable ends. Other persons, reduced to the status of instruments, lose their dignity and values in themselves. The meaning of reflection and action also is impoverished. Reflection, deprived of its character as self-understanding, is reduced to mere scientific theorization; action, deprived in turn of its character as moral praxis, is reduced to mere technical application of scientific theories.

This strengthened nexus of the person with nature, with society and with technical systems constitutes a novel context for moral praxis. Just as in the case of language, the more complex and rigorous its syntactical structure, the more precise and determinate its semantic meaning becomes. In moral philosophy, the more complicated and rigorous ethical relations become under the influence of technological development, the more precise and determinate must be that which gives meaning to this relation--the moral action. This situation requires of modern man a higher moral creativity and more psychological flexibility, thus making people tend to moral indifference or social apathy.

### *Freedom and Responsibility*

The development of science and technology also has raised the degree of human freedom, the capacity for autonomy and thereby for moral responsibility. These characteristics contrast with those above. The development of science and technology, by knitting the world into a systematic whole, increases each individual's freedom and autonomy. This is true principally because the domain under the control of free choice is greatly enlarged. But moral responsibility is also enlarged; only when one can foresee the consequence of one's action and control it effectively is one responsible for one's action. Morally responsible action is known and chosen. If things impose upon us without our knowledge and control, that is, in spite of our free choice, they are beyond our responsibility. Even when we can act freely, but lose control, this uncontrollable process is outside of our real responsibility.

The development of science helps us to know better those things which concern our life; with the progress of technology we are equipped with effective instruments to control areas of reality which thusfar had been unattainable. The natural sciences and technology help us to know more about the regularities of nature, to control natural phenomena and to override partial natural determinism. Social sciences and techniques help us know more about social patterns and improve social institutions to the point of increasing social freedom. In short, scientific knowledge and technical know-how increase our freedom and efficacy. The more we are free and efficacious in our action, the greater is our moral responsibility. Thus, the development of science and technology entails the enlargement of man's moral responsibility, not its diminution.

The development of science and technology also creates new moral values since it enables us freely and consciously to initiate a process of action, to control it and to evaluate its consequence. This self-conscious and self-determining control renders scientific knowledge and technical activity morally relevant. Thus, the professional actions of doctors, engineers, businessmen, etc., supported by their scientific knowledge and technical capabilities become moral actions. Natural and social laws, when internalized as concrete norms of action by a free and rational person, become moral norms. Just as our free will effectively transforms originally scientific or technologically constringent norms of action into norms of moral action it can transform new scientific and technical discoveries into new moral values.

## Restoration of the Human Person as the Focus of Moral Education

The above contrast between the development of both autonomy and relativity leads us to a new understanding of human nature. In re-thinking the Kantian problem, "What is man?" in this epoch of science and technology, we must avoid the one-sidedness of either defining man through his autonomous subjectivity, as do modern Western philosophers since Descartes, or of underlining only his relativity to other beings as do some Chinese philosophers. We must take into consideration the structural and dynamic contrast of autonomy and relativity in human nature. This requirement makes possible a re-appreciation of the richness and wisdom of the notion of person in Scholastic philosophy.

Boethius's definition of person is famous: an individual substance of rational nature (*rationalis naturae individua substantia*). This definition contains the elements of autonomy (individual substance) and universality (rational). In assuming this definition St. Thomas seems to have had a deep insight into the interplay between autonomy and relativity in the human person.

First, Thomas seemed to have understood human autonomy in referring to the person as a self-controlled agent. He writes:

In a more special and perfect way the particular and the individual are found in the rational substances who control their actions--they are not merely acted upon as others are, but act autonomously. For it is proper to individuals or singular substances to act. So a special name is given among all other substances to individual beings having a rational nature, and this name is 'person'.<sup>10</sup>

Second, St. Thomas seemed to situate personal relativity in one's rationality--not merely as intellectual, but as comprising intellect and will, knowledge and love. For St. Thomas, intellect and will possess a certain "transcendental capacity" to include the whole realm of being in their object. In that sense, intellect and will are potentially everything and related to everything. Note that when analyzing the relation between intellect and will, knowledge and love, St. Thomas seemed to have remarked the contrasting character between autonomy and relativity as the ultimate constitution and dynamism of properly human nature. He said:

In all things there is a twofold perfection: one by which the thing subsists in itself, the other by which it is related to other things. . . . In both ways, however, immaterial things have a certain infinity because they are somehow all things insofar as the essence of the immaterial thing is the exemplar and likeness of all things either by act or by potentiality, . . . in this way they have knowledge. Likewise they also have an inclination and order to all things, and in this way they have will, by which all things are pleasing or displeasing by act or potency. . . . It is therefore evident that knowledge pertains to the perfection of the knower by which in himself he is perfected; however, the will pertains to a thing's perfection by its relation to other things. And likewise the object of the knowing power is the true, which is in the soul. . . . The object of the tending power, however, is the good, which is in things.<sup>11</sup>

This somewhat phenomenological description of St. Thomas distinguishes two universalizing dynamisms in human nature which nonetheless form an ontological unity in the human person. They differ in their unity and unite in their difference. A person is therefore constituted and moves by contrast.

In the new light derived from the impact of science and technology on the modern person's moral praxis as analyzed in the above section, we must re-define the human person as constituted and moved by the contrast of autonomy and relatedness, for only such an understanding of man could retain the wholeness of the person and its innermost dynamism. This could avoid the one-sidedness of such other philosophies as the Cartesian *cogito* as thinking substance, or the Kantian transcendental apperception as mere condition of possibility of our positive knowledge, or the Kantian freedom of the soul as mere postulate of moral actions, or the Contemporary Neo-Confucian moral subjectivity as autonomous and even infinite--all of which philosophies look upon the human person only from the aspect of autonomy. On the other hand, Classical Confucianism, which formed the basis of traditional Chinese moral education, seemed to underline only the relatedness of the person with nature, with society and with heaven.

Avoiding these one-sided philosophies, we understand the person as constituted and moved by the contrast of his or her autonomy and relatedness with other beings. These two constituents of the person interplay in a dialectical manner toward the full realization of humanity. This represents the logic of human self-realization. One has to realize oneself through a kind of rhythmic movement of two interplaying moments: one of distancing and the other of co-belongingness.

To keep oneself autonomous, one has to distance oneself from (*epoché*, in phenomenological sense) all the heterogeneous constraints and external limitations coming from nature, society, and even from transcendent beings. One must be able to disengage oneself from all external determinism and to act according to one's own free decision. Autonomy means the promulgation of laws of action by the actor himself. The person's free will cannot set up norms of action against the realization of one's own self; on the contrary, one cannot but search to realize one's own self to the highest degree. In this sense, we can accept the Kantian and contemporary Neo-Confucian autonomous subjectivity, not as a mere condition of possibility or as a formal postulate, nor as an all-encompassing subjectivity negating any transcendent dimension, but as autonomous persons tending towards the full realization of their own potentiality and determining the meaning of existence in their own specific manner. Heidegger's criticism of a Cartesian philosophy of subjectivity has the merit of revealing the person as *Dasein*, as the manifestation of Being. But we cannot thereby pass over the person's autonomous subjectivity in the making, which in turn is relative to other beings: man is relatively free and relationally autonomous.

The human person even in searching for his or her autonomy, still belongs to the same realm of existence in which other beings participate. Contemporary thinkers in psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc., seem to have re-discovered this relative dimension of man. For example, the French psychoanalyst J. Lacan has reinterpreted the Freudian desire as an unconscious signifying dynamism, directed towards other men and other things: in Lacan's words, desire is the language of the other (*le langage de l'autre*).<sup>12</sup> Desire is this constitutive element of our personality which reveals the existential interconnection between a person and other persons or other beings.

The structural and dynamic contrast of the relatedness and autonomy of human person is thus the anthropological foundation of moral education. The impact of science and technology upon this is quite ambiguous. Positively, the development of science and technology has promoted human freedom and enlarged the system of relatedness. But it also has had a negative effect in that it has encouraged the abuse of free will through the blind acceptance and passive determination of social and technical systems. In this context, if we want to be the master and not the slave of science and technology, we must restore the human person as the center of moral education. The problem is not that science and technology could undermine the autonomy and the relativity of

human person, but to look at the development of science and technology as deriving from the desire of human persons to promote their autonomy and to enlarge their relations with other beings.

First, we must look upon the autonomy of the scientifico-technological sectors as a symbol or concrete image of the kind of autonomy mankind wants to realize through its moral, social and historical actions. Seen from this side, science and technology could prepare the ground for realizing moral autonomy. With the help of science and technology, people could liberate themselves from external determinism, avoid pure chance and establish a known and controllable world submissive to the demand of the human person and concurring in its concrete realization.

Second, we must look upon the systematic character of scientifico-technological sectors as symbolizing the interconnection between man, nature and society and as articulating this in an eloquent manner. The auto-complexification of science and technology, in differentiating itself into ever more detailed sub-systems while grouping more and more sub-systems into larger systems, eventually could prepare a rational field for the concrete realization of the human person's relatedness to other beings.

In short, the restoration of human person as the focus of moral education in technological society means the formation and realization of the human person's autonomy and relatedness as prior to, and productive of, the autonomy and relatedness in science and technology. This is the way for mankind to be the master of science and technology.

### **Essential Content of Moral Education**

Moral education consists in the interiorization of essential moral norms and the formation of moral characters. But all these finally have to be derived from the requirements and dynamism of human nature.

Moral norms make explicit the manner in which a person needs to conduct his action in a certain concrete situation in order to realize the autonomy of his person and to develop his relations to other beings. They function, therefore, as a kind of mediation through which a person can affirm his autonomy in concrete situations of action and realize his existential interconnection with the external world. In this sense, our moral norms must be derived from the constitution and the dynamism of the human person as analyzed above.

From the person's desire for autonomy, freedom and self-realization it is possible to derive the moral norm of justice. Although the concept of justice has many definitions, it designates principally the moral norm that the desire and the right of every person to realize his or her own subjectivity must be respected by other persons. What John Rawls calls "distributational justice" is secondary in the sense that distributational justice is morally significant only when it contributes to the self-realization of the persons in question. The justice of revenge is derivative, in turn, from moral and distributational justice because often an offense against these forms of justice causes the retribution of other persons. Justice as a moral norm is concerned essentially with the right of everyone to realize his or herself as an autonomous and free person.

From the moral norm of justice, we could derive other relevant norms, such as respect for human rights, which could be made concrete in a bill of human rights, the contents of which might vary from one country to another.

From the human person's interrelatedness with other beings we could derive the norm of love. This norm is condensed in the words of Jesus: "You should love one another." Love is tender care for the good of others in a way that reveals and purifies one's existential innerconnections with

other beings. In love, only the realization of the good of other person's could contribute to the good of the subject.

From the norm of love we could derive the norm of respect for life which is quite universal in all civilizations. This norm is expressed negatively as the prohibition of hurting or killing any living being, and positively as the imperative to save and improve the lives of others.

Besides the interiorization of these moral norms, moral education has another task: that of forming essential moral character. The contemporary world implemented by science and technology needs people with a spirit of criticism and of commitment. On the one hand, justice demands from us a spirit of criticism. This does not mean a Kantian search for the conditions of possibility of the object in question, nor does it mean an Hegelian *Aufhebung*, often operating negatively. It means a special regard for the just degree of freedom and autonomy proportionate to the self-realization of each person in this complicated and rapidly changing society.

On the other hand, love demands from us a spirit of commitment. This does not mean blind engagement in action without knowing the cause. It is rather a self-conscious participation in the active realization of being-togetherness. Just as criticism plays the role of distancing in order to make justice possible, commitment plays the role of co-belonging to reinforce our interconnection with other beings. Criticism and commitment are thus two moments of the same dynamic movement towards the full realization of our subjectivity and intersubjectivity.

To realize the criticism that is justice and the commitment that is love, we must carry forward a life of action and reflection. These are important in moral education as a teaching-learning process. Criticism demands a moment of reflection, not as theorizing or referring to any natural or social science theory for judging a phenomenon, but as a mental distancing in order to circumscribe the situation of justice and criticize it in referring to the ideal. Commitment demands a moment of action, not as a mere application of scientific theories to the manipulation of natural or social phenomena,<sup>13</sup> but as a creative intervention in the flux of events caused by the relativity of the world.

## Conclusion

In this epoch of rapid technological development, it is very important to appreciate properly the function of moral education and to understand well its anthropological foundation. The function of moral education today is to assure the person of his or her humanity and thereby to render human beings capable of being master, rather than slave, of science and technology. The human person as constituted structurally and dynamically by the contrast of autonomy and relatedness is the anthropological foundation of all moral education. In turn, the autonomous and systematic character of science and technology is derived from this profound structure and dynamism of human nature. This way of understanding science and technology enables them to be related to the human project towards the total realization of one's potentialities.

Moreover, in forming our own personality and in training students in moral education, we must set up a model of the human person capable of both action and reflection: reflection with a view to attaining justice through criticism, and action with a view to fulfilling love through commitment. The logic of contrast between action and reflection, commitment and criticism, love and justice, leads finally to the fullest realization of our subjectivity and intersubjectivity. All these have their anthropological foundation in the human nature, namely, the autonomous and related person. The whole schema can be expressed as follows.

## Person

### *Anthropological foundation*

Autonomy <-----> Relativity

### *Moral norms*

Justice <-----> Love

### *Moral characters*

Criticism <-----> Commitment

### *Ways of life*

Reflection<-----> Action

The founding process of moral education goes from reflection to criticism, to justice, to personal autonomy; and from action to commitment, to love, to personal relatedness. The manifesting process of moral education goes from personal autonomy to justice, to criticism, to reflection; and from personal relatedness to love, to commitment, to action. The two moments of each stage (reflection and action, criticism and commitment, justice and love, autonomy and relativity) are in structural and dynamic contrast. This logic of contrast penetrates the whole process of the formation of an integral person. Moral education, either as an institutionalized process of teaching and learning, or as the whole process of human formation, must take into consideration both the founding process and the manifesting process schematized above. In thus forming more and more persons in action and reflection who are capable of realizing justice and love through criticism and commitment, and thereby of attaining the fulfillment of their autonomous but relational personality, such a moral education could render possible the mastery of science and technology by mankind.

*National Chengchi University*

*Taipei, Taiwan*

## Notes

1. M. Heidegger, *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (French translation by A. Preau, *Essais et Conférences*) (Paris: Gallimard, 1958), p. 88.
2. H.G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method* tr. G. Barden and J. Cumming (London: Sheed and Ward, 1976), p. 13.
3. *The Doctrine of the Mean*, in W.T. Chan, *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 98.
4. Cicero said in *De fato* that he used the Latin adjective "Moralis" to translate the Greek word *ethikos*.
5. W. Chan, p. 86.
6. Chuang Tzu, *Works* (Taipei: The World Book Co., 1982), ch. 33, p. 463.
7. Contrast means for us an interplay between identity and difference, distanciation and co-belongingness, rupture and continuity, which constitutes the structure and dynamism of an object

under investigation. It is our manner of replacing Hegelian dialectics by a creative positivity. See our *Action et Créativité* (Louvain-la-Neuve: University Catholique de Louvain, 1980), pp. 4-36.

8. The first is distinguished by Aristotle, the second by Berdyaev.

9. As to the distinction between *Zweckrationalität* and *Wertrationalität*, see M. Weber, *Economy and Society*, eds. G. Roth and C. Wittich (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).

10. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* I, q. 29, a. 1 and ad. 2, in *An Aquinas Reader*, tr. M.T. Clark (New York: Image Books, 1972), pp. 222-223.

11. Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum super libros sententiarum*, I, d. 27, q. 1, a. 4; see *An Aquinas Reader* pp. 264-265.

12. J. Lacan, *Ecrits* (Paris: Seuil, 1966), pp. 524, 838.

13. Concerning the critique of reflection as theorization and action as technical application of scientific theories, cf. G. Habermas, *Theory and Practice*, tr. J. Viertel (London: Heineman, 1974), pp. 1-40, 253-282.

## Bibliography

Barbour, I.G., ed. *Western Man and Environmental Ethics*. London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1973.

Chan, W.T. *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Chuang, Tzu. *Works* (the critical Chinese text of Kuo Ching-Fan, 1894). Taipei: The World Bk. Co., 1982.

Habermas, G. *Theory and Practice*. Trans. by J. Viertel. London: Heinemann, 1974.

Heidegger, M. *Vortage und Aufsätze*. French trans. by A. Preau: *Essais et Conférences*. Paris: Gallimard, 1958.

Gadamer, H.-G. *Wahrheit und Methode*. English trans. by G. Barden and J. Cumming: *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1976.

Lacan, J. *Ecrits*. Paris: Seuil, 1966.

Shen, V. *Action et créativité, une étude sur les contrastes génétiques et structurels entre l'action Blondelienne et la créativité Whiteheadienne* (Dissertation). Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1980.

Stanley, M. *The Technological Conscience, Survival and Dignity in an Age of Expertise*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

St. Thomas Aquinas. *An Aquinas Reader*. Edited, with an Introduction by M.T. Clark. New York: Image Books, 1972.

Weber, M. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. English trans. as *Economy and Society*. Edited by Roth G. and Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.



**Part III**  
**Moral Education: Student and Teacher, School and Nation**



## Ideological Education and Moral Education

*Tran Van Doan*

### Introduction

The triumph of Confucianism in The Han dynasty can be seen from two aspects: its glorification and its domination. For certain motives, (political, cultural, religious, educational and economic, etc.), Confucianism was adopted to defend the social *status quo*, to maintain social order, and to cultivate human nature. For this fateful multi-dimensional power Confucianism was glorified by the intellectuals (*Shih*) as a form of ideology (*Ru-chia sz-hsiang*) and by the ordinary people as a religion (*Ru-chia*). When ideology and religion combined, Confucianism enjoyed unparalleled spiritual as well as political power and the absolute domination of Confucianism in Chinese history (though challenged at times by Taoists and Buddhists, and later by Christianity) is a logical consequence.

As a dominant force, it tends to dictate, manipulate and transform the whole life-world and life-view. Authoritarianism, dogmatism and dictatorship were all aspects of this domination. More exactly, as ideology and religion Confucianism transformed its own doctrines into morality, and then, morality into canon law. Loyalty, obedience, rites-observance and filial duty have been both norms and dogmas ever since. Needless to say, Confucianism determined also politics, aesthetics and even economy.

This chapter concerns particularly the process of transformation of Confucianism from a philosophy of life into ideology and religion determining the features of present moral education. Its aim is to reveal the hidden essence of Chinese education through a critique of this ideology. Thus, it seeks to understand the ideological aspects of moral education in order to remove its mystical shell. To rediscover the rational kernel of moral education, authentic Confucian humanism must be clearly distinguished from Confucianism as a form of ideology. These questions will be treated through both an analytic and a synthetic approach.

In the first part, present moral education is diagnosed from three aspects: policy, method (didactics) and application. No difference appears between moral education, citizen-education, patriotic education and national education.<sup>2</sup> The method of teaching and learning bears, in many aspects, the characteristics of the past, i.e., it is mimetic, uncritical, passive and dogmatic; its application is ambiguous and disoriented. All in all, moral education has been radically transformed from the noble cause determining human nature to a sheer instrument. From another point of view, however, this moral education registers a remarkable success: it helps the State in keeping social order, in maintaining the *status quo* of society and in uniting the nation.

The second part aims at clarifying this contradiction whose essence lies in the ambiguity of moral education as a form of ideology. Thus, this part deals with ideology, whose main characteristics as it is used to defend the cause of the state or class-interests is instrumental and purposive reason.

The third part attempts to dissociate moral education from ideological education by a critique of ideology. It critically reviews some ideas of Habermas and Kohlberg which can contribute to a discussion of moral education in general, and to a rethinking of Confucian moral education in particular. First Habermas' theory of human interests as the basic characteristic of human nature and his theory of consensus and communicative action as a mode of resolving interest conflicts

are worthy of a careful study. Though this may be insufficient, its value and definitive contribution to understanding morality is undeniable. Second, Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development, an application of Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive-psychological development, also deserves attention. Though somewhat materialist and mechanical, it should not discourage us from a careful evaluation on its merits, for these theories bring out the notion of responsibility and help to rethink moral education.

Finally, in a manner that is less dogmatic and ideological, Confucian morality will be rethought with its original insistence upon the central role of persons and their inter-action within a totally integrated structure of man, world and God, and upon the dynamic development of social man after the model of nature. This contrasts to the ideological, static and dogmatic understanding of mankind found in most followers of Confucius.

### **Contemporary Moral Education**

Even before Premier Lee K.Y. of Singapore<sup>3</sup> declared the need for moral education, China had practiced it more rigorously than any other country. In over two thousand years, moral education had been *de jure* and *de facto* the only thing taught or permitted to be taught in Chinese schools. Moral codes were identified with juridical laws, while politics was synonymous with the art of applying these moral codes to social life.<sup>4</sup>

Far from being irrelevant then, the warnings of Lee and leaders in Taiwan seemed instead to touch but the tip of the iceberg. The increase of crimes, egoism, materialism, a-patriotism<sup>5</sup> and the like revealed a sad fact: moral education, even if it is still included in the school is losing its credibility and remains only as a footnote to Chinese culture. Its central role has been assumed by technology and economy. The onslaught of sciences, ironically by Hu-shi,<sup>6</sup> casts morality in an anti-progressive role; *de facto*, it is dead.

The reasons for such moral decadence are believed to be matters of recent history. Some blame the poisonous effects of Western culture, such as selfishness, irresponsibility and materialism;<sup>7</sup> other blame the ineffectiveness of teachers and parents; still others blame the devastating consequence of technological development. In short, one blames everything which happens to be related to modern life. Most of our time and resources are spent in issuing declarations and warnings. Finally, to calm our consciences, we make some cosmetic changes such as upgrading techniques in teaching and learning, or substituting some modern themes.

In our view, the official efforts have touched only some apparent, phenomenal and less necessary problems. While wasting mountains of paper for very little progress they leave the *status quo* and the *modus vivendi* of the kernel of moral education policy untouched. The illusion that some new ideas imported from the Western countries, e.g., USA, and the upgrading of some techniques can solve the problems can be seen in the government prepared text books. The naive belief that with economic and scientific progress moral problems might become non-existent turns out to be destructive. The whole problem is, in the expression of Max Horkheimer, that we do not recognize the constructive and destructive elements of our educational system.

The Enlightenment sought by Hu-shi is also an anti-enlightenment.<sup>9</sup> The politics that relied on technique as an effective instrument for seizing and maintaining power, described by Machiavelli and adored by our modern politicians, has destroyed the traditional politics built upon morality. `Wang-dao' or the royal and moral way of governance, being important to cope with modern techniques of seizing power, is forgotten and replaced by `Ba-dao' (the art of usurping power, or the amoral way of governing). In a word, politics appears as a sheer instrument or tool

as does morality which once was regarded as the scope of human life. It is sought only when politics and technology are overwhelmed by human problems. Thus, to tackle this problem, we need to look deeply into moral education, i.e., our policy, our method of teaching and learning, and finally the way of applying moral principles to individual and social life.

### **Contemporary Policy in Moral Education**

First, it must be noted that though, etymologically, citizen-education differs from moral education, today they are almost synonymous in educational practice in China. Such other terms as national education and patriotic education have more or less the same meaning.

The purposes of moral education as articulated by the authorities are to promote:

- Perfection in education
- Harmony in society
- 'Right' in the legal system
- Democracy in politics
- Prosperity in the economy, and
- Harmony in culture<sup>10</sup>

In the same preface, however, one reads:

All arguments and historical sources are based on the teachings of the Founding Father of the Nation, (i.e., Dr. Sun yat sen) and of the President (Chiang K.S.), as well as on the present policy of the State, in order to promote the national consciousness. The directives of the President on citizens and moral policy in the secondary school, issued 12 April 1960, are respectfully taken to be the purposes of this text book.<sup>11</sup>

In this context, moral or citizen education becomes a kind of catechism as would be taught in religious schools. A quick glance at the content of the text book shows unmistakably that moral education:

- serves as a means to protect the State, to safeguard the social order, and to develop the country;
- aims at cultivating a model individual created by the State (useful, patriotic, moral), and preserving the traditional values; and
- functions as the best means for preserving and promoting Chinese identity.

### *Moral Education for the State*

The idea that morality aims at making man better is universal and as old as human history. Confucians regarded morality as the sole way to transform human nature. In *The Great Learning*, Confucius was totally convinced that morality alone best serves mankind and its world: "The way of learning to be great consists in manifesting clear character, loving the people and abiding in the highest good."<sup>12</sup> Although one might question the meaning of morality as expressed by Confucius, one could not deny the fact that after Confucius morality became the most important, if not the only, way of governing. In *The Great Learning*, Confucius describes politics in eight

steps: investigating things, extending knowledge, sincerity of will, correction of the mind, cultivation of one's personal life, ruling one's family, national order and world peace.<sup>12</sup> A careful look at these shows morality to be the cornerstone of politics.<sup>14</sup>

After Confucius, the belief that morality is the metaphysical principle of politics became undisputed, unquestionable and unchallenged dogma. This transformed Chinese culture into a moral culture and Chinese politics into the moral art of governing (*Wang-dao*). Peace and prosperity, humanity and love, order and rites . . . are possible only if we possess morality.<sup>15</sup> This dogma was so forceful and fateful that Confucians and Neo-Confucians have done no more than interpret and rearrange it in various manners. Chu-Hsi (1130-2000) for example, rearranged the text and placed 'the investigation of things' in the first place, while Wang Yang-ming (1422-1529) insisted on the correction of the mind and sincerity of will as the most important principles.<sup>16</sup> They all share the view that these eight steps are indispensable for politics.

Although we are not in a position clearly to determine whether or not Confucius himself understood morality as the unique means for political life, it is commonly accepted that fundamentally morality is the ideal means. The text in *The Great Learning* clearly indicates that, by correcting oneself, one can rule one's family; by ruling one's family, one can govern the State, and so on. However, this does not establish whether moral conduct is for the sake of the State or the world; morality is the best means for both.

The confusion between means and ends, and the ambiguity in the sequence from the individual to the State and back to the individual, were used extensively in favor of the State. Han Fei-tzu, for example, by developing this idea, transformed morality into a kind of national law, the purpose of which was to defend the régime or State. Instead of morality, laws were taken as the best available means to serve state purposes. Han Fei-tzu argued that "the people's nature is such that they delight in disorder and do not cherish the law,"<sup>17</sup> and that the "ruler in the end will be able to prove to them that their own long term interests will be served best by a system based upon a draconian code of penal law."<sup>18</sup> His arguments sound like Hsun-tzu, famous for his theory that human nature tends to evil, and like Machiavelli, known for his police-state. This violent interpretation of morality in terms of law did not do justice to Confucius himself, who often regarded morality as higher and more noble than laws. Morality is for *Chun-tzu*, the noble man, while laws are for ordinary people. Accordingly, laws or *Fa* are not patterns forced on men;<sup>19</sup> they play only a secondary role when morality does not prevail.

Mencius interpreted Confucius rightly when he wrote: "Noble men will violate the penal laws."<sup>20</sup> However, Mencius did not take pains to make a clear distinction between morality and law. He often complained of the insufficiency of morality and his remark that "virtue alone is insufficient for ruling; the laws cannot carry themselves into practice,"<sup>21</sup> suggests that basically morality and laws have a similar instrumental character. Han fei-tzu, in this respect, asserted the roles of law and morality in the same manner. Benjamin Schwartz rightly observed:

In the book of Han Fei-tzu, one even discerns the outlines of an ultimate utopia lying beyond the more immediate goals of the legalists' program. Once the laws and the methods of rational government have become internalized in the habits of the people, the old dysfunctional attitudes based on belief in 'private action' (*Ssu-hsing*) will disappear. The irrelevancies of the cultural heritage with its stress on personal morality, the proud adherence of the wandering philosophers to their own inane 'private doctrines' and private values, private vendettas and 'private warriors' will have disappeared and the 'public interests' (*kung-li*) will reign supreme. Peace, harmony, and general welfare will prevail.<sup>22</sup>

In brief, the instrumentalization of morality was taken as a matter of fact. Weber's description of rationalization in Western culture had taken place in Chinese history long before. Hobbes's definition of politics as an art of the matter, form and power of a commonwealth, his understanding of human behavior as the material for sciences, are not new to the legalists who had practiced Machiavellian *Realpolitik* long before. Well-known principles in *Il Principe*, such as "All human beings are ungrateful, fickle, hypocritical, cowardly and selfish,"<sup>23</sup> or "politics is the art of governing men (Menschenführung) or the science of domination" were familiar to the legalists. In short, with the legalists, moral education was also an art of governance analogous to politics and laws.

This historical fact explains why three quarters of the content of the textbook on moral education deals precisely with politics and laws. It explains also how the overtone of politics in moral education is accepted as undisputed, justified, rational and thoughtful policy. Mr. Lee-huan, Minister of Education, stated bluntly:

Education is the fundamental and most important factor in constructing the Nation, and citizen-education (moral education) is the most essential of the many kinds of educations. It can determine our success or failure, i.e., the fate, of our Nation. . . . We must unite all the resources and powers of the people in order to survive. (Therefore) citizen-education needs to be upgraded in order to make our nation stronger. . . . Our most important task now is to upgrade, to better citizen-education.<sup>24</sup>

With equal vigor, the former Minister of Education, Mr. Chu K.S., traced the main lines of moral or citizen education as follows: 1) based upon morality or *Wang-dao*; 2) aimed at democratic life, at respecting the national laws; 3) helping the young generation acquire more scientific knowledge; and 4) contributing to the improvement of the livelihood of the people.<sup>25</sup> Chen Li-fu, president of the *Confucius-Mencius Society*, insists upon Citizen or moral education as the unique means for the survival of the Nation.<sup>26</sup> Those directives are executed literally and so effectively that one can hardly detect its artificiality. One gets the impression that moral education might be based completely on Confucian ethics, which impression turns out to be real if one understands Confucianism as a form of ideology.

#### *Moral Education and the Chinese Model-man*

The second character of moral education is seen in its goal of building a model man. Even if individuals are suppressed, some room is still made for them; however, it is necessary to note that the Chinese individual described in the textbook is a 'social individual'. The second and third volumes of the six-volume textbook reserve a great part to individuals, instructing the student on becoming a great citizen, a model student, a filial son or daughter, a responsible man or woman.<sup>27</sup> In short, the individual is mentioned in terms, not of the individual, but of his or her family, society and nation. What the authorities mean by individual is not synonymous with the solipsist romantic ego broadly assumed in Western culture. The Chinese individual is neither the center nor the starting-point of society, but a member or co-maker, living with others in society. One's life is determined by one's family and society to which one has responsibility. The concept of man (*jen*), for example, describes the social character of the person in terms of responsibility and communication.

Of course, in *The Analects*, one can detect some clues pointing to a certain type of individualism,<sup>28</sup> and in *Shi-ching* or *The Book of Poetry* one finds some similar passages. But this kind of individualism must be understood in the sense of Kantian autonomy<sup>29</sup> or Hegelian self-consciousness, because it expresses an individual who possesses a spiritual self-sufficiency which renders him independent of 'popularity' or dependence upon others. Thus, it has little to do with what is meant by an individual in Western culture. The Chinese individual is self-sufficient in virtue, but not in terms of sociality. What the official textbook stated concerning the individual is really the person of universal character required by Chinese society: a person with wisdom, responsibility, loyalty, politeness, filial piety, success and, today, technical knowledge. Moral education is supposed to help the student to become such a person.

Thus, in the first two volumes, though many chapters deal with the ideal individual, nothing is left to the individual as such. The first chapter of the volume deals with the four main benefits of education, of which only one is related directly to the individual as such:

- it gives the knowledge (technical ability) indispensable for survival;
- it develops human capabilities;
- it instructs concerning the way of acquiring wisdom (the art of living);
- it is the best means of realizing individual ideals.<sup>30</sup>

The other, more important, benefits from education are for society, the State, and the world. Careful reflection upon the first individual benefit, shows that it concerns an individual preparing for society. Morality, technology, knowledge, etc. . . . primarily benefit one's family and the State. The third point, for example, which deals with the art of living (*dao-li*), is unmistakable: "Education instructs man on how to acquire wisdom (*dao-li*): the individual cannot be independent from society. He must share his life with others. Only when he understands this art of living (*dao-li*), can he live peacefully and harmoniously with others."<sup>31</sup>

From the above analysis, one can describe education in its own Chinese expression of *Chiao-yu*<sup>32</sup> as the best means to teach and to raise students to become model persons. According to these descriptions, one can resume the characteristics of a model person as follows:

- patriotic, altruistic and responsible (vol. I)
- possessed of knowledge and technical ability, useful to the society and the State (vols. I and V)
- law abiding and ready to fulfill one's duty to the State, to defend its interests (vols. III and IV)
- a person of moral integrity, who strictly observes traditional values (loyalty, filial piety, benevolence, etc.) (vols. II, III and VI), who maintains social order
- one who puts the interests of the State . . . prior to his or her own interests (vols. I and II).

In short, the ideal person as described in the textbook is conservative in a strict sense. He does not blame others but accepts his fate and fulfills his duty.

### *Moral Education or the Ideology of Chinese Identity*

The public authorities in Taiwan attend to traditional culture for a number of tactical reasons. 1) The emphasis upon Chinese culture has a less ideological tone, but more effective result. It is



commonly accepted as the unique factor which could unite the Nation and preserve Chinese identity.<sup>33</sup> 2) It is designed as part of a policy against factors blamed for destroying Chinese culture and promoting internationalism. 3) Chinese traditional culture is rich in morality. Thus, preserving culture means respecting social order, family structure, etc.

*Culture and Chinese Identity:* In all six volumes, culture is often mentioned under various forms of morality, laws and knowledge. The particularity of Chinese morality and laws is traced to the distinctiveness of Chinese culture as the most rich and most profound in terms of history and knowledge. Thus exaltation of Chinese culture is necessary for restoring Chinese identity. In the recent past, after the political, military and scientific failure of the Ching dynasty, a great number of Chinese lost faith in China. The mass exodus of Chinese to Western countries, disarray and disorientation, lack of self-identity and a self-defeatist attitude were the main causes of Chinese humiliation by Japan and Western colonialism. They explain why and how the Chinese Communists have easily controlled Mainland China.

But these symptoms have by no means disappeared. The brain-drain,<sup>34</sup> lack of self-assurance, fetishism of science and commerce,<sup>35</sup> etc., which are born of such defeatism could cause more harm. Thus, restoring culture is identified with restoring Chinese identity. The stories of Chinese heroes are rewritten in a more patriotic and cultured manner; Chinese culture is exalted in such terms as "Chinese culture aims at humanism and spiritualism, while Western culture aims at materialism."<sup>36</sup> History, geography, philosophy and literature are rewritten in this context.<sup>37</sup>

*Culture and Ideology.* The destructive character of Mao's cultural revolution is cited as an example of the self-destruction of China. In Taiwan the effort to restore Chinese culture was at first propaganda against communism (Ministers Lee and Chu), but later became a means for unifying China. Culture here being understood as traditional morality and social order, e.g., the virtues of obedience, piety, respect, reverence for Confucius, etc.

*Culture and Morality.* For lack of clear demarcation between culture and morality, morality is often taken for culture. Indeed, besides art, the rest of Chinese culture is identified with moral teaching. Thus, the teachings of Confucius, Lao-tzu, Buddhism, etc., . . . constitute the central body of Chinese culture.

All in all, the exaltation of culture transforms it into a kind of ideology. In fact *The Three Principles of the People*, written by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, are often described as part of Chinese culture and vice-versa, or rooted in Chinese culture. This theory is the main ideology of the Republic of China and its ruling party, which considers it the key to the success of the economy and living standard of Taiwan today.

### **The Method in Moral Education**

In the preface of the textbook, one reads:

6) The method of this book consists in explanations with examples after each chapter in order to facilitate the student's understanding. 7) From chapter to chapter, there is a systematic and logical relationship and order. 8) Notes and references are included after each chapter. 9) After each lecture (chapter), exercises are included, the purpose of which is to stimulate the reflective capacity and the moral judgment of the students.<sup>38</sup>

Though apparently arranged and written according to such a method, a number of the above claims are controversial, e.g., "facilitating the students' understanding," "logic and system," and the understanding on the part of the teachers. In our view, though apparently scientific, its method is still dogmatic, and for a number of reasons.

*The Facilitation of the Student's Understanding:* It is true that the language used is simple and brief and that many arguments and examples are given, but what counts is the content. To our view, the content is too difficult for first or second grade students. Metaphysical theories concerning human nature are explained superficially; theories of politics are abbreviated into a single sentence. Simple language does not mean that the readers can understand, on the contrary, even philosophers and scientists experience difficulty in reading so simple a book as *The Three Characters Book*.<sup>39</sup> The reason is that it does not take account of the capacity for understanding on the part of the students.

*The Ability and Understanding of Teachers.* Of course, one cannot say categorically that the teachers do not understand the subjects they are teaching, but neither are there statistics or answers relating to this problem.<sup>40</sup> The fact is that all textbooks used in the secondary and even in the primary schools are written by the university professors who habitually write the textbooks in a quasi-academic manner. Though experts in their own fields, as they have no pedagogical experience in the schools their language is often too difficult, even for secondary school teachers. Further, the training of these teachers is often inadequate. The majority of the teachers have studied *The Three Principles of the People* which trains them in different matters, but is insufficient for self-reflection. Their lack of philosophical training (logic, systematic and critical thinking, history of philosophy, etc.) makes it difficult for them to understand theories written in too concise a manner.

*The Claim of Logic and System.* On the whole, it is true that the book is arranged in a relatively systematic fashion after the model of *The Great Learning*, going from individuals to society. But as to the claim that the argumentation is logical, one notes that many arguments are insufficiently convincing because: 1) the examples given are too few and, at times, irrelevant, 2) the tone is always affirmative (dogmatic), and 3) the logic is often tautological.

For these reasons, the claim of the authors appears questionable. For lack of experience in secondary schools these high officials and university professors<sup>42</sup> are ineffective in reforming the method of teaching morality. What remains are cosmetic changes, while the traditional spirit of teaching remains intact.

In the past, children were expected to repeat what the teachers said; repeating and copying were synonymous with learning and were fundamental characteristics of traditional education. This begins with the way the children learn reading and writing. The system of Chinese characters does not promote the child's ability to think. What they need to do is to copy exactly, to write the exact number of strokes of a character: the more faithful they are, the better they achieve. There is no question, wonder, critique or remark, but only memorization and imitation. As the best students are those who can memorize all the characters without missing a stroke, from the first year in elementary school to the last year of high school (and probably in university), the mark of a student depends upon his memory. Homework and cram-schools are designed to help the students to repeat and memorize all the material asked in examinations. No wonder even creative work like arts is

understood in terms of copying. Thus, though the method of teaching and of learning be upgraded, it is only a cosmetic change which helps the children memorize more easily or pleurably. Video-system, photos, maps, stories, etc., are widely used for this purpose.

In a word, memorization as a method remains; only its techniques are updated. This fact can be verified in the textbook and by the way in which a teacher executes his or her duty:

- all texts and arguments are descriptive in style,
- all explanations are simple and condensed,
- expressions are affirmative with hardly an hypothesis or question,
- teachers have only a few references to literature,
- as the content of moral education is too rich and the time allowed is too short, teachers can only do their best to repeat the text and force the students to memorize.
- there is no discussion or question and answer forum (this fact pleases both teacher and students: the former need not spend more time for research, while the latter prefer having fewer items for examinations).

This method of teaching is the best and the most effective way to get through all the examinations, up to those for college entrance. In short, students and even teachers are treated like machines or computers who need only reproduce exact solutions, and the above method is best for transforming students into such computers. It is normal to see students who can go through complicated mathematical sequences without understanding their process,<sup>43</sup> while others score high marks in an English examination (TOEFL) without being able to speak, write or understand that language when spoken.

Finally, the content is too abstract to understand. In the past, children began to learn metaphysics (the nature of human beings) even before they learned reading and writing. No wonder we still see these theories, rewritten and rearranged in a more attractive manner in the textbook.

We do not need to repeat other shortcomings of this method already discussed by other scholars. What we do wish to say is that this kind of method is born within an ideological structure and preserved by dogmatists, that it is the most conservative method and does more harm than good.

### **The Practice of Moral Education**

Moral education is emphasized partly because of the increase in crime, especially among teenagers, which can threaten social stability; partly as a component of the policy against communism, and partly for the sake of national identity. As we already argued, it takes little account of individuals. It is directed first toward the stability, order and progress of the nation, secondly toward unifying and fighting against communism, and finally toward the growth of individuals.

Moral education is quite successful in furthering patriotism. It gives people more confidence in China, makes the students more obedient and loyal, helps to curb the crime rate (though we still have no statistics or results to verify this claim), and contributes to keeping the traditional family in order. In these respects, moral education has reason for claiming to be necessary. But, there are also many reasons for worry: an increase in crime especially among white-collar workers (i.e., those receiving more education), the brain drain, the lack of interest in the national cause,

individualism, and the danger of losing Chinese identity by accepting the so-called `americanisation'.<sup>45</sup> These maladies come, not only from our policies and methods, but even more from their application, which manifest the following difficulties:

- the content of moral education is too difficult or too ideal
- it is also too abstract
- its method is anti-scientific and against human growth
- the policy and sequence of moral education are ambiguous and beyond the reach especially of children, who have no idea of politics.

The most serious problem, however, is the disunity between theory and practice.<sup>46</sup> The changing character of our society and the relevance thereto of these theories and of traditional virtues have not been studied. In other words, the micro and macro sociological facets have not been thought through.

All these shortcomings force us to reflect upon the nature of ideology, which we consider to be the key to understanding moral education and its importance.

## **Morality and Ideology**

We have noted that this kind of moral education had been embraced by our ancestors in the past, and that feudalism and monarchism had used it extensively for their causes. As was noted above, teachings were rejected by Confucius himself; the method and theory were developed by the Confucians after Confucius. Though historically there may have been reason for such an ideology, it contributed to the collapse of China in the 19th and 20th centuries. Thus this part intends to clarify the difference between morality and ideology, and to trace the process of the transformation of morality into ideology. This process is too complicated to handle in a few pages for it involves, not only the purpose and method of morality, but the psychological attitude of acceptance or resistance, free or unfree decision, etc. Mass media, social circumstances, religion, etc., also play an important role in the process of transformation of morality into ideology. Aware of such complexity, we shall limit ourselves to a few points relevant to our discussion: (1) the meaning of ideology, (2) the nature of ideology, and finally (3) the process of the transformation of morality into ideology.

### *The Meaning of Ideology*

Historically, the term `ideology' is very ambiguous, if not self-contradictory.<sup>47</sup> It means not simply `a study of ideas' as the term suggests, but a system of correct ideas which can determine others. However, as it is extremely difficult to know which idea is correct, we will take the common use of ideology as the standard of our discussion.

What we understand by ideology is of rather recent history. It was used by Karl Marx in his *Deutsche Ideologie*<sup>48</sup> and more recently by Karl Mannheim in his *Ideologie und Utopie*.<sup>49</sup> Marx understood ideology as a system of ideas which, though logically valid, is constructed on an erroneous basis<sup>50</sup>--for example, the Platonic ideas, the Christian God, or the bourgeois constitution--the purpose of which is to defend the interests of the dominant class. Ironically, his view on ideology was reversed by such followers as Lenin, Stalin or Mao Tse-tung, so that the Soviet ideology<sup>51</sup> and the Maoist ideology are by no means compatible with the view of Marx. In

a manner similar to the bourgeois whom they attack, with Marxist language they built another ideology to defend their own interests or those of the party. Thus, while Marx regards ideology as a closed, self-proclaimed sufficient system of thought which excludes freedom and tends toward determinism, his believers dogmatize Marxism as the most scientific, authoritarian, rational and perfect system of ideas mankind could conceive. In a word, they regard Marxism as an ideology and reject all other thought.

This contradiction in fact lies in the nature of ideology itself, and can best be seen in the history of its development. According to Francis Bacon, de Tracy and de Condillac or Cabanis, ideology means a critique of false idols or idolatry.<sup>52</sup> It is a rational theory of knowledge constructed on empirical observation (Bacon),<sup>53</sup> sensation (de Condillac),<sup>54</sup> physical sensibility (Cabanis),<sup>55</sup> biological factors (de Tracy),<sup>56</sup> pleasure (Helvetius),<sup>57</sup> etc. It accuses idealism, spiritualism and rationalism of being irrational and unreal because constructed on a wrong basis.

These critiques were important to Marx for whom any theory, however logical, constructed on an erroneous basis is an ideology and falls prey to dogmatism. In this sense, he is against Bacon, de Condillac and Cabanis because their theories give birth to positivism, which is another form of ideology. In short, Marx stands completely and unconditionally against any form of ideology. Without doubt, the insights of Marx have a certain value in contributing to our understanding of ideology of today. His view that one must reject any theory which contradicts social human nature as a dynamic, evolutionary entity, which defends the *status quo* of social structures, or which makes eternal and absolute pronouncements, is extremely important for understanding moral education.

In this context, we regard as ideologies any closed theories (or *ism's*) such as idealism, positivism, scientism, spiritualism or materialism. However, Marx's radical critique is not completely justified. His neglect of the positive aspect of ideology and his irresponsible attack on all forms of ideology gave birth either to anarchism or to another ideology such as that of the Soviet's and of Mao. For this reason, it would be better to look at ideology from two different angles: positive and negative, as did Mannheim.

Positive ideology is a systematic and scientific theory which satisfies a temporal need of society, which can resolve democratically and rationally conflicts of interest, and which is open to the future (in the trial and error manner advocated by Karl Popper).<sup>58</sup> Negative ideology is a logical system of ideas which can satisfy or resolve only certain problems and conflicts, but claims to be unique, eternal, unchangeable, omnipotent and free from any possible error. It is constructed, not on a scientific basis, but upon authority (whether political, theological, economic or the like). It is arbitrary in the sense of serving the interests of a certain class or regime, though claiming to be universal. Its *raison d'être* is nothing but the sheer means-ends rationality of instrumental reason.

Marx's critique of ideology is valid for this second kind of ideology, but remains insufficient because he failed to detect the positive aspect of ideology. Though temporal and insufficient, this can contribute to human progress by serving as a strong basis of culture, contributing to the formation of national consciousness, and playing a decisive factor in the development of individual.

In *Ideologie und Utopie*, Mannheim partly abandoned the Marxist material and class approach in understanding ideology. He understood ideology in the context of total social structure and tried to study both its positive and negative aspects. The undeniable value of ideology in shaping history and motivating economic development has been pointed out by Max Weber. The function of political and sociological ideology in developing and forming national or group identity or class

consciousness has been made evident by Lukács's in *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein*. Thus, Mannheim distinguishes between particular and total ideologies.

- Particular ideologies aim at refuting specific assertions "which may be regarded as concealments, falsifications or lies without attacking the integrity of the total mental structure of the asserting subject."<sup>59</sup>

- Total ideologies refer to the entire *Weltanschauung* of an age or historical group.<sup>60</sup> This kind of ideology is attacked by Marx, Nietzsche and Freud. Nietzsche devalues all traditional values which he regards as useless, unreal, inhuman. Marx rejects all concepts of justice, equality, fraternity, charity, as well as religions, as sheer forms of class interests. Freud casts doubt upon the whole history of human nature.

In viewing the complexity of ideology, Mannheim distinguishes between ideologies as idea-systems which are congruent with, and supportive of, the *status quo*, and those which are against this (as seen in Marx, Nietzsche and Freud). These two different and opposed senses are related and sometimes confused as two aspects of the same reality inasmuch as they have the same rigid totalitarian nature and give birth to a new kind of ideology once attacked. Utopias such as Marxism, Freudianism, or Nietzscheanism, which are opposed to the *status quo* and supportive of an alternative social order or human nature, could have both of these characteristics. First, they are against the *status quo* of other ideologies; then they transform themselves into other ideologies or utopias. Thus, utopia has a double meaning: devaluation and revaluation, deconstruction and reconstruction.

### *The Nature of Ideology*

In a previous article dealing with ideology,<sup>61</sup> I have tried to trace the line between ideologies by pinpointing some criteria. Those used were rather Kantian, being developed according to mathematical principles of universality and necessity. Since then the study of Dilthey and Habermas<sup>62</sup> has shown that there is no absolute universality and necessity in morality as Kant had insisted, and that the human sciences differ in nature from the pure sciences. It seems mistaken to interpret the nature of morality and ideology in terms of a mathematical model.

The quasi-transcendental categories proposed by Habermas should be considered as candidates for the needed criteria. I shall not discuss the scientific status of Habermas' quasi-transcendental categories; his categories do not claim an absolute scientific status, but are constructed after the model of language and the genetic psychology of Jean Piaget. Hence, his categories are at least more human and social than those of Kant or Aristotle. Though possibly insufficient they avoid a dogmatic objectivism or relativism. Through a careful study of various schools of *Lebensphilosophie*, Habermas' theory escapes the naive belief of the Enlightenment in the absolute value of the sciences, and its attempt to reduce all human activities to a scientific exploration.

Thus, we shall study the nature of ideology under the following aspects:

- its universal character in the sense of democratic decision-making and common sense
- its necessity
- its degree of freedom in decision-making
- its historicity

- its developing or dialectical essence
- its temporality and spatiality

A theory falls prey to ideology when it lacks a universal (that is, democratic) and necessary character, or when it is valid only for a certain place and time but claims an absolute and eternal character, forcing others to follow it by any available means such as power, authority, manipulation or seduction. If these criteria are acceptable, then we can describe the nature of ideology as:

- lack of a universal, and necessary character
- lack of free decision (relying on authority, power, wealth)
- of limited validity temporally and spatially
- tending to absolutize history, and thus being against historicity
- static, conservative and tending to defend the *status quo*
- conservative in method, stressing analysis and interpretation
- employing especially narrative and interpretative methods.

In view of this revised meaning and nature of ideology, we can now return to moral education: (a) to examine whether or not it is a kind of ideology, and (b) to inquire about its relevance and importance. On the first question, there is no doubt that moral education as practiced today is a kind of ideology. That fact is acknowledged officially and accords with our criteria:

- it is effective for only a certain age in a certain time and at a certain place;
- it loses its weight when students become more critical and when they begin to wonder about freedom, autonomy and individual interests;
- it tends to defend the old social order or *status quo*;
- it uses a rigid, static, uncritical method;
- its topics reflect, not common interests, but only those of the State.

Before answering the second question, we need to examine the process of transformation of morality into ideology so that we can talk about the relevance and importance of ideology.

### *The Transformation of Morality into Ideology*

To understand why morality becomes ideology one needs to know: the nature and effectiveness of morality, its political function in Chinese history and the process of its transformation into ideology.

*The nature and effectiveness of morality.* Since Aristotle, Western morality has been a study of human conduct aiming at happiness, resolving conflicts and the like. On the nature of morality, however, there is a division: idealists and rationalists hold an eternal or transcendental nature for morality, while the empiricists and utilitarians think of moral nature in *a posteriori* terms, denying it any transcendence to morality. The former tend to absolutize morality, while the latter tend to instrumentalize it.

In China, it is not the same. No school, including that of Confucius himself, regards morality either as transcendental and fully *a priori*, or as completely *a posteriori*. All schools, however, accept the importance of morality and consider it the foundation of Chinese culture. This view

could easily be misinterpreted or absolutized, as in the case of the Confucians after Confucius, to whom morality is the quintessence of Chinese culture and determines Chinese politics, aesthetics and economy. Morality is the last resort and highest point--higher even than religion.

It is this that gives birth to Confucian ideology when, by a *stroke*, morality is transformed into a kind of eternal and static instrument for the defense of the *status quo*. They ignore the fact that morality is of three different levels: the first or quasi transcendental is constructed on a human nature which also is transcendental; the second changes and develops in accordance with human evolution and development; and the third is built on social activity. With the exception of the first category, morality is seen as being in steady change. Of course, its development or change is in conformity with human development, with one's adaptation to nature and with one's capacity to resolve conflicts.

We will return to this problem in the third part when we discuss the theories of Habermas and Piaget on morality. Here we need only know how morality becomes ideology. We have stated that any attempt at transforming morality into ideology is tantamount to the act of dogmatizing, monopolizing and manipulating human beings for a calculated purpose. Thus, the transformation of morality into ideology begins with the first step of absolutizing and monopolizing morality.

In an agricultural society such as China at the time of Confucius, one tends to conquer nature, not by force, but by technical knowledge. One tends to defend oneself, not by violence, but by laws. That explains the effectiveness of morality for it is the best means to domesticate barbarism and to survive in a crowded conflictual situation. It replaces the role of violence in the Stone Age, transforming it into a civilized society. Thus, as the best means of educating men Confucius himself chose *Li*<sup>63</sup> or rites as the symbol of morality, and music<sup>64</sup> as the symbol of civilization. The ineffectiveness of violence in an agricultural society in dealing with daily problems (of course, war is an exception) forced our ancestors to look for another more effective means for resolving conflicts without sacrificing one of the partners involved in the conflict. While violence always ends with one losing and one gaining, or with both losing, morality ends with the happy result of no one losing. The effectiveness of morality in society is undeniable; indeed it is so effective that one tends to absolutize it as the ultimate means and end.

*The political function of morality in China and its transformation into ideology.* By regarding morality as the ultimate foundation, all human activities come to be built upon moral principles. Thus, politics is influenced by morality; indeed, the political order is constructed on the moral order, and the legitimacy of political order must be justified in terms of the moral leadership of the ruler.<sup>65</sup> In this context, morality becomes absolute. As pointed out, there are three different categories of morality: the quasi-transcendental one born in man's most fundamental nature and in religion; the second one based on human nature as changing and developing (in terms of the human genetic and psychological development proposed by Piaget and Kohlberg); and the third which is formed and developed in the context of social activity. By absolutizing morality without discussing its nature it is dogmatized and transformed into ideology.

The process of transformation of morality into ideology is legitimated and justified: 1) by accepting its effectiveness, 2) by applying it in society (politics), and finally 3) by interpreting it in accordance with the interests of the ruling class. It is the third point which distinguishes morality from ideology. We acknowledge that morality of the first category is transcendental or quasi-transcendental. This means morality has a common nature accepted by mankind and is not restricted by space or time. A Chinese has much the same duty toward his parents as a European or African. Morality in the second category is of only limited transcendence. It is developing and



changing, and cannot be held as universal. For example, sexual morality is varied in each country, and for different groups or classes. The third category of morality changes according to the social development so that these moral laws are often identified with social laws.

The process of transforming morality into ideology, takes the third category to be the first, while ignoring the nature of the second category. Thus, one interprets national, civil, royal or party laws to be universal morality, and civil duties to be categorical imperatives. This violent and radical interpretation was practiced in the era after Confucius. All social laws such as loyalty, obedience, respect, and humility came to be interpreted as the most universal laws. Once forcefully accepted, these virtues become the cornerstone of Chinese political and economic activities. A dynasty is built on loyalty and obedience. Corporations are based on *Yi* and confidence, family structure is built on filial piety rather than on love. This is contrary to Confucius' preaching of *Jen* benevolence, of love and harmony. This explains also the practices in the past of excluding women in society, dividing classes, and excluding all but the Shi or ruling class from policy and decision-making. The violent interpretation of the third category of morality explains why there is such a difference between the politics of Yao, Schwen, Chou and others. Yao or Schwen based their politics on the first category of morality while the others based theirs on the third category, but interpreted it as the first category. While the politics of Yao and Schwen were democratic, the latter is dogmatic and dictatorial.

### **Morality and Interests: A Critique of Ideology**

By analyzing our present moral education in the first part, and making a distinction between morality and ideology in the second part, we come to a tentative proposal that a sound moral education must be freed of the characteristics of ideology. At first glance this seems a quasi impossible task, for it involves not only national policy, but also the method of teaching and learning. We lack also the critique necessary for distinguishing ideology from morality, and thus far we have no theory which can determine the exact nature of morality. Thus, in this part, we shall focus upon the last point, i.e., the nature of morality, as the first step toward a sound understanding of moral education.

The second part mentioned briefly the nature of morality, but too briefly for an adequate understanding. Morality was divided into three different categories: quasi-transcendental, empirical and social morality. This division was already visible in Aristotle who acknowledged that morality, though born in human nature (*ethos*), was developed in human social relations and human activity (*ethicos*).<sup>66</sup> He acknowledged also that morality attempts to transcend the limit of time and space, but contradicted himself by interpreting morality in terms of customs and habits which are time and space-bound. In this way, he confused the three categories of morality. The same mistake is found in the Latin tradition with its understanding of morality as *morals*, which comes rather from the term *mos*, i.e., customs or habits.<sup>67</sup> As habits, morality loses its claim to dictate or transform human nature. It lacks transcendence (universality and necessity) and become class morality or the morality of a certain social group.

Kant refused to accept such an understanding of morality and his distinction between *morals* and morality is genial.<sup>68</sup> But his radical insistence on the neutrality, objectivity and transcendence of morality makes his morality 'inhuman' and a-social. Designed for a superman, it seems beyond space and time and incompatible with human beings. Hegel correctly criticized Kantian morality as aloof,<sup>69</sup> as not morality but only the idea of morality. His solution of identifying morality and morals seems headed along the right path, and able to resolve the dichotomy between Kant's

transcendental morality and Locke's empirical morality. Regretfully, he failed because his solution engaged only his mind and reality.

In our view, morality must be understood in the same way as human nature which tends toward its perfection (in relative terms). Hence, what Aristotle and other moralists call *morals* in the sense of *mos* are in fact only some apparent, changing and accidental forms of morality, but are not yet morality. The same applies to the social order and social laws: customs, morals, laws and orders are limited in time and space and express only a part of the totality of human nature. They are not yet morality, which expresses what is most fundamental to human nature such as the act of preserving oneself, the act of loving and the need for communication.<sup>70</sup> It expresses the duration of human nature through time and universal space. To be more concrete, the act of killing is against such properties of human nature as preserving, loving and communicating, and is eternally condemned by all societies in every place.

However, this distinction does not help us to locate or to build sound moral education. As described above, a pure morality, although both neutral and universal, could degenerate or be manipulated in practice. For this reason all three aspects of morality must be studied seriously. In fact, a pure morality is impossible in practice, while a purely empirical morality will generate disorientation and relativism in moral education. Therefore, sound moral education should be based on a genuine, rational, democratic and practical consensus of basic human interests and nature.

Such a consensus must satisfy the rigorous tests of the human sciences and the demand of reason. It is universal on two different levels: *a priori*, for it is inborn and inseparable from one's most basic human nature; *a posteriori* but nonetheless 'transcendental', for it is born and developed in accord with human activities, but has a certain dimension of universality and necessity such as language and communicative acts. For Habermas the second kind of universal principle is quasi-transcendental. To accept only the first kind is to fall into the metaphysical domain, while to affirm only the second one is to stand within the range of empiricism. In contrast to separating the three different natures of morality, these two kinds of universals must be seen as interwoven.

Habermas' consensus is precisely a tentative synthesis of these two kinds of universals, for consensus is:

- the most essential characteristic of the human race;
- the main reason explaining the formation of society;
- quasi-transcendental in the sense that other quasi-transcendental forms such as language, feeling, hope, etc., are explicit forms of consensus;
- expressive of human freedom by resisting any dogmatic coercion;
- the symbol of the human capacity for communication; and
- expressed by such forms of communication as grammar, laws, morals and customs.

The question, however, is how to achieve this consensus. It is the main question treated by Habermas in his three important works, namely, *Knowledge and Human Interests*,<sup>71</sup> *Towards a Reconstruction of Historical Materialism*,<sup>72</sup> and *Theory of Communicative Action*.<sup>73</sup> What are their implications for moral education? First, in order to discover a genuine consensus, one needs to criticize all that blocks this consensus. Thus, according to Habermas, a critique of ideology is the *conditio sine qua non* for attaining consensus.<sup>74</sup>

Our critique of the present moral education as a form of ideology--i.e., a system grounded on a belief which maintains its legitimacy despite its inability to be validated in rational discourse--is

intended as the first step toward a genuine consensus in our moral education. Our critique questions the emphasis or over-emphasis upon the instrumentality of moral education, the development of method or technical abilities at the cost of its content, and the disarray in applying moral education which produces both a loss of moral meaning in day-to-day life and a diminution of freedom of choice. The critique is not against science as such, but questions any form of domination which distorts or misforms consensus, and any form of manipulation by a certain class, regime or dynasty for the purpose of dictating the moral codes in favor of their own interests.

But critique is only the first step of a project aimed at discovering the heart of moral education and engaging therein. In this part we need to proceed constructively in pointing out the basis of consensus and shall follow Habermas' analysis of interests because it can illumine the nature of consensus. According to Habermas, in order to reconstruct an authentic moral education, one needs:

- to pinpoint the most basic human interests which determine our conduct,
- to reconstruct moral regulations based on these basic interests, and
- to test moral regulations in daily life in order to verify these regulations in accordance with human consensus.

### *Interests and Morality*

In the second part, we tried to distinguish between ideology and morality and indicated that most of the so-called codes in our moral system bear ideological characteristics. Similarly, we shall try now to show the difference between substantial or basic interests and secondary interests. Basic interests are:

- universal or common to mankind. They are also necessary in the sense that they are an inseparable part of human nature.
- necessary conditions for human life and for society. According to Marx, basic human interests are material or economic and on these human conduct is constructed. This is not wrong but insufficient, for material interests alone cannot satisfy human needs or explain the whole complex of human and social structures, such as those of the family. The material interests cannot produce arts or generate purely intellectual needs. Finally we cannot logically and scientifically demonstrate the relationship between material interests and those of emancipation, freedom, progress, etc. Thus, we need to consider a third type of interests.
- transcendent in character, that is, they have an indefinite and unlimited capacity for progress, development and openness towards new horizons. In this sense, all that Habermas expresses as 'emancipation',<sup>75</sup> Adorno calls 'negativity',<sup>76</sup> Bloch defines as 'hope',<sup>77</sup> and even Popper signifies by 'openness'<sup>78</sup>--all express these basic interests of transcendence.

Other interests which cannot satisfy these three conditions are secondary or auxiliary, limited, particular and accidental. They produce only limited effects, and bear little weight upon human conduct.

With these criteria in mind, in examining the nature and conditions of moral regulations one must distinguish substantial moral codes built upon basic interests from accidental codes built upon auxiliary interests. To distinguish the two types of interests requires a profound understanding of the nature of human interests themselves and their relation to human nature. Here

the first obstacle is that we cannot grasp the whole of human nature, but only a part: human nature is as mysterious as is the divine. What we can grasp is that human nature is still developing and to be revealed (in Heidegger's expression) through our actions and relations with others and with ourselves. Hence, what we describe here is of only relative value. Though insufficient, we can hope for some light upon moral education from Habermas' description of human interests.

*Human Interests and Human Nature:* In his well-known book, *Knowledge and Human Interests*, Habermas proposed approaching three aspects of human interests by three different methods. As it is not our intention to undertake the project of establishing an epistemology based upon interests, we will put aside his work on method and epistemology. Our attention is directed rather to the nature of these interests and whether or not they are of universal, necessary and transcendent character. Habermas divided human interests into three different categories: technical, practical and emancipatory:

- *Technical interests* are understood as "anthropologically deep-seated interests" in predicting and controlling events in the natural environment.<sup>79</sup> They are born in the human desire to respond to the material needs to survive and to satisfy basic instincts; in short, they are the interests of domination.

- *Practical interests* are rooted in human social nature and respond to the need to secure and expand the possibilities of mutual and self-understanding in the conduct of life.<sup>80</sup>

- *Emancipatory interests* aim at liberation from pseudo-natural constraints whose power resides in their non-transparency.<sup>81</sup> In Freudian expression, emancipatory interests express the human desire for freedom and authenticity.

According to Habermas, these interests satisfy both theory and practice. As theory or contemplation of the cosmos they share with the sciences a commitment to the "theoretical attitude that frees those who take it from dogmatic association with the natural interests of life and their irritating influence."<sup>82</sup> They aim also at "describing the universe theoretically in its law-like order, just as it is."

As practice, they describe and guide the life-world. They are not

influences on cognition that have to be eliminated for the sake of the objectivity of knowledge; rather they themselves determine the aspect under which reality can be objectified and thus made accessible to experience in the first place. They are for all subjects capable of speech and action the necessary conditions of the possibility of experience that can claim to be objective.<sup>83</sup>

Accordingly, the interests constitutive of knowledge are linked to the functions of an ego that adapts itself to its external conditions through learning processes, is initiated into the communications system of a social life-world by means of self-formative processes, and constructs an identity in the conflict between instinctual aims and social constraints.<sup>84</sup>

A quick glance on these interests indicates that all these interests could claim a certain universal necessity. They are reconstructed after such evident human characteristics as instincts and language which we consider as quasi-transcendental. Habermas' 'transcendental' is not identified completely with that of Kant: whereas the "transcendentals" in Kant's system are universal and necessary in the sense of being beyond space and time, the "quasi-transcendentals" of Habermas are subject to change in accordance with the nature of language and human instincts.

They relate first to the universal process of preserving, conserving and developing, that is, to the dialectical nature of mankind. In short, the difference between Kant and Habermas lies in the fact that Habermas' analysis of interests is based on human nature as such, while Kant relies only on the faculty of knowledge. This means that Kant had seen only a kind of human interest, namely, technical interests in their theoretical form.

Before examining Habermas' claim that interests are the basis of human nature, we need to understand what he means by human nature. It is true that Habermas, like Marx and the members of The Frankfurt School, protests any theory of human nature based upon static, idealist and metaphysical foundations. He rejects the Platonic Idea, the solipsist Cartesian *Cogito*, and the Kantian transcendental Ego as the basis for human nature, and accepts the Marxian idea that human nature is constructed upon human praxis. However, he considers the Marxian understanding of praxis as labor to be too simplistic. As a productive action labor can explain only human technical interests,<sup>85</sup> not why we have or need morality. Nor does it satisfy the human desire of freedom.

We will not discuss here whether Habermas' critique of Marx's praxis is justified. What attracts our interest is Habermas' position that human nature is interrelated with human activities or praxis taken in a much broader sense than that of Marx for it explains the total activity in a total structure of practical, contemplative, technical, emancipatory and communicative activity.<sup>86</sup> In a word, human nature is so complex and total that one cannot grasp it by means of a concept or a certain activity. It develops dynamically in the Hegelian manner of describing the activity of spirit. The human interests Habermas tentatively described are among the most explicit 'presentations' of human nature. To say that they are universal and necessary means only that they belong to human nature which is universal.

*A Critique of Interests.* To see whether fundamental human interests can be served by moral education, one must examine whether or not these interests are as real and complete as Habermas claimed and, secondly, in the case of interest-conflicts what criteria are needed for their resolution.

First, Habermas analyzed technical interests from the point of view of domination. Technical interests are meant to expand knowledge which is the best tool for controlling nature and others in order to secure the position of mankind and free it from danger. Expanding technology and knowledge, developing medical practice and pharmaceuticals, aims at prolonging human life and rendering it more agreeable. At the same time, for such a purpose one needs to dominate all other factors which might endanger man. A contradiction appears in technical interests, namely, between the two elements of destruction and construction, conservation and development, which are hidden in these interests. Domination means destroying nature for the sake of preserving man; expanding knowledge and technique means pursuing development in order to secure the position of man. This contradiction in the very essence of technical interests shows that any solution of interests is impossible. Thus, Marx for example, had followed the Darwinian description of struggle for life by accepting the class-struggle solution. If this is so, then conflict is as fundamental as technical interests, and any attempt to subdue it is futile.

Second, practical interests themselves are ambiguous, just as technical interests are also practical. Obviously, Habermas has taken the Kantian description of practical sciences in order to explain practical interests. Since in Kant's moral philosophy praxis is almost identified with moral activity, according to Habermas practical interests are aimed at the modes of the human conduct of life. Their purpose is to help human beings regulate human conflicts without being exploited or manipulated. In another expression, if Aristotle understands morality as a way of achieving happiness, then Habermas describes human practical interests as those which aim at resolving

conflicts and at regulating human conduct. This explication is sound but incomplete, for if practical interests are limited to those functions then morality is deformed into a kind of law or social convention and loses its own sublime end, i.e., the meaning of life. His morality is as such purely materialist<sup>87</sup> and temporal, for since conflicts are as essential as interests, they will never have a definitive solution. Thus, all moral acts are only strategic and for a certain purpose. Morality is degraded into instrumentality, which Habermas himself had vehemently attacked.

Third, there is hardly any difference between practical and emancipatory interests, because the latter express the same idea of freeing and resolving conflicts described in the former, though in a different milieu. Emancipatory interests arise only by means of reflecting on the conditions of human life, comparing them with those of others, reflecting on human nature and finally criticizing those conditions. This description of emancipatory interests cannot satisfy the question of why we need or have such interests, whether or not one can find the meaning of life, the ultimate concern of man, etc.

Evidently, Habermas' interests lack the most fundamental reason urging man to develop technical knowledge, to further morality and to retain ultimate hope. We call it the interest in transcendence, by which we mean the human desire and capacity to overcome the conflicts of interest, to find the meaning of one's life and world and to tend toward the ultimate concern. Such transcendent interests are visible in Confucius' concept of harmony and *Jen*, which we will discuss later.

Further, the inner contradiction in Habermas' theory of interests, namely, that among the interests themselves, seems impossible to overcome. It is difficult to accept that human nature is tending simultaneously toward domination and consensus. To accept domination as essential to human nature one must think of consensus as a merely temporal strategy the purpose of which is to avoid defeat in case of weakness. The logical consequence of Habermas' insistence upon domination in his interpretation of human interest would reduce all to an endless struggle between man and nature as among human beings themselves so that his theory of consensus as the foundation of morality would collapse.

*Communicative Action:* The weakness of the theory of human interests forces Habermas to develop a new theory: the theory of communicative action,<sup>88</sup> to supplement his theory of human interests. Basically, the idea of consensus remains as the backbone, but in a certain aspect this theory is more sophisticated than the prior one, for it attempts to resolve the contradiction between various interests by proposing quasi-transcendental elements to justify consensus. The element of domination is downgraded, while that of harmony in the form of consensus in language, laws or habits is upgraded.<sup>89</sup> Practical interests are now interpreted in the sense of the interests in communication, in understanding and in finding a consensual solution acceptable to all partners.

Weber's theory of rationalization, which Habermas used to demonstrate his thesis of technical interests, is reinterpreted in the light of Gadamer's hermeneutics to base a new process of understanding and its categories upon such common human features as language.<sup>90</sup> Here, it is shown that the need for communication and consensus in human nature is as real and necessary as other interests. Further, as his communicative action is not *a priori*, but empirically constructed and reconstructed, human acts are seen as tending naturally toward communication and man as tending naturally and necessarily to solve conflicts of interests, for communication is impossible without resolving conflicts by means of consensus. Habermas cites concrete examples in language, psychoanalysis and politics to demonstrate his theory of communicative action. For example, language is our common tool, but by learning a language we accept the rules implicit in it. Thus,

the first step in understanding others is accepting the common rule of others. However, the act of learning shows also the active participation of the subject in this common rule, for the rule of language is by no means eternal but needs to be changed or improved if it cannot satisfy human communication, or causes misunderstanding or conflicts.

Here, communication appears as the transcendental basis for consensus and language. But if this is so then one has arrived at the metaphysical explanation that communication is an *a priori* in human nature, and that dis-communication is only a form of distorted communication. Such a metaphysical or theological explanation is rejected by Habermas as well as by empiricists and positivists. (Note that such arguments on the nature of communication or discommunication are analogous to the dispute between Hsun-tzu and Mencius on the nature of man.) Such arguments do not make sense because Habermas never intends to demonstrate the *a priori* character of communication or language. To him, the transcendental character of language does not show us that language is *a priori* or *a posteriori*, but only its universality and necessity. The model of language is used only to show that communication, like language, possesses this transcendental character.<sup>91</sup>

Although this theory of communication is an improvement over his earlier theory of human interests, it is not free of problems. Since our aim is not to center upon Habermas' theory, but to use it in order to shed more light upon the nature of moral education, we will not discuss his theory further, nor its problems. Only one point relating to our moral education needs to be mentioned, namely, Habermas' unanswered question: why do we need communication? If communication is a transcendental then so are conflicts of the same nature; if communication is needed only as a means to resolve conflicts in human interests, then interests are the main theme to be discussed, but he has insufficiently developed and resolved that theme.

## **Morality and Responsibility**

The difficulty in Habermas' theory of human interests means that one cannot build morality or moral education on interests alone. Regulations built upon a division of interests practiced by bourgeois society, even if this division is agreed to by all members or parties, are not necessarily right and just because: 1) there is no common basis for this division--the regulations are often dictated by a certain party; 2) these regulations are thus only temporary; and 3) these regulations are not free from coercion or manipulation. The model of language given by Habermas based upon the consent of all parties is inapplicable in the domain of economy. In short, the transcendental status of morality that Habermas sought in human interests is not as easily found as he claimed.

### *Responsibility*

Lawrence Kohlberg developed an understanding of morality from another point of view, similar to Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development.<sup>92</sup> In his *The Psychology of Moral Development*<sup>93</sup> he followed the division of epistemological development into various stages proposed by Piaget, and identified three stages in the development of moral consciousness: 1) a pre-conventional stage which orients to actions, 2) a conventional stage which explains how man is aware of norms and anti-norms, and 3) a post conventional stage in which one treats only norms as such.<sup>94</sup> Kohlberg's division is a great advantage in understanding the nature of the second category of morality, i.e., its quasi-transcendental character as following human nature itself.

Nonetheless, his analysis in accordance with Piaget's description of the stages of cognitive development is still questionable. First, one would need to verify the plausibility of Piaget's cognitive development theory, and second, one would need to check the analogy between cognitive development and psychological development and between psychological development and moral development. (We will not criticize Kohlberg's theory in terms of his intention to develop only moral judgment and not morality as such in this article, because it is not fully necessary for our discussion.) To evaluate whether the theory of Piaget is acceptable, one needs to consider some of his main theses. According to Piaget, our knowledge develops genetically in two different senses: one narrower and the other wider. First, Piaget distinguishes among stages of cognitive development characterized in terms of structurally described levels of learning ability. In the narrower sense, cognitive development refers to the structures of thought and action acquired constructively by the growing child in active confrontation with external reality or the processes of the objective world.<sup>95</sup> That means that children develop their intelligence through their reciprocal action between themselves as subjects and other physical and social objects, between themselves as subjects and other subjects. Second, cognitive development in a wider sense signifies the de-centering of an egocentric understanding of the world. This means that cognitive development is understood as the construction not solely of an external world, but also of a reference system for the simultaneous demarcation of the objective and social worlds from the subject world.<sup>96</sup>

This theory of cognitive development is plausible as far as it goes. However, whether this theory could be applied in the normative world remains questionable. The fact is that cognitive development is not identified with moral development. In Kohlberg's interpretation, cognitive development is parallel to the development of our moral judgment. But his cannot be sustained because moral knowledge does not equate to moral action, although the former is necessary to value a moral act. Besides, the domain of human psychology is not as scientific as that of knowledge. Cognitive development increases with the tempo of the reception of knowledge from outside and from reflection, while psychological development accords generally with genetic development. The difference between psychology and epistemology, between epistemology and morality (as Kant had been aware) renders the thesis of Kohlberg questionable. Habermas supplements the idea of Piaget<sup>97</sup> and Kohlberg<sup>98</sup> in the following chart,<sup>99</sup> according to which the future or post-conventional morality is based on principles accepted by individuals (responsibility) and is rather formal and democratic.

## Stages of Development

*Stages of moral consciousness*

-----

*Fundamental Socio-cognitive Concept*

-----

*Ethics*

-----

*Types of Laws*

-----

Preconventional

Particular expectation regarding conduct

Magical ethics



Revealed law  
Conventional  
Norms  
Legal ethics  
Traditional law  
Postconventional  
Principles  
Ethics of responsibility  
Formal laws

## **A Confucian Concept of Moral Education**

This idea of Habermas is of great significance for moral education. How we educate the students to be responsible, to respect laws and build consensus is discussed further in my work on Habermas' consensus and Confucian harmony.<sup>100</sup> In the frame of this article, I would raise some reflections on the Confucian (and not Confucianist) idea of moral education. Confucius' description of the process of moral development in *The Great Learning* is very impressive; he begins with the individual as such, with the way an individual acquires a moral sense and rectifies him/herself.<sup>101</sup> The crucial difficulty in understanding his idea concerns the criteria of morality which the individual should follow and how the individual knows them. As his explanation does not seem to be clear, it appears to suggest the other 'extreme', namely, that the social factor determines the individual.

There are four things in the Way of the superior man (*chun-tzu*) none of which I have been able to do. To serve my father as I would expect my son to serve me: that I have been unable to do. To serve my ruler as I would expect my ministers to serve me: that I have not been able to do. To serve my elder brothers as I would expect my younger brothers to serve me: that I have not been able to do. To be the first to treat friends as I would expect my friends to treat me: that I have not been able to do.<sup>102</sup>

The ancients who wished to manifest their clear character to the world would first bring order to their states. Those who wished to bring order to their states, would first regulate their families. Those who wished to regulate their families would first cultivate their personal lives. Those who wished to cultivate their personal lives would first rectify their mind.<sup>103</sup>

These ambiguous statements attract his followers to treat the individual as secondary because all norms are social, or those of state or family. On the other hand, Confucius himself seems to incline to the theory that moral feelings are personal and a matter of self-consciousness. Many passages confirm such an understanding, for example: "Heaven produced the virtue that is in me,"<sup>104</sup> or "Confucius said, 'Man is born with uprightness. If one loses it, he will be lucky if he escapes with his life!'"<sup>105</sup> These ambiguities in the way Confucius handled the nature of morality led to the Confucian ideology which affirms the role of the State in deciding and judging moral acts, and in making laws.

A third way of interpreting Confucius' explanation of human nature as moral nature should be studied to counter this tendency to make Confucian theories dogmatic. That is, Confucius might have understood that human nature and moral nature are apprehended and accepted by man through learning, which means acquiring knowledge of good or evil through actions, contacts with others and living in nature and in society. Confucius for example said:

At fifteen my mind was set on learning. At thirty my character had been formed. At forty I had no more perplexities. At fifty I knew the Mandate of Heaven (*T'ien-ming*). At sixty I was at ease with whatever I heard. At seventy I could follow my heart's desire without transgressing moral principles.<sup>106</sup>

The above passage and many similar ones point to a series of stages:

*First stage:*

- The learning process is one of mutual-cognition and recognition of the subject and other objects and subjects.

- The learning process and cognitive reception are developed through individual as well as social praxis.

*Second stage:*

- Moral cognition or consciousness is acquired through learning fundamental human interests based upon human nature and their impact upon subjective life.

- Moral judgment is based on the benefits of a division of interests and on the natural order.

*Third stage:*

- Moral laws are constructed on moral judgment and the consensus of basic interests.

- The act of consensus is free from coercion; it comes from the subjective cognition of moral laws or from self-consciousness.

- A metaphysical and theological foundation of morality is possible.

*The First Stage*

The dispute between Mencius and Hsün-tzu on the nature of human beings misreads the original Confucian idea on human nature. Human nature is originally neither good nor bad, but tends both to goodness and to evil, for both are known to us when either offers the subject favor or disfavor, benefit or loss, pleasure or pain. That is to say, goodness is what fulfills and satisfies subjective interests or desires, and evil is the opposite. 'Tending towards' is by no means *a priori* but rather 'transcendental', in the sense that the desire for goodness or evil is born and known in the human involvement or contact with nature and human fellows. The human act could be good or bad depending on the milieu, the benefits, the degree of satisfaction of human interests or the universality of those interests. Thus, goodness or evil are learned through our experiences, education and tradition. Confucius for example, said: "Give me a few more years so that I can devote fifty years to the study of change. I may be free from great mistakes"<sup>107</sup> Or "There are those who act without knowing (what is right). But I am not one of them. To hear much and select what is good and follow it, to see much and remember it, is the second type of knowledge (next to innate knowledge)."<sup>108</sup>

Human action, living-experiences in man's life-world help one to know goodness and evil. But in order to be conscious the human act must be neither purely objective nor purely subjective. The dualist interpretation of the Western tradition and the dualist attitude of Mencius and Hsün-tzu cannot help, but only obscure human nature. The fundamental human act is natural and reversible or dialectical,<sup>109</sup> that means, it has the twin character of giving and receiving, of analyzing and synthesizing. It is a mutual cognitive act: 'to serve my father as I would expect my son to serve me . . . , to serve my ruler as I would my ministers to serve.'<sup>110</sup>

Third, the learning process is developed through human practice. Confucius is very clear in this point when he asserts that rightness is acquired only through human acts depending upon the natural order. His argument against the Duke of She in *The Analects* is striking:

The Duke of She told Confucius, 'In my country there is an upright man named Kung. When his father stole a sheep, he bore witness against him.' Confucius said, 'The upright men in my community are different from this. The father conceals the misconduct of the son, and the son conceals the misconduct of the father. Uprightness is to be found in this.'<sup>111</sup>

Here, uprightness is known not by an external factor unrelated to human act such as neutral laws, but through the act of mutual loving between father and son.

### *The Second Stage*

We have argued that morality is acquired through learning, and that learning is a mutual cognition and recognition of the benefit of interpersonal activity. However, the point to be raised here is that not all actions can produce knowledge, and not all knowledge could help us to have moral criteria. To solve this problem moral cognition should be viewed from the aspects of human interests. Habermas has analyzed three fundamental human interests determining human nature: technical, practical and emancipatory. Technical interests explain the most fundamental human instincts of survival by dominating, controlling, expanding, etc., but give birth to the inevitable conflicts of the social man. They are the interests of survival, but also of destruction.

Practical interests aim at solving these conflicts by moral laws, civil laws which are constructed on the consensus of men regarding their fundamental interests. Confucius had a similar idea, namely, that the fundamental interests must be 'equally' and rightly distributed. Laws, morality as the best means of warranting a right distribution of these fundamental interests, must reflect the consensus of interests. He said of the superior man: "The superior man is conciliatory but does not identify himself with others,"<sup>112</sup> and "If a ruler sets himself right, he will be followed without his command."<sup>113</sup> But the most convincing evidence in support of this interpretation is Confucius' theory of harmony. From the anthropological perspectives, harmony concerns human interests at various stages and is as natural as the natural order. Each has its role and function, each receives what it needs according to its capacity (just as Marx later promised in his 1848 *Communists Manifesto*).<sup>114</sup> In the words of Confucius:

He who possesses great virtue will certainly attain to corresponding position, wealth, to corresponding fame, and to corresponding long life. For Heaven, in the production of things, is sure to be bountiful of them, according to their natural capacity.<sup>115</sup>

To be more clear, the Confucian theory of harmony could be understood from the following aspects: 1) harmony is a natural fact or appears in nature, 2) it is seen in the relation between man and nature, and 3) it is found in human relationships. In the *Doctrine of the Mean*, there is an interesting passage: 'What Heaven imparts to man is called human nature. To follow our nature is called the Way. Cultivating the Way is called education.'<sup>116</sup> This sheds light upon the three points above.

*Harmony in nature.* This harmony in the cosmological order is determined not by a human factor but by Heaven. Cosmological order is a perfect order and in Kantian terms is both *a priori* and transcendental. Whenever some mishaps occur, it is understood that man had done

something wrong against Heaven: "When equilibrium and harmony are realized to the highest degree, Heaven and earth will attain their proper order and all things will flourish."<sup>117</sup>

*Harmony between man and nature.* For Confucius, as human nature is part of Heaven,<sup>118</sup> man originally possessed this harmonious status. The break or conflict between man and nature is due to the fact that man is thirsty for power and domination, for accumulation of interests. However, this could be self-contradictory, for if man is harmonious in the cosmological order how could he tend towards evil. Hsun-tzu may go too far in asserting that human nature is evil, but he provided some corrective to the over-optimistic Mencius. In fact, human and social order are understood by Confucius analogously to the cosmological order so that what determines human fate is not the *a priori* cosmological order, but human actions such as inter-relations, labor and the like, for this is Confucius' concern in establishing moral laws.

*Harmony among men themselves.* This is the central theme of the Confucian harmony: to express no conflict (feelings) between men, to subdue conflicts<sup>119</sup> when they arise, and, more importantly, to have a just distribution of interests based on a natural equilibrium:

Therefore the superior man governs men as men, in accordance with human nature, and as soon as they change (what is wrong) he stops. Consciousness (*chung*) and altruism (*shu*) are not far from the Way, what you do not wish others to do to you, do not do to them.<sup>120</sup>

### *The Third Stage*

By accepting that morality is to be learned in nature and human society and that morality is constructed in accordance with natural laws, Confucius had tried to establish moral criteria based upon: 1) harmony between nature and man, and 2) harmony between men. We will concentrate on the second point, i.e., moral criteria constructed on human *sociality* or harmony between men.

In discussing Habermas' theory of consensus and in Part I analyzing present moral education, we insisted on the necessity of paying attention to the fundamental problem of conflict. We pinpointed human interests and conflicts lying at the bottom of any moral system. Thus, to solve moral conflicts means precisely to solve fundamental human conflicts of interests. One solution which appears plausible is Habermas' consensus. A similar solution was offered by Confucius when we asked what criteria an individual needs in order to rectify himself. These criteria concern not an imaginary lone individual, but one's real experiences of living, interacting and working in a society. The criteria aim at solving conflicts and attaining harmony. In this context, Confucius constructed his moral criteria in three different fields: harmonious living, harmonious relationships, and an harmonious way of nature.

*Moral criteria of harmonious living:* Tung chung-shu developed Confucius' concept *Jen* (humanity) as follows:

What is meant by humanity? The man of humanity loves people with a sense of commiseration. He is careful and agreeable and does not quarrel. His likes and dislikes are harmonized with human relations. He does not harbor the feeling of hate or a desire to hurt. He has no intention to conceal or to evade. He has no disposition of jealousy. He has no desires that lead to sadness or worry. He does not do anything treacherous or cunning. And he does not do anything depraved. Therefore

his heart is at ease, his will is peaceful, his vital force is harmonious, his desires are regulated, his actions are easy, and his conduct is in accord with the moral law. It is for this reason that he puts things in order peacefully and easily without any quarrel. That is what is meant by humanity.<sup>121</sup>

In the *Analects*, Confucius demonstrated the following virtues (note that virtue comes from *virtus* in Latin meaning the characteristic nature of a man, *vir*):

- Filial piety (1:2)
- Brotherliness (1:2)
- Loyalty (1:4)
- Faithfulness (1:4)
- Sincerity (1:8, 1:16, etc.)
- Benevolence (4:3, 7:29, etc.)
- Dutifulness (5:25, etc.)
- Li (rites, properly conducts) (1:15, 2:3, etc.)

The above regulations or virtues aim at: 1) establishing an harmonious and orderly life agreed to by society and each individual, 2) defending the interests of every individual and of society: "What you do not wish others to do to you, do not do to them."

*Criteria of harmonious relationship or the doctrine of the mean.* Confucius' philosophy had a great role in shaping the politics and economics of Chinese society. Its criteria include loyalty, dutifulness, responsibility, righteousness, conscientiousness, altruism, "The Doctrine of the Mean," *op. cit.*, chap. 13, unity of theory and practice,<sup>122</sup> and the observance of rites. Confucius stated:

There are five universal ways (in human relations), and the ways by which they are practiced are three. The five are those governing the relationship between ruler and ministers, between father and son, between husband and wife, between elder and young brothers, and those in the intercourse between friends. These five are universal paths in the world. Wisdom, humanity and courage, these three are the universal virtues. The way by which they are practiced is one.<sup>123</sup>

In more detailed description he said:

There are nine standards by which to administer the empire, its states and the families. They are: cultivating the personal life, honoring the worthy, being affectionate to relatives, being respectful toward the great ministers, identifying oneself with the welfare of the whole body of officers, treating the common people as one's own children, attracting the various partisans, showing tenderness to strangers from far countries, and extending kindly and awesome influence on the feudal lords.<sup>124</sup>

*Criteria of harmonious way in nature.* Though these criteria are not developed and often are vaguely stated, they are as important as those criteria in the first and second categories. He begins *The Doctrine of the Mean* with: "What Heaven imparts to man is called human nature. To follow our nature is called the Way (*Tao*) . . . . The Way cannot be separated from us a moment."<sup>125</sup> For Confucius nature, man and Heaven are inseparable in the sense that they belong

to the Wholeness determining the structure of the cosmos. What Confucius means by Heaven is not our concern in this article,<sup>126</sup> but it is extremely important to note that the pure materialist outlook of humanism is against the theory of harmony. To understand the value of his insistence on harmony with Heaven, nature and man, one should keep in mind that the act of relationship is itself a dialectical act and that only by means of a hermeneutic circle can one understand the Confucian consensus.

By revising the Confucian understanding of morality, we come now to a tentative conclusion that Confucius understood moral education as a continuous learning of human nature, and that moral rules are constructed not dogmatically, but by a certain consensus. This consensus is constructed on the natural order, on human relational activities and on most fundamental human nature. In a word, the Confucian description of morality and consensus, though not as sophisticated and systematic as Habermas' and Kohlberg's, has given a deep insight into understanding the genetic formation and transformation of morality. Certainly, it has shed more light upon present moral education.

## **Conclusion**

Our conclusion is rather tentative and inconclusive in the sense that it serves only as a critical reflection upon our present moral education. The task of critique is not to protest, but to detect the symptoms of its illness. We have found the ideological elements in our moral education to be one of these symptoms. We do not deny that ideological education has its own value: it had helped to maintain the Chinese identity, to rally patriotism in time of war, to preserve Chinese culture, etc. Nor do we refuse to accept its necessity.

Our critique aims to show only that ideology is of value only for a certain time and place. It lacks the universal and necessary (or transcendental) character of an authentic morality built on the most fundamental human interests (and nature). Thus, its claim to solve all moral problems and to provide mankind with future direction or sense of life is very questionable. This explains why our 'moral education', although rigorously and officially promoted, falls short of its objectives.

Our critique aims also at the instrumentality of "moral education." Mistakenly taken by Confucianists as an instrument, morality was reduced to a functional purpose, a sheer instrument, which was easily manipulated and dictated by a certain régime or class. As such, it is transformed into an ideology.

For all these reasons, it is suggested that our policy and method of moral education, as well as its application, be rethought in a more open manner. Moral education aims at the broader objective of improving mankind as Confucius had proposed: "The Way of learning to be great consists in manifesting clear character, loving the people, and abiding in the highest good."<sup>127</sup>

*National Taiwan University  
Taipei, Taiwan*

## **Notes**

1. By Confucianism, we understand the theories or doctrines based on the teachings of Confucius, Mencius, etc., and systematically developed into the philosophical school named for Confucius. Many scholars have complained that a great number of Confucianists have distorted

the original teaching of Confucius. See, for example, the article of Roger Ames and David L. Hall, "Getting it Right, on Saving Confucius from the Confucians," *Philosophy East and West*, 34 (1984).

2. The textbook is entitled *Citizen and Morality*. Officials identify citizen education and moral education. See *Gung-ming yu Tao-te*, ed., Kwo-li bian-yih kwan (Taipei, 1985), 6 vols.

3. Lee Kwan-yau officially promoted moral education, especially Confucian morality, in 1981, after acknowledging the deficiency of laws or policies alone. Since then, the Singapore government has established an institute specializing in this matter and included moral and religious education in the curriculum of secondary schools.

4. See Yang Chung-sen, "Confucianism and National Modernization from the Legal Point of View," *Seminar on Confucianism and Modernization* (Taipei, 1986), p. 1. The traditional Chinese legal system was overwhelmingly molded by Confucianism and infused with ethical thinking in both its nature and contents. See also Kung-ch'uan Hsiao, *A History of Chinese Political Thought*, trans. F.W. Mote (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 2 vols.

5. Wei Cheng-tung, general editor of the *China Tribune* stated: "In the context of our daily life, however, not even the minimum degree of observing the law and the custom of public morality can be maintained," in "Ethical Problems in Democratic Societies: The Path of Modernization of The Confucian Ethics," *Seminar on Confucianism and Modernization* (Taipei, 1986), abstract. According to the statistics of The Ministry of the Interior, and The Ministry of Justice (Center of Study of Criminal Problems), the crime rate is increasing dramatically each year. In 1983 the rate was 30.04, while in 1984 the rate was 33.37. Among teenagers the crime rate is increasing at the accelerated rate of more than 10%. See Ministry of Justice, *Statistics of Crimes in Taiwan* (1984), p. 267. See also the article of R.C. Hsieh, Wo kwo Shao-nian "Controlling Teen-age Policy," in *Seminar on Human-Social Sciences - Education in Secondary Schools* (Taiwan Normal University, 1986).

6. I.e., the May Fourth Movement, which spread over China in the 1920s and broke into different radical groups, some of which were strongly against traditional Chinese values.

7. See e.g., Thomé Fang, "The Alienation of Man in Philosophy, Religion and Philosophical Anthropology" *Creativity of Man and Nature* (Taipei: Linking, 1980).

8. See Shih C.T., ed., *Gung-ming Chiao-yu Chi-chian Wen-ti yu twei-tse* (Taiwan: Bureau of Education of Taiwan Province, 1985), 2 vols.

9. M. Horkheimer and Th. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (New York: Continuum, 1972), p. 1. See also M. Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* (New York: Oxford U.P., 1947).

10. Cf. *Citizen and Morality*, p. 1.

11. *Ibid.*

12. Confucius, *The Great Learning*, chap. 1. Trans. Chan W.T., in *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 86 (hereafter *Chan*, . . . )

13. *Ibid.*, Chan, pp. 86-87.

14. Chan, p. 84; see also Kung-ch'uan Hsiao, *A History of Chinese Politics*, vol. 1, Introd.

15. *The Great Learning*, chap. 1: "From the Son of Heaven down to the common people, all must regard cultivation of the personal life as the root or foundation," Chan, p. 87.

16. Chu Hsi, *Ta-hsueh chang-chu*, chap. 5 in Chan W.T., *Chu Hsi luen chih* (Collected Essays on Chu Hsi), (Taiwan: Hsueh-sheng Book Co., 1982). Wang yang-ming, *Ch-uan-hsi lu* (Instructions for Practical Living), sec. 129, 135-7, etc., quoted in Chan, pp. 84-85, Footnotes 2 and 3.

17. Han Fei-tzu chi-chieh, in *Chu-tzu Chi-ch'eng*, vol. 5, chap. 54, p. 365, quoted by B. Schwartz, *The World of Thought in Ancient China* (Cambridge: Harvard U.P., 1985), p. 323.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 323.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 382.
20. *Mencius*, trans. Lau D.C., bk. 4, part 1 p. 118.
21. *Mencius*, Lau, *id.*, p. 117.
22. Schwartz, p. 341; *Han Fei-tzu*, chap. 49, p. 344.
23. N. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. N. Hill Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913). chap. VIII, p. 130. J. Habermas, *Theory and Practice*, trans. J. Viertel (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), p. 59.
24. *Gung-ming Chiao-yu Chi-chian Wen-ti yu Twei-tse*, vol. 1, p. 8.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 5 and 6.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
27. *Citizen and Morality*, vol. 1, chaps. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, etc.
28. *The Analects*, 15:20, "The superior man seeks in himself; the inferior man seeks it in others;" Chan, p. 43.
29. Schwartz, p. 113.
30. *Citizen and Morality*, chap. 1, pp. 2-4.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
32. Albert Chao, "On `Chiao-yu': An Inquiry into the Philosophical Foundation of Chinese Education," *International Symposium on The Philosophical Foundations of Moral Education in China* (Taipei: Fujen U.P., 1985), pp. 44-45.
33. 'The Movement for the Renaissance of Chinese Culture' has been organized recently and is headed by former R.O.C. President Yen, C.K. Its directives state that it will "make known The Three Principles of The People, Democracy and Freedom." Mr. Ku, the general editor of the series, states that the motives of the movement include to "spread the power and spirit of Chinese culture," overcoming communism and national reunion. (Printed in each book published by The Movement, pp. 6 and 9 respectively.)
34. Statistics of The Government Information Office indicate that 90% of the students going abroad for advanced study do not return.
35. An exemplary case is seen by the establishing of 9 new colleges which are all oriented to technology and engineering.
36. The draft of the course of history. (Through the courtesy of Professor Chang-yuan, editor.)
37. Directives of The Ministry of Education, 1966 (*Reinforcing National Consciousness*).
38. *Citizen and Morality*, p. 2.
39. The book begins with Mencius' theory on human nature tending to Goodness. "At the very beginning, human nature is good," *San dz Ching*, p. 1.
40. See *The Girl's High-School of Tai-chung: Report on the Method of Citizen Educational Sciences in High School - A Comparative Study* (Kao-chung Gung-ming He-hsuye Fang-fa de Pi-chiao Yan-chiu bao-kao), 1986. It contains little information about the method of teaching, and nothing about teachers. Table 13 p. 22, indicates that a majority of 60% of the respondents considered: (a) the method is too passive, (b) there is hardly any engagement of the students, (c) there is no relation to social reality, and (d) the teachers do not care about the students.
41. 20 of the 26 members of the editorial committee of *Citizen and Education* are professors.
42. *Ibid.*, more than 10 members are officials, some of whom are also university or college professors.



43. The test done by the Department of Mathematics of National Taiwan University in 1980 reveals that professors of mathematics who have earned their Ph.D.s in prestigious universities in the U.S. or Japan do not fare better than the student participants in the Joint College Entrance Examination.

44. According to the report of the Ministry of Finance, the economic crimes (fraudulence, bad checks, false bankruptcy) are dramatically increasing. In February 1967, there was an insignificant 2% decrease from the previous year. (See *China Times*, Feb. 22, 1987).

45. English schools in Taiwan outnumber other preparatory schools. It is claimed that Taiwan Chinese are among the most successful participants in TOEFL.

46. I have analyzed this problem in one of my previous articles in which I have pointed out the double moral standard of the intellectual class. See Tran Van Doan, *Christian Mission and Higher Education in Taiwan* (Taiwan: Fujen Press, 1986), p. 4.

47. Cf. John B. Thompson, *Studies in the Theory of Ideology* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984), p. 2.

48. Karl Marx, *Deutsche Ideologie* (1845-46), in *MEW* 3, p. 20 or *MEW* 27, pp. 460ff., *MEW* 21, p. 179.

49. Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich), 1936.

50. Karl Marx, *Die Deutsche Ideologie*, *MEW* 3, p. 26; *Die heilige Familie*, *MEW* 2, p. 55; and *Zur Kritik der Politischen Okonomie*, Vorwort, 1859, *MEW* 13, p. 9.

51. Boris Souvarine, "Ideology of Soviet Communism," *Dictionary of the History of Ideas* (New York: Scribner's, 1973), vol. 2, pp. 559-564.

52. Cf. M. Rejai, 'Ideology', in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, *op. cit.*, pp. 552-559, esp. p. 553.

53. Francis Bacon, *Novum Organum*, I, 38-68. According to Bacon, there are four types of idols: 1) idols of tribe, 2) idols of the cave or den, 3) idols of the marketplace, and 4) idols of the theatre.

54. Etienne Bonnet de Condillac, *Treatise on Sensations*, trans. G. Carr (London: Favel, 1930), I, iii, p. 1.

55. Pierre J.G. Cabanis, *Rapport du physique et du moral de l'homme*, in *Oeuvres*, ed. Thurot, Paris 1823-25. Cabanis's famous phrase: 'Les nerfs - voilà tout l'homme'.

56. Destutt de Tracy, *Eléments d'idéologie* (1801-1815), 4 vols.

57. Claude Adrien Helvetius, *De l'homme, de ses facultés et de son education* (1772), trans. *On Man*, 2, 7, trans. Hooper, 1777, I, p. 127.

58. K. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968).

59. K. Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, p. 55-56, 265-66.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 60.

61. Tran van Doan, 'Ideology, Interests and Morality', in *International Symposium on The Philosophical Foundation of Moral Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-136.

62. Tran Van Doan, "Habermas's Theory of Consensus" (Indonesia: Styana University, 1986).

63. *The Analects*, 1:12; 2:5, etc.

64. *Ibid.*, 3:3; 3:4.

65. *Ibid.*, 2:1, etc.

66. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, book II, 1103b.

67. Bernard Haring, 'Morality', in *Sacramentum Mundi* (New York: Herder, 1968), vol. 4, p. 112.

68. Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. H.J. Paton (New York: Harper and Row, 1948).
69. Kant himself had acknowledged: 'Das mag in der Theorie richtig sein, taugt aber nicht für die Praxis', in E. Kant, *Gesammelte Schriften*, VI, pp. 221, 35-56.
70. *The Analects*, 6:18. Chan, p. 30: 'To know (it) is not as good as to love (it), and to love (it) is not as good as to take delight in it.'
71. J. Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests*, trans. J. Shapiro (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971).
72. J. Habermas, *Towards a Reconstruction of Historical Materialism* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1976), German text.
73. *Theory of Communicative Action*, trans. T. McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), vol. I.
74. J. Habermas, *Theory and Practice*, p. 254.
75. *Knowledge and Human Interests*, pp. 310, 314, etc.
76. A. Theodor, *Negative Dialectics*, tr. E.B. Ashton (New York: Continuum, 1973), part 2.
77. Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1959), pp. 129ff.
78. Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).
79. *Knowledge and Human Interests*, p. 211.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 205.
81. *Ibid.*, p. 212.
82. *Technik und Wissenschaft als Ideologie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1968), pp. 146-68; *Knowledge and Human Interests*, Appendix, p. 303.
83. *Theory and Practice*, p. 111.
84. *Knowledge and Human Interests*, Appendix, p. 313.
85. *Theory and Practice*, p. 111.
86. *Ibid.*, Introduction. See also Richard Bernstein, *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), p. 190ff; and Tran Van Doan, "Praxis and Hsing," paper presented at The Fourth International Conference on Chinese Philosophy, New York, 1985.
87. Despite his reconstruction of materialism on the more speculative level. See Habermas, *Zur Rekonstruktion des historischen Materialismus* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1976).
88. Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action* and *Knowledge and Human Interests*, Appendix.
89. *Ibid.*, vol. I, part III, esp. pp. 385ff.
90. *Theory of Communicative Action*, p. 143ff.
91. *Ibid.*, pp. 55-101, 397-98.
92. L. Kohlberg, "From Is to Ought: How to Commit the Naturalistic Fallacy and Get Away With It in the Study of Moral Development" in Th. Mischel, ed., *Cognitive Development and Epistemology* (New York: Academic Press, 1971), J. Piaget, *The Principles of Genetic Epistemology* (New York, 1972).
93. L. Kohlberg, *The Psychology of Moral Development* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984).
94. Cf. J. Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action* (German edition), vol. II, p. 260, quoted from Kohlberg, *Zur Kognitiven Entwicklung des Kindes* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1974).

95. J. Piaget, *The Principles of Genetic Epistemology*, *op. cit.*, cf. B. Kaplan, 'Meditation on Genesis' in *Human Development*, 10 (1967), p. 65. N. Rotenstreich, "An Analysis of Piaget's Concept of Structure" in *Philosophical and Phenomenological Research*, 37 (1977), p. 368ff.
96. J. Piaget, *Introduction à l'épistémologie génétique* (Paris: P.U.F., 1953), p. 189.
97. J. Habermas, *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*, vol. I, pp. 76, 104-110, 200ff., 249, 324; Vol. II, pp. 21, 50, 218, 588.
98. *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 260; vol. I, p. 250.
99. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
100. Tran Van Doan, "Harmony and Consensus," in *The Asian Journal of Philosophy* (Taipei, Manila, Tokyo, Seoul: 1987), I, 101-130.
101. *The Great Learning*, Chan, p. 85.
102. *The Doctrine of the Mean*, Chap. 13, Chan, p. 101.
103. *The Great Learning*, Chan, p. 86.
104. *The Analects*, 7:22, Chan, p. 32.
105. *Ibid.*, 6:7, Chan, p. 29.
106. *Ibid.*, 2:4, Chan, p. 22.
107. *Ibid.*, 7:15, Chan, p. 32.
108. *Ibid.*, 7:27, Chan, pp. 3-33.
109. *The Doctrine of the Mean*, chap. 13.
110. *Ibid.*, chap. 13, Chan, p. 101.
111. *The Analects*, 13:18, Chan, p. 41.
112. *Ibid.*, 13:23, Chan, p. 41.
113. *Ibid.*, 13:6, Chan, p. 41.
114. K. Marx, "Jeder mach seinen Fähigkeiten, jedem nach seinen Bedürfnissen." See also *The Doctrine of the Mean*, chap. 17, Chan, p. 102: "Thus it is that he who possesses great virtue will certainly attain to a corresponding position, wealth, fame and long life."
115. *The Doctrine of the Mean*, *ibid.*
116. *Ibid.*, chap. 1, Chan, p. 98.
117. *The Doctrine of the Mean*, chap. 1, Chan, p. 98.
118. *Ibid.*
119. *The Analects*, 12:2; Chan, p. 20.
120. *Ibid.*, 12:2; Chan, p. 39.
121. *Tung Chung-shu*, chap. 56, Chan, p. 286.
122. *The Doctrine of the Mean*, chap. 13.
123. *Ibid.*, chap. 20, Chan, p. 105.
124. *Ibid.*
125. *Ibid.*, chap. 1, Chan, p. 98.
126. For a detailed study see Fu Pei-jung, *The Concept of T'ien in Classical Confucianism* (New Haven: Yale Dissertation, 1985).
127. *The Great Learning*, Chan, p. 86.



## 8. Higher Moral Education in Taiwan

*Arnold Sprenger*

### **Introduction**

Industrialization makes great demands upon educational systems. In all industrial states need for tertiary and further education is increasing.<sup>1</sup> The investment of time and financial resources is growing proportionately. At the same time the intellectual situation of the modern world is governed by a dialectic which stamps public consciousness and effects, above all, higher education.<sup>2</sup> Students come to college or university in search of orientation because they do not yet, or no longer, understand the world.<sup>3</sup> Certainly, they want to be introduced to professional knowledge, but at the same time they need enlightenment and look for help in their personal life.

They are confused by the wealth of information with which they are confronted, puzzled by the many choices they must make in the learning process, and shocked at discovering that modern higher education does not offer a sound value system and reliable guidance with regard to moral behavior. Pluralistic society provides individuals with so many "valuable" things that it is hard to make a good choice. This is all the more difficult when it comes to questions of what one ought to do in a given situation.

Our present pluralistic situation is caused by the constantly growing differentiation and complexity of modern social life. In primitive cultures the situation of the young is quite different. There one grows into an existing (value) system which is in no way questioned by members of the respective community. The existing order provides for survival, but also demands complete acceptance and identification. This order binds into a single, homogenous life reality the normal processes of nature, actions needed for survival, forms of social and sexual companionship, religious convictions and religious practices.<sup>4</sup> One permeates and postulates the other. One does not ask what is caused by what. Explanations and interpretations are provided through stories and myths; scientifically rational explanations are alien.

Hence, any new development in any one of these areas threatens the homogeneity of the culture. The unity of life experience is lost once major economic changes occur, or religious beliefs are questioned, or when the educational system creates new modes of thinking and new needs.

At that point a process is initiated whose results are simultaneously both welcomed and deplored. Heretofore unquestioned principles of order are dissolved. Overnight new possibilities become important and valuable which till then no one had dreamed. Different potentialities, ways of life, world views, and value systems appear and stand--seemingly equally legitimate--side by side. The question, of course, is what to opt for in this entirely new situation; and how to arrive at and convey convictions without suppressing those of other people. In other words, the questions of values and norms must be posed anew.

### *Present Moral Education in Taiwan: a Student Perspective*

The process of modernization in Taiwan has opened the door to practically all the changes discussed above and has seemingly hastened the dissolution of the homogeneous reality of life experienced in former generations. Looking at the educational system we discover a growing disorientation and discontent with regard to values and norms for the young. As background for

this paper some groups of undergraduate and graduate university students were asked to discuss the educational system in Taiwan and to express their opinion regarding the moral quality of education. The following three pages briefly summarize these discussions. It should be kept in mind that these are experiences and impressions of groups of students, rather than statements based on closely controlled research.

- The students experience a wide gap between the traditional moral order taught and advocated in the educational system and the real situation with which they are confronted in and outside the schools. They are critical of traditional aspects of morality which tend to favor the successful and sidetrack the weaker, the loser.

- The strong trend toward higher education and the many entrance examinations threaten genuine educational goals and harm sound moral growth of the students. For many students, teachers, schools and parents the main educational goal is to pass examinations. The pressure on students and teachers is enormous. Students are either not in position or no longer interested in studying matters which could help them gain a balanced education.

- Many students at the university level are at a loss. While in secondary schools they had goals to work for, namely, passing the various entrance examinations, which left hardly any time for other meaningful activities or for recreation. At the university level this pressure is off: students have a lot of time at their disposal and for the first time in their lives many are free to determine their own life-style. But they discover that they do not know what to do with their free time and with themselves. They had never been asked to make their own study plans and approach their studies in an independent way. They feel that, at least in many instances, teaching is not geared toward their level of education and their needs.

- In matters of social life in general, and in matters of moral behavior in particular, they find hardly any guidelines or norms to abide by, for in previous school and family education such topics were taboo. Many students are greatly disturbed by the fact that they have no one to turn to in their time of need and distress. It is difficult for them to discuss matters of a more private and intimate concern with their peers; they are annoyed by the impression that their teachers are either busy doing many other things or shy away from getting involved in students' problems. Thus many university students feel left alone; the institution that was to become a place of enlightenment and joy to the student has become a place of disillusion and a source of great trial.

- Moral education seems to be at a low in the present compulsory junior high school system. Courses in ethics are prescribed and taught, but hardly taken seriously by teachers and students. They are abstract in nature and not geared to the students' actual life situations. In many instances classes in ethics are used for teaching and drilling subjects that are part of the crucial examination system.

- The examination system plays a dominant role in the students' life. "Hopeful" students are subject to special pressure. They are often asked by their teachers, who have a stake in their students' passing the examinations, to attend extra-curricular learning activities in the evening. Little attention is given to weaker students who suffer neglect if not contempt from their teachers; in certain cases they are even subject to ridicule and harassing by their more successful student peers. To whom can these "black sheep" turn in their educational plight? Since the family's educational objectives normally conform to the school's objectives, the failing student will find little understanding, consolation and help at home. It is easy to imagine that the step from a person's intellectual and educational boredom or failure to his feeling of disillusion and hopelessness is very close. The bearing of this situation on the person's moral life need not be emphasized here.

- The students' evaluation of teachers and professors gives ample food for reflection. Generally speaking, they are not very favorably impressed by the average teacher and/or professor. They feel that many are not well qualified for their teaching job. Students maintain that a teacher or professor should be more interested in the educational aspects of his or her work than in the professional aspects of his or her career.

- Criticism is leveled against the fact that many full time teachers look for side jobs which tend to develop into time and energy consuming occupations. There are even teachers who do a lot of private tutoring and at least morally force their students to attend these courses. What vexes students more than anything else is when they observe teachers or professors shy away from speaking the truth or make statements in the classroom or in their writings that do not express their true convictions. Students feel dismayed at discovering dishonesty in their teachers. The situation becomes all the more aggravated if a teacher or professor uses double standards to advance his professional career or to make economic gains.

- When asked what they considered the most damaging influence on moral education, students pointed to profit-making which seems to permeate the entire educational system. Parents expect their children to graduate from the best universities so that they can easily find jobs in the most respected and most lucrative professions. Teachers are constantly under pressure to conform to the system, to give up on genuine educational goals, or to use their teaching jobs for profit-making. The ever-growing "educational-industry" has become big business and is producing ever greater amounts of educational material, often with little regard for the students' needs or the products' suitability in the educational process. Understandably, many of these phenomena do not find the approval of students who expect enlightenment and moral guidance through their teachers.

The above students' evaluation of the present educational system is based largely on their personal experience, impressions and reflections. But it can be expected that more thorough-going studies would point in similar directions. Important issues have been raised which should not be overlooked in any serious study dealing with the moral aspects of our present educational system.

The first paragraph of this paper referred to the dialectic of modern educational systems: adult students search for enlightenment, orientation and even prescriptions, but teachers are not in the position to provide simple answers to complex problems. In our pluralistic society the teacher must try to convey to the students the complexity of the points of view and help them to arrive at a responsible decision. Consequently, the teacher must constantly assess the intellectual situation of his time and be ready to take up the moral questions that arise from these deliberations. With this understanding of the concept "dialectic" in mind, we will raise and discuss some issues of higher moral education in Taiwan.

### *The Concepts: Norm, Value, and Meaning*

Before entering upon our investigation it will be helpful to discuss the terms "value" and "norm" which we consider crucial for moral education.<sup>5</sup> The two concepts are closely related one to the other, yet must be distinguished. Norms are given or established for the attainment and realization of values; they are concrete and relate to practical behavior; they are comprehensible and can be imposed. Values cannot be imposed, for they are grounded in insight and cannot easily be presented in an exact and unmistakable manner. Values are always "subjective," whereas norms are more "objective." The moment a person no longer has the related insight, the value ceases to be such for this particular person, and becomes merely an imposed norm.

The concept of value is closely related to that of meaning. Insight into values leads to the discovery of a value system and thence to the understanding that values are not man-made but pre-given--persons are dependent upon them. Insight into a value system helps a person arrive at meaningful human behavior and an appropriate life-style. A person who knows what his life is about experiences meaning and is able to make important decisions, whereas lack of an order of values leads to a state of affairs in which everything is arbitrary, exchangeable and indifferent. Without values life is no longer worth living: absurdity is all that remains.

## **The Dialectic of the Educational System**

In a recent report called "Integrity in the College Curriculum" the Association of American Colleges has alleged that "Colleges and Universities" have allowed their curricula to slip into a state of `disarray' and `incoherence,' placing in question the quality of what U.S. college students learn. The fear is expressed that "In the end, the quality of American life is at stake, the wisdom and humanity of our leaders, our ability as citizens to make informed choices, and the dedication with which we inhibit humane and democratic values as we go about our daily lives."<sup>6</sup>

### *Traditional Education in China*

It would be easy to find similar critical reports or warnings in other industrialized nations.<sup>7</sup> Before we ask how the present educational system in Taiwan relates to moral values, a short summary review of traditional education in China will be made in order to provide a guide to present problems and help in the search for answers to these problems.

Traditional education in China sought to instill social harmony by giving each individual moral training so that they might behave correctly in their manifold relations.<sup>8</sup> Education took place in one's family or kinship group. The process of socialization of the young was in certain cases carried on by schools or a private teacher. The teacher enjoyed high respect and was the key figure in the educational process. The teacher-pupil or master-disciple relationship played a dominant role in a student's life and was woven into the general social and political structure of society. The teacher represented authority and was the main source of knowledge. At times he was the object of a disciple's entire personal commitment and became something like the final moderator of his disciple's personality and philosophy of life. Hardly any tension was experienced between truth and teacher.<sup>9</sup>

The purpose of higher education was the preparation of individuals for entrance into Government and Civil Service. A very strict and efficient examination system selected those most learned in right conduct and best suited to govern. Classical learning became the yardstick of a student's achievement and the criterion of his worth. The classical textual guides for proper behavior and administration were linked to religion, both in terms of their origins and in their function of preserving the State's relationship to Heaven through the *Son of Heaven*, i.e., the Emperor.

In traditional China we observe therefore a threefold unity of: (a) higher education, (b) ethical grounding in the classics, and (c) government. "The Chinese believed that there was no separation between education and administration (Cheng-chiao ho-i).<sup>10</sup> Education was largely the cultivation of scholar-officials. "Education was considered a part of the technique of government and thus bureaucrats were the final source of authority over educational ideas and programs."<sup>11</sup> Education as a means to acquire objective, scientific knowledge was little emphasized in the official system.



Since for the average Chinese citizen the passing of the Civil Service Examinations provided the only road to social advancement, many students attended schools to study for examinations. Educational programs throughout the country were designed to prepare students for these examinations, and passing the examinations became for many the ultimate end of education.<sup>12</sup>

### *Post-war Educational Progress in Taiwan*

Does the present educational system provide the ordinary student with as clearly defined a system of educational, social, and moral values as did the traditional system? Even the greatest optimist would hesitate to answer affirmatively.

In our time the traditional Chinese higher educational system, which benefited mainly a very small elite, has been made open for all.

Postwar educational progress in Taiwan may be measured by comparing the number of schools and the number of students enrolled at all levels of education. For example, the number of institutions of higher learning increased from seven in 1950-51 (one university, three colleges, and three junior colleges) with a total of 6,665 students to 104 in 1981-82 (sixteen universities, 11 colleges and 77 junior colleges) with a total enrollment of 358,437 an increase of 5,277.9% in student enrollment. Similar expansion is to be found in the enrollment of schools and students at the secondary level. In 1951-52 there were 128 secondary schools (junior and senior) having a total of 79,948 students. In 1981-82 there were 838 secondary schools (junior and senior) with 1,253,333 students, an increase of 1,467.7% in student enrollment. At the elementary level, there were 1,231 schools enrolling 906,950 students in 1950-51, by 1981-82 there were 2,444 schools with 2,213,179 students, an increase of 144.0%.<sup>13</sup>

These statistics show that relatively the highest increase in student population during the last three decades was recorded in higher education: 5,277.9%. Education for all produces a lower quality of education. Furthermore, the explosion of knowledge has resulted in everyone being educated in just one or a few subjects, but only half-educated in nearly all other fields.

As long as the population was divided into the few who were well educated and the broad masses of the uneducated nobody became aware of the danger education may represent to human beings. Today we have a multiplicity of possible knowledge ranging from politics to medicine, from art to technology; but we are more disturbed and distressed by this knowledge than we have been helped by it.<sup>14</sup>

In former times the educational system corresponded to the employment system. Today educational know-how and training is given to many people who cannot find professional fulfillment corresponding to their qualifications; thus we talk about over-qualification or underemployment. These and many other problems come to the fore when the question of higher education in Taiwan is discussed. All these problems must be seen in relation to social and moral values.

### *Post-war Educational Progress and Moral Education*

Postwar "educational progress" in Taiwan, as demonstrated by the above statistics, has done away almost completely with some of the most fundamental moral and social concepts of the traditional educational system. The important teacher-student relationship is rapidly disappearing. In the age of mass education, large classes and knowledge-oriented learning (objective learning approaches) the teacher is no longer a moral authority but an expert in his field, his role being

reduced to that of an organizer or a guide to knowledge. In addition, individual teachers are only part of a larger system. They may teach a class of students only once a week which makes it difficult for them to get to know the students. Students often attend classes of various teachers with different backgrounds, different approaches to teaching and research, different ideologies or value systems. They are left largely to themselves to work out their own value system and answers to the many pressing questions of life and the future. Many teachers, who at heart are concerned about their students, become disillusioned with the situation, do their "teaching job," and then go about their own business.

The legacy of the traditional examination system is still with us. The Joint Colleges Entrance Examinations has assumed enormous proportions and exercises an incomparably strong influence on the entire educational system in Taiwan.<sup>15</sup> Education on the secondary level is conceived--at least to a large extent--as a preparation for university entrance examinations. Close scrutiny of the actual examinations reveals that not only basic educational values but social and moral values, which were of the utmost importance in traditional education, are neglected or simply non-existent. Since under social pressure teachers teach basically only things that are necessary to pass the examinations, little emphasis is placed upon these values. It is no wonder that so many university students who have gone through such a soulless system feel disoriented, if not disillusioned, and find it difficult to appreciate educational values and to identify with ethical norms.

We referred above to the unity in traditional China of higher education, ethical grounding in the classics, and government. This unity no longer exists in modern higher education, as witnessed by the multitude of different college departments and university research institutes. In many instances their educational concepts and objectives are far from life: in the College of Liberal Arts traditional approaches to teaching and learning largely are adhered to, the subjects taught mainly are part of a given canon of traditional requirements; problems of our present age do not figure greatly in the classrooms; the past is hardly investigated in the light of the experiences and problems of our present age; students have to live in two worlds.

In the natural sciences and such fields as engineering, business, trade and law the most modern knowledge is communicated. Courses not strictly pertaining to the student's major field of study are often considered an intrusion and an annoyance by many teachers and students. Traditional educational and moral values fall by the wayside. There is little interest in the ethical aspects of science and business; no such specialized courses have been developed and teachers are not prepared to address the issues. Courses in the history and philosophy of the sciences and many other fields are scarce or even non-existent. As a result students are not given a more comprehensive understanding of modern science and how it relates to intellectual, social and moral issues. The authorities concerned seem to be aware of these problems and have taken remedial measures.<sup>16</sup>

Many of the issues raised here are not limited to the educational system in Taiwan. In our attempt to find ways and means out of the present dilemma not only should we search for possible answers in the traditional educational system, but also pay close attention to the efforts made in other countries to solve these or related problems. In this connection the findings, warnings, and suggestions of the Association of American Colleges might fit our purpose. Some of its findings suggest that educators in the United States and Taiwan are confronted with similar issues in higher education.

Evidence of decline and devaluation in college curriculums is everywhere . . . while many colleges require students to take a 'General education program for broad knowledge and thinking skill,' . . . these programs are often little more than 'distribution requirements, for example, two

courses each in the humanities, social sciences and sciences,' that reflect political divisions in the faculty.

Similarly, in most colleges the 'major' or 'concentration' program was described as 'little more than a gathering of courses taken in one department.' Today's majors, it said, are not so much 'experiences in depth' as they are 'bureaucratic conveniences. . . .' 'Today's student populations are less well prepared, more vocationally oriented and apparently more materialistic than their immediate predecessors', the study declared. 'A survival ethic encourages a hunkering down, a diminished vision,' in colleges. Another factor, it continued, is the academic 'value system' that 'puts little emphasis on good teaching, counseling of students, and working with secondary schools.' Most young faculty members entered the classroom having had no formal instruction in how to teach, and they soon learned that 'research, not teaching, pays off.'<sup>17</sup>

The above statements come very close to an apt description of educational problems in Taiwan. A study in depth of these problems would probably unearth hosts of educational and moral problems suggesting that the students' criticism of the present educational system which was summarized in the first part of this paper is valid and appropriate.

### *Important Aspects of Higher Moral Education in Our Time*

To solve basic educational and moral problems it will not suffice to introduce some formal changes in the curriculum. Suggestions by the report of the Association of American Colleges seem to spell this out.

The document, prepared by a panel of 18 educators, called on colleges and universities to change doctoral courses to offer training in teaching as well as in academic content. It also described a nine-point 'minimum required curriculum' that it said would prepare both liberal arts and professional students to 'live responsibly and joyfully, fulfilling their promise as individual humans and their obligations as democratic citizens.' The nine 'experiences' that the report said 'should inform all study' were literacy, which comprises writing, reading, speaking, and listening; understanding numerical data; historical consciousness; values; art; international and multicultural experiences; study in depth of a discipline or groups of disciplines; and inquiry, including abstract logical thinking and critical analysis.<sup>18</sup>

If our students are to learn to "live responsibly and joyfully, fulfilling their promise as individual humans and their obligations as democratic citizens" they must be helped to understand the world in which we are living. They must learn that a man can become a mature human being only in community, i.e., in joint responsibility; they must be made to appreciate ethical values such as self-respect, selflessness, friendship, love, honesty, faith in other people, hope and patience, sacrifice for others or for a common good, search for the truth, the dignity of man, the value of life, freedom and responsibility on all levels, openness vis-a-vis transcendent values, etc. These values are the most difficult to acquire, yet they will be decisive for prudent and mature judgement and decision-making in the future years of the students and are needed for the establishment of a truly progressive and humane society. However, those values cannot be taught through programmed instruction--they cannot be instilled via "objective" teaching and learning approaches--they can be learned only from, and taught by, human beings. Education in general, and moral education in particular, is essentially an affair between man and man, be this in the family, in schools, or any other institution in society. Great educators have known and stressed this fact throughout the history of mankind. It is here that the great Chinese sages should be called upon to play a decisive role in solving modern problems.

## *The Role of Professors and Educators*

What all this amounts to is the call for a thorough re-evaluation of the role of the teacher and professor. We may set up programs for students which include the "minimum required curriculum." But, who is to teach the respective courses and how should they be taught effectively? Who is to teach students of the natural sciences courses which lead to genuine appreciation of art and values, and which instill historical consciousness? The average teacher or professor may consider himself an expert in his own field, but would not venture to step beyond the borders of his discipline.

There is a great need for interdisciplinary research, cooperation and teaching on our campuses. This type of work could be carried out by groups or committees of teachers and professors from various academic fields. They might discuss a problem or an issue from the points of view of their various disciplines (valuable information on the problem of abortion--to mention but one area--could be provided by biologists, sociologists, philosophers, theologians, historians, etc.). They could invite groups of students to talk over the most pressing problems. In the long run teaching materials might be provided which could familiarize the individual teacher with important pieces of information and help him or her to conduct his course effectively.<sup>19</sup> In this connection books and articles could be translated and published which discuss educational, social and moral values for our time and offer answers to difficult problems.<sup>20</sup>

Today as in the days of Confucius and Socrates the teacher may be said to play the dominant role in the educational system. However, in our modern age authority as it was known and exercised in the past is to a large extent being replaced by so called "democratic" processes. That is why authority in order to exert influence will need to depend increasingly upon intellectual, spiritual and moral superiority. In other words, the powers of reasoning and persuasion on the part of the teacher, and motivation and trust on the part of the student will have to play an increasingly important role in future education.<sup>21</sup>

Students can easily be motivated when their desire for acting and demonstrating, their hunger for success and achievement, are met by understanding teachers. The latter will not be afraid to reason with their students, listen to their suggestions, discuss study plans and teaching methods with them, undertake new teaching and learning experiments, and outline short and long range study goals for them. The latter is of the utmost importance for freshmen at the college level. They must be made to understand their study goals, what kind of intellectual<sup>22</sup> and social virtues are expected of them and the moral choices with which they will be confronted. Since according to our experience the freshmen year is decisive for a student's academic formation, the heads of the respective departments and the very best professors should be available to these students from the first days to teach and guide them. In fact, the very first weeks of the students' college life often decides the success or failure of college students.

In our ever more complex society problem solving becomes one of the primary goals of college and university education. Students should be introduced to or be made aware of all kinds of problems surrounding them. They should be made to see how now and even more in the future they can contribute to problem solving. Students who are deeply impressed or even shocked by problems, malfunctions, injustices, and evils in society, who begin to realize that tomorrow they will be a full and responsible member of this troubled society, may very well sense that they are given a great chance in their college years to prepare carefully and thoughtfully for their future career and life. Abstract teaching on the part of the teacher and too little contact with the realities

of today's life on the part of the student are, at least to a large extent, to be blamed for so many students' lack of interest in their own country and their ardent desire to go abroad--which unfortunately for quite a few becomes an intellectual and moral disaster.

It is part of the teacher's job to implant and foster social virtues in the students. Classical Chinese education with its emphasis on *jen* (humanity) may still be able to fire the imagination of both teacher and students. Confucius's love of music and his interest in the social, educational and ethical aspects of poetry and music could also be of significance for our time.<sup>23</sup> New ways of cooperation among students also should be explored. Experiments have shown that advanced students are able and willing to help freshmen or less advanced students in many ways.<sup>24</sup> Group work under the guidance of the classroom teacher or some competent student has proved advantageous for fostering community spirit in the classroom<sup>25</sup> or the larger student body.<sup>26</sup> Students are given chances to discuss matters together, to plan together, and to cooperate in certain tasks or projects. They experience things together and get to know one another better. Bonds of friendship develop that in many cases will last beyond college or university years. Experience has shown that in many instances students turn to their former student friends when meeting problems and hardships in their careers or in private life.

The teacher's or professor's personality is of paramount importance for effective social and moral education. He must attempt to create a pedagogic atmosphere which O.F. Bollnow describes as determined by trust, security, gratitude, obedience, love, patience, hope, cheerfulness, humor and kindness.<sup>27</sup> The stress on self-education is made by Harry Hauke in unmistakable terms:

All education necessarily involves the self-education of the teacher, who must subject himself to the trouble of it if he is not just practising a trade on . . . the pupil. The process, direction and result of such a coming-to-grips with oneself (in a way that alters one's psychic structure) and with one's experiences in . . . intercourse with one's fellowmen depend to a considerable extent, however, on the intention with which a person goes about his task. They will therefore take place differently, depending on whether the teacher approaches the young person entrusted to him for education with mistrustful scepticism or trustful patience.<sup>28</sup>

The list of virtues and skills the teacher is expected to possess could be prolonged. But all that has been stated "depend(s) particularly on whether and how the teacher has come to terms with his previous life--or whether he perpetrates his unresolved conflicts in his class."<sup>29</sup>

From what has been said we can understand the great and, in many instances, appalling burden of the teacher and educator. Confronted with failures and noticing only little appreciation on the part of society it becomes only too understandable that many teachers become prematurely weary and embittered and then only carry on the practice of their profession as a matter of routine. With Otto F. Bollnow we ask this question: whence does the teacher obtain the strength to summon up new faith in his students in spite of disappointments?

He can succeed in doing that of his own accord on the strength of pure determination. That is only possible if the educator, for his part, is sustained by another, deeper faith, the faith that in spite of all setbacks and failures his activity has a significance. And that, in turn, is only possible if in performing his work he is convinced of an ultimate purposefulness of the world, if in the final analysis he feels himself to be sustained by a divine order. . . . It is from that alone that he can derive the strength to carry on with his work and without it all his endeavours would be in vain and clutching at the wind.<sup>30</sup>

## The Dialectic of Religion

### *The Modern World, Metaphysical Questions, and Moral Behavior*

In the previous section we arrived at the understanding that teachers need "divine guidance" in order to carry out their many duties as responsible educators. We will turn now to the students and suggest that they, too, have to be sustained by a divine order if they are to master their lives in this modern world, and especially if they are to fulfill their moral duties as responsible citizens. Harry Hauke refers to this point in the section "Interpretation of the Concept of Trust" in the following way:

We have already pointed out that trust does not relate to one's fellow-citizen only but extends far beyond interhuman relations. Thus we speak in general of a trust in being and in life or a trust in God and what we mean by that is a direct turning of the human being to a transcendental power that not only supports and preserves him but also gives him the certainty of standing under a benevolent protection in the midst and uncertainty of this world.<sup>31</sup>

College and university students are citizens of the modern world. Confronted with today's world-wide problems they share modern anxieties and pose anew, in a rather radical way, such age-old questions as: what is the meaning of all this; what is life all about? They are no longer content with prefabricated answers. As citizens of our turbulent age they have tasted and are being fed with all manner of food, that is, by a great variety of rational and irrational philosophies and by different "humanisms," but their appetite for spiritual and moral values remaining unsatisfied. The discussions with students, referred to at the beginning of this paper, attest to this fact. Students are searching for ways and means that will enhance their human and personal dignity and provide meaning for the totality of their existence in a technological, overwhelmingly inhuman world. Karl Jaspers noted:

The question is: How will the content of our cultural heritage be preserved under the conditions of the Age of Technology and the reorganization of the whole human community? How shall we preserve the infinite value of the individual, the dignity and rights of man, the freedom of the spirit, the metaphysical experiences of the millennia? The specific question of the future, however, which conditions and includes everything, is how and what man will believe. Man cannot live without faith. For even nihilism, as the opposite pole of faith, exists only in relation to a possible, but denied, faith.<sup>32</sup>

In his shocking book *The End of the Modern World* Romano Guardini goes beyond Jaspers' cultural analysis and evaluation.<sup>33</sup> He feels that, in the aftermath of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the great scientific revolutions, modern Western man transferred the old sense of the Infinite from God to nature. Nature became an infinite womb from whence were born human personality and human culture. The three together--nature, personality and culture--constituted the whole of being. Mankind had become autonomous with a sense of entering an infinite domain whose conquest was its very destiny. However, Guardini maintains that at the turn of the twentieth century, especially at the end of the Second World War, the modern optimism was shattered.

Until a short time ago, the three elements discussed in the preceding section of our study as intrinsic to modern life were considered an inviolable heritage. The intellectual consciousness of

modern Europe as commonly delineated and accepted even in our day proclaimed those three ideals: a nature subsisting in itself; an autonomous personality of the human subject; a culture self-created out of norms intrinsic to its own essence. The European mind believed further that the constant creation and perfection of this 'culture' constituted the final goal of history. This was all a mistake. Of the many signs appearing today all point to the fact that these cherished ideals are fading from history.<sup>34</sup>

Guardini speaks of the former vision of modern man being supplanted by a new vision and person. This new person is Mass Man, who is in danger of losing his personality. If the new man is to live a human life in a de-humanized and de-humanizing society new moral virtues and a re-assessment of metaphysical questions are called for. The superficiality of modern culture will be of little help in the future.<sup>35</sup> Peter Wust is hoping for a "resurrection of metaphysics."<sup>36</sup> Questions raised by thinkers like Jaspers, Guardini and Wust ought to play an increasing role in spiritual and higher moral education. If the discussion of moral issues does not go beyond a mere rational and/or functional level, i.e., if our students are not asked to delve into the very center of their existence, higher moral education becomes a farce and we face a bleak future.

### *Confucianism and Metaphysical Questions*

If metaphysical considerations and the question of moral virtues are to play such an important role in future higher education, we cannot escape raising the question how far these issues are part of the Chinese heritage. Much has been written on these topics. In the following deliberations we will follow mainly the thought of Julia Ching.<sup>37</sup>

In her paper "The Problem of God in Confucianism", she begins with a statement which is basic to any discussion of metaphysics in Chinese tradition.

The dominant tradition in Confucianism resembles the Jewish tradition and the Christian Gospels in refraining from proving God's existence, while acknowledging it explicitly. But whereas God is the chief actor in the Christian Bible, and occupies the central place in Christian theology, he appears only in occasional references in the Confucian classics and their commentaries.<sup>38</sup>

Despite many unresolved questions, the general consensus of scholarship attests to the ancient belief in a personal God. With particular reference to the *Books of Odes* and of *Documents* Ching discusses terms that imply the notion of a creator God, the source and principle of all things, the giver of life and the protector of the human race.<sup>39</sup> God is also recognized as the Lord of human history, the source of all power and authority. Worldly rulership is derived from a special mandate of Heaven.<sup>40</sup>

The term T'ien-ming is found in the *Odes*, the *Documents*, the *Spring-Autumn Classics* and other texts, notably the *Analects*. It refers to the Will or Decree of Heaven and has often the particular meaning of "Mandate of Heaven"--the divine origin of rulership. It can also refer to destiny or fate. T'ien-ming was interpreted by Confucius as the Will of God.

Where Confucius is concerned, the term connotes apparently the meaning of "God's Will", the Will of a personal God. Confucius speaks of it with reverence. Unless one knows this Will (ming), he says, one cannot be a gentleman, that is, a person of high moral character (20:3) And yet, he also says of himself that he did not know 'The Will of Heaven' (*T'ien-ming*) until the age of fifty (2:4).<sup>41</sup>

The book of Mencius signals a clear change in the meaning of the term of Heaven, which is now present within one's heart so that one who knows his/her own heart and nature knows Heaven.

Heaven is immanent, and no longer necessarily a personal deity. This mystical dimension of Confucianism is also attested to by the *Doctrine of the Mean*, where "Way of Heaven" (*T'ien-tao*) becomes prominent.

This way is eternal and unceasing, transcending time, space, substance, and motion. It is characterized by the universal harmony found in nature as well as in man. It is a fuller expression of the 'Unity of Heaven and Man': an integration of the cosmic-moral and human levels of thinking (ch.22).<sup>42</sup>

The strong emphasis on humanism in the *Analects* and the *Book of Mencius* leads to the "silence of God," the growing "secularising" tendencies in early Confucianism which culminate in the negation of God within the Confucian tradition itself. Hsün-tzu demythologizes the notion of Heaven as a personal deity in control of the cosmic and human universe. The negation of God brings with it the negation of spiritual beings, including personal spiritual immortality.<sup>43</sup>

This depersonalization of Heaven, as we may call it, in the third century B.C., is perhaps the result of rational, naturalistic, as well as metaphysical criticism of *t'ien* as a living person by naturalistic thinkers associated with taoism. *T'ien* is subsumed under the Way (*tao*), the spontaneous and yet necessary activity of a comprehensive reality with its regularity. Thus, *t'ien* gradually loses its personalistic traits.<sup>44</sup>

Thus we have both the affirmation of the existence of God and its negation in early Confucianism. During the Han dynasty eclecticism prevailed, especially with the absorption of ideas from the Yin-Yang school. "Han Confucianism focuses upon a mystic correspondence theory of Heaven, Earth, and Man--of the natural cosmic order and the moral and social order."<sup>45</sup>

The rise of neo-Confucianism and its concerns was stimulated mostly by Buddhist religious philosophy. Neo-Confucianists borrowed from Buddhist technology and Buddhist metaphysical ideas in their fight against a Buddhist inclination toward cosmic pessimism and negation of man's social responsibility. But religious Taoism also was blended into neo-Confucianist philosophy that found its most fitting expression in the term Absolute. This term comprises the source of all being and goodness, holds the universe together, explains its inner and ultimate meaning; to it, somehow, all things return. "The neo-Confucian philosophers have given many names to this Absolute. They have referred to it as the Great Ultimate (*T'ai-chi*). They have also referred to it as *Jen* (Humanity, Benevolence, or Love), the ethical virtue they transformed into a cosmic life force."<sup>46</sup>

In discussing the philosophy of such neo-Confucianists as *Chou Tun-yi*, *Chu Hsi*, *Lu Chin-yuän*, *Wang Yang-ming*, *Hsiung Shih-li* and others, Ching compares their ideas with those of Nicolas of Cusa, Meister Eckhart, Pascal, Teilhard de Chardin, A.N. Whitehead and others. Such an approach shows the breadth and depth of neo-Confucian thinking (cosmological, mystical, transcendent and immanent, absolute and relative, being and becoming) and brings it into modern times. The question is raised with regard to the most outstanding neo-Confucianist, Chu Hsi, whether he rejected or lost sight of the notion of a personal God. In analyzing respective statements made by Chu Hsi with regard to the terms "Heaven" and "Lord-on-high" as found in the classics, Ching concludes:

As far as Chu Hsi is concerned, the two words 'Heaven' and 'Lord-on-High' both refer to some 'Ruler on high'--God. But Chu has endeavoured to remove the anthropomorphic overtones of these words, while affirming the presence of some divine power ruling over the world. He has also identified this Ruler's action with that of Principle, that which, in his own words, both flows from and is one with *T'ai-chi*, the Ultimate source and principle of things. And so, the belief in a supreme



deity has subsisted although Chu prefers to emphasize the deity as metaphysical Absolute more than as personal Absolute.<sup>47</sup>

Summing up the discussion on religion in Confucianism it may be stated that we see a gradual transition from the earlier, theistic belief to the later, philosophical interpretation of the Absolute. But the later evolution in philosophical understanding did not preclude the survival of an earlier belief in a personal God. This is shown by the long history of the Confucian cult of Heaven and by the survival of the popular belief in a Heavenly Ruler, sometimes called *T'ien-lao-yeh* (Heavenly Master). This fact may be one of the reasons why the Chinese communists have criticized Confucianism in general and its religious dimensions in particular.

Is a study of the problem of God in Confucianism relevant to our contemporary understanding of God?

Surprisingly perhaps, one can find much relevance, not only in the discovery of the God of the Classics--a personal God--but also in the neo-Confucian focus upon a God of process and becoming, a God of mind and objectivity, as offered by the later philosophical tradition. Even where the problem of God is concerned, the Confucian tradition has always kept a predilection for starting its reflections with man, with his understanding of the universe and of himself, in each of which he discovers something greater, that which explains the oneness between self and the universe. Now this path--the path of man leading to the knowledge of God--is also that of contemporary philosophy and theology.<sup>48</sup>

#### *Metaphysical Questions, the Meaning of Life, and Moral Higher Education in Taiwan*

Confronted with the many unsettling phenomena of rapidly increasing industrialization and modernization, rationalistic-technological thinking, a life-style little concerned about the individual's personal and spiritual needs, and a shocking breakdown of the traditional social and moral order, serious higher education can no longer evade raising man's most elementary questions concerning the problems of existence in a frightening world and the meaning of life. As long as persons are left entirely to themselves, not at all assured of themselves and their place in the world, they will find it difficult to make responsible moral decisions, and it will be even more difficult to carry them out. A famous Austrian professor of psychiatry and logotherapy, Victor E. Frankl, claims that most psychological and especially psycho-somatic sicknesses are caused by our reductionist approaches to the problems of life which exclude the search for meaning. The latter must become an essential part of professional life and particularly of higher education if we are to create a "healthy" climate for a genuinely humane future.<sup>49</sup>

Our discussion of the problem of God in Confucianism has revealed great riches of thought and experience which may help students find their place in today's world, and fulfill their responsibilities before society, mankind, their own conscience, and finally before the Absolute or God. In this connection it should be especially rewarding to search for a deeper understanding of the term *Jen* as this was developed by Neo-Confucianists.

Originally, *Jen* designated the virtue of kindness on the part of superiors for inferiors. The word took on the meaning of a universal virtue with Confucius and his followers; it has been variously rendered as Humanity, Benevolence and Love. With the Neo-Confucianists the term *Jen* occupies a central position, representing the integration of the various ethical, metaphysical and cosmological levels of reality.

*Jen* refers to the bond of altruistic love between men. *Jen* also refers to the bond between man and the universe. And *Jen* refers, besides, to the life of the universe itself, even to the totality of reality which makes the universe what it is. *Jen* is Principle (*Li*) and Great Ultimate (*T'ai-chi*). *Jen* is also Mind and True Self. And *Jen* remains always the virtue which defines the essence of true man. *Jen* began, as mentioned earlier, as a virtue of horizontal relationships. It gained in breadth and in depth, acquiring a dimension of verticality and serving as a *raison d'être* for the oneness of Heaven and Man.<sup>50</sup>

### *Resources of East and West for Moral Higher Education*

As East and West continue to meet at various levels of culture they should put special emphasis on spiritual and moral issues. These are the elements, in the final analysis, which bring about the much heralded universal culture. In this context it is of the utmost importance that Confucian and Christian philosophical and religious values be investigated on a level of reflection and experience where they challenge and support each other at the same time. The richness of the terms Absolute and *Jen*, referred to above, could very well challenge Christian thinking and belief to strive for a much closer union of man (and mankind) with God--for which the gospels and the sacraments indeed call. Christian mystics have shown how deeply the oneness of God and Man can be experienced.<sup>51</sup> The future points to a life where this union may be experienced as the ultimate, if not only true, shelter of the individual in a threatening world.

This free union of the human person with the Absolute through unconditional freedom will enable the faithful to stand firm--God-centered--even though placeless and unprotected. It will enable man to enter into an immediate relationship with God which will cut through all force and danger. It will permit him to remain a vital person within the mounting loneliness of the future, a loneliness experienced in the very midst of the masses and all their organizations.<sup>52</sup>

The Christian belief in a personal God could very well challenge Neo-Confucian thinking by suggesting that the identification of the Absolute and related terms with the personal deity (Heaven) of the Classics would bring the God of the philosophers closer to the common people or rather to the "masses" of the future. The Confucian cult of Heaven, which was the prerogative of the Emperor alone (as representative of the populace), no longer exists. Why should not the mass of the populace and each individual be encouraged to turn directly to the personal Lord-on-High, the source and principle of all things, the Lord of Nature and History? Could not the East and West meet in their common origin and goal, the Lord of all mankind and all the universe?

As was mentioned before, we are living in a highly pluralistic society. If in the future people will have to rely increasingly upon personal choices and individual moral decisions, they will need more than the answers offered by philosophical and theological systems constructed in the past. They may begin to search for answers that only the living personal God can provide. They may well engage in radical questioning which could reveal that only in God do all things find fulfillment, and that God in turn cannot be controlled by anyone, either with rational or irrational means. In radical openness to the mystery of existence in a world that is not of their own making, persons might be given the grace to hear within their innermost being the voice of their maker and master: the One who speaks about the uniqueness and greatness of their existence: the One who reveals the very meaning of their life: the One who promises to be with them in their loneliness, failures, sufferings, and despair; and the One who invites them to an intimate union. Christian belief speaks even about God who revealed Himself in a special way in Jesus Christ and who is always ready to enter into personal dialogue with mankind.

This has obvious application to moral higher education. Teachers who are conscious of God's presence within themselves and their students, or at least believe in the uniqueness and greatness of each individual human being, will treat their students with respect and honesty, will consider their teaching a most challenging task and will find fulfillment therein. Students who believe in God's love will find courage in trying circumstances, grow in self-respect and self-confidence, come to terms with difficult moral decisions, and discover the joy that comes from sacrifice and selfless service for others.

One could add how deep religious awareness would affect the entire educational atmosphere.<sup>53</sup> It could be held that these are religious questions which belong to a person's private sphere and should not be part of the educational system. But we are confronted with a visible and rather general breakdown in moral education and I would suggest that at least to a large extent this is due to the exclusion of genuine religious issues from modern education. Furthermore, it could be claimed rightly that our present higher educational system is permeated by pseudo-religious beliefs--the omnipotence of science, technology, business, positivistic philosophies, and materialistic ideologies--which are little concerned about spiritual and moral values. Has any authority or ideology the right to deprive students of genuine opportunities to grow and to be enriched through meaningful confrontation with mankind's most elementary questions and challenging issues?

### **The Dialectic of Science and Technology**

Science and technology top the list of the fields considered of utmost importance for modernization and national reconstruction in the Republic of China. There is certainly a great need for capable scientists and experts in the various fields of technology. The nation has to make special efforts in this direction in order to survive in our highly competitive world. Thus, we do not question the Government's drive for excellence in matters of science and technology.

But here we are dealing with the question of moral values. This means looking at the same fields from a different perspective which shows the utmost importance of the moral perspective being part of higher education. Our first step will be to view some achievements of science and technology from a dialectical point of view:

- The human body is unburdened through technology which enables it to move about effortlessly with the aid of cars and airplanes. There is danger that new illnesses will be generated by the absence of physical effort, and that persons will become alienated from nature.

- Television is an enrichment of our sources of information, but can easily lead to the degeneration of our capacity for moral discernment. Man is in danger of becoming a "slave" of technology: television can have an emancipatory effect, but it can also reduce the powers of observation and decision.

- Computers and robots may be of tremendous service, but they can also alienate people from nature and society and force upon them a dreadful life.<sup>54</sup>

- Modern educational hardware has been created in support of teaching and learning approaches, but in many cases it has turned against genuine teaching and learning.

- Studies in the fields of medicine and biology have done much to improve medical services, but they can so fascinate doctors and staff that patients come to feel lost in monstrous modern hospitals.<sup>55</sup>

- Atomic energy studies and the atom bomb are the ultimate extremes of the dialectic of science and technology. The same science and technology that helps us overcome the lack of energy threatens us with an end to the world.

- Natural science claims to study and explain nature, but has alienated people from nature through its abstract, functional, "objective" approaches to research; indeed, its prolific technological "outgrowth" threatens to destroy nature.

Thus, we discover that human beings are on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, there is the scientific-technological world they have created, which they constantly seek to enlarge and perfect by means of their curiosity, ability and discoveries. On the other hand, there is the realization of the hazards of life, controlled only with difficulty by ethics and morals. In this situation mankind no longer knows if it is entitled to make an all-out effort in such fields as, e.g., nuclear energy, computers and the manipulation of genes.<sup>56</sup>

### *Need for Clarification of Basic Issues in Science and Technology*

The urge to discover, create and invent things is part of human nature itself. Whether technology is made to serve the improvement of life, or to imperil or even destroy it, depends entirely on man who creates technology and makes use of it. For the adult learner it is of great importance to have at least a general understanding of what science and technology are all about in order to avoid falling prey to the very dangerous belief in the omnipotence of modern science and technology. Since the latter, at least as far as their theoretical background are concerned, are imports from the West and alien to traditional Chinese thinking, special emphasis must be made to clarify the most important issues.

Efforts will have to be made to train students in independent work and scientific methodology. At the same time they must be introduced to philosophical, historical, and critical studies of the sciences and technology. Serious efforts ought to be made to have students understand the scientific enterprise from all possible viewpoints.<sup>57</sup> Interdisciplinary studies and research must play an important role in this respect. Above all, students should be taught to see the limits imposed on the different disciplines by their own presuppositions. Richard Schlegel in his article "Is Science the Only Way to Truth?" refers to the following limits of science: its partial, fragmentary nature, the necessary limitation on its explanations, and its symbolic character. He illustrates these limits as follows:

If we wish to gain a scientific account of a human being we must obviously employ many different sciences. The anatomist, psychologist, biochemist, physician, physiologist, educator, and economist--each of these and others has something important and different to contribute. However, in religion and also to a degree in philosophy, the person functioning as a whole being is of interest. Questions of guidance in living and relations to other persons are paramount. Information and elucidation from any one special science do not answer these questions.<sup>58</sup>

The point made in the above statement is that science is not in a position to provide knowledge of the whole-person and situation that is important for moral decisions demanded in a free human life, nor is technology. Furthermore, whether a person finds meaning in life, gains self-respect, self-confidence and respect for others, is in love with others and his own work, looks with hope and confidence into the future, is at peace with his conscience and with God . . . all this does not

depend so much on scientific knowledge or technological means but upon spiritual insights and experiences. The conclusions drawn from our discussion so far have far-reaching implications for moral higher education.

Science and technology serve many important purposes; they are indispensable in our modern life. But being blind as regards spiritual and moral values they cannot promise persons future happiness or solve their future problems. Nor should they be employed as weapons against religious beliefs or convictions, as often has been done in the past. Science and religion in the future should be acknowledged and accepted in their own rights, they should join hands in their endeavours to serve mankind to the best of their abilities.<sup>59</sup> How this could be accomplished is shown in the experience and work of a great scientist of our age to whom we give the last word:

For too long a time, for half a century in fact, psychiatry tried to interpret the human mind as a mechanism, and consequently, the therapy of mental disease merely as a technique. I believe this dream has been dreamt out.

A human being is not one thing among others; things determine each other, but man is ultimately self-determining. In the concentration camps, for example, in this living laboratory and this testing ground, we watched and witnessed some of our comrades behave like swine while others behaved like saints. Man has both potentialities within himself; which one is actualized depends on decisions but not on conditions.

Our generation is realistic, for we have come to know man as he really is. After all, man is that being who has invented the gas chambers of Auschwitz; however, he is also that being who has entered those gas chambers upright, with the Lord's Prayers or the Shema Ysrael on his lips.<sup>60</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Industrialization and the process of modernization have within decades changed the face of this country. The many rapid changes in the socio-economic field have become a challenge to the traditional value system which has led to a rather widespread disorientation in matters of morals. A new value order is not yet in sight. This period of transition from a formerly well established order, which lasted unquestioned for hundreds of years, to a new order of which the contours are not yet clearly visible, affects all members of society in general and adult students in particular.

This paper attempts in a first step to show how the new objectives of education have influenced moral higher education. During the past decades we witnessed a change from education of the elite to education for all (mass education); from education for the former scholar-official to professional education; from education as part of the socialization process of the young to education as transmission of knowledge; from a teacher-oriented education to objective, functional approaches in education. All these phenomena have in common that they tend to neglect the moral aspects of education. In curriculum discussions, in the preparation of coursework, in decisions about teaching and learning approaches, and in the training of teachers, efforts must be made to humanize higher education, to offer students opportunities to familiarize themselves with moral issues and to help them arrive at responsible decisions.

Reflections on the complexity of present moral education show that the responsible teacher, who is deeply committed to his cause, is overburdened by the task. If one is not grounded in a spirituality which sees in education more than one job among many others, one soon will be disillusioned by the many daily misunderstandings, disappointments and failures.

Traditional education in China was rooted in a larger socio-religious framework. Unfortunately, neither the present educators nor our students can fall back on this convenient

cushion since religious issues largely have been side-tracked in our modern educational system. A genuine understanding of religious questions and belief in transcendent values could be of great help to teachers and students alike in their search for meaning in life and in their many struggles to come to terms with important moral issues and to make related decisions.

Science and technology are sometimes called the "religion of our age." This expression is proof of the dialectic of science and technology. We moderns can no longer do without them, they are part of our lives. They are man-made to serve certain intellectual or practical purposes and are neutral as far as moral values are concerned. If they force moral decisions upon persons, their freedom and dignity are endangered. Higher moral education must prepare the individual and the group to understand the basic suppositions of science and technology and help them to integrate these in a meaningful hierarchical order of values.

### *Topics for Further Studies on Moral Issues in Higher Education*

It was not possible to discuss the whole range of moral issues with which serious higher education in our age has to deal. A rather comprehensive study would have to take up a host of other problems which hardly have been touched upon thusfar. Some will be mentioned briefly.

We have repeatedly referred to values of a social, moral, or spiritual nature. More intensive occupation with these values would confront us with the "dialectic of the system of values." What was the traditional value system in China and what is left of this system? The question of values plays a decisive role for every form of instruction and education.

The search for values has broken out throughout the world. When traditional values have largely become incredible the young, in particular, clutch at almost any kind of offers of values. Adult education must show the way that the individual human being can make his value judgements and how he can respond to traditional values.<sup>61</sup>

The "dialectic of freedom" is shown by the fact that so many different movements, issues and political systems claim to stand for freedom.<sup>62</sup> For the individual who cannot experience his freedom absolutely communal life becomes impossible. Yet greater freedom for the individual means also greater instability, greater self-responsibility, i.e., the worry of deciding how one lives and what one does. To discuss the dialectic of freedom and show how to live in freedom is a very urgent task of higher education.

Our modern age is confronted with the "dialectic of peace." Because of the atomic bomb international peace is an urgent concern, but peace is not only the prevention of destruction. It can mean also the perpetuation of intolerable social grievances. Peace as an element of life and peace as a form of domination are mutually exclusive. Hence, it is important in higher education to work for clarification of the concept of peace in all its ramifications: international, inter-social, interhuman, etc.

Much could be said about the "dialectic of affluence and need" and the "dialectic of social justice" in a country that is still very much in the process of industrialization and modernization. In this context also the "dialect of ecology" must be considered in view of the destruction of parts of the natural environment and the harm done to the quality of life. The moral implications of these phenomena must clearly be worked out. There are also the dialectics of emancipation, individualism, sexuality and related problems which play a very important role in the life of today's students.

Finally, the "dialectic of time" should not be overlooked. Modern technology is so fascinating to the contemporary person because it gets things done. *Homo faber* lays out his plans and the

products are delivered in the time assigned. Thus President Kennedy could decide to have an American on the moon before 1970. However, things look different in education, certainly in moral education. What is needed more than anything else are the virtues of love, hope, faith--and patience. The Chinese tradition has expressed this fact in a most convincing way: to grow a tree you need ten years; to educate a person you need a hundred years.

*Fu Jen Catholic University*  
*Taipei, Taiwan*

## Notes

1. It is assumed here that the Republic of China will be a fully industrialized nation within the next decade.

2. The terms 'adult' and 'higher' education here refer mainly to college, university, and university extension education.

3. See Hellmut Becker, *Education* (a bi-annual collection of recent German contributions to the field of educational research), 30 (1984), 92-100.

4. For a thorough discussion of the issues at stake see Josef Janda, "Wertvermittlung als pädagogische Aufgabe," *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift*, 132 (1984), 171-182.

5. See Josef Janda's discussion of these and related terms in his "Wertvermittlung als pädagogische Aufgabe," p. 174f.

6. See "Curricula in Disarray," *International Herald Tribune*, Feb. 12, 1985, p. 1.

7. Many critical voices in Germany deplore the destruction of moral and educational values at all school levels which was experienced during the last two decades. See e.g., Christa Meves, "Was hindert die Jugend der Bundesrepublik, zu Kulturträgern des christlichen-abendländischen Geistes zu werden?" in *Wohin gehen wir? Orientierungspunkte* (Freiburg: Herder, 1984), pp. 64-76.

8. See my paper "Social Harmony in China: Past and Present," pp. 10, 14-18. The paper was presented at the 1984 Workshop of the Association of Christian Universities and Colleges in Asia, held at Fu Jen University, Taipei.

9. For more detailed information on this topic see Lee Thomas Hong-Chi, *Education in Northern Sung China* (New Haven: Yale University unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation, 1974).

10. *Ibid.*, p. 254.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 255.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 257.

13. See *Republic of China. A Reference Book* (Taipei: United Pacific International Inc., 1983), p. 220f.

14. Hellmut Becker, "Persistent Contradictions," p. 96.

15. I have repeatedly dealt with this topic in my "Die Katholische Universität in China (Taiwan)," *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft (NZM)*, 36 (1980), 114-135 and 219-234.

16. According to the University Curriculum initiated in 1983 science students have to take special courses in the field of liberal arts and students of liberal arts have to be introduced to the field of science.

17. See "Curricula in 'Disaray' . . .", p. 3.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

19. Interdisciplinary research done during the last decades could be of great help in providing important information. See e.g., the monumental *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*, Warren T. Reich (New York: The Free Press, 1978), 4 vols. The article on abortion (vol. I, 1-32) deals with medical aspects, Jewish, Roman Catholic and Protestant perspectives, the contemporary debate in philosophical and religious ethics, and legal aspects.

20. Since the impact of modernization with its many demoralizing experiences has been felt in the West for quite some time, many voices heard there discuss critically and constructively the related intellectual, educational, social and moral issues. A great variety of excellent books are available offering valuable and immediately helpful opinions on questions such as the meaning of life, science and the quality of life, sex and love, health of body and soul, spiritual values in a technological age, education for life in modern (post-industrial) society, etc. I would cite two famous German authors: Christa Meves (philosopher and psychologist with a practice in youth-psychotherapy) and Joachim Illies (biologist, theologian, professor of zoology and researcher at the Max Planck Institute in Schlitz/Hessen), who have done intensive joint research in interdisciplinary studies and produced an enormous wealth of meaningful information. They have published more than fifty books thusfar whose editions have reached several millions, e.g.: *Mut zur Erziehung*; *Antriebe, Charakter, Erziehung*; *bedrohte Jugend, gefährdete Zukunft*; *Freiheit will gelernt sein*; *Manipulierte Masslosigkeit*; *Mit der Aggression leben*; *Macht Gleichheit glücklich?*; *Wunschtraum und Wirklichkeit*; *Unterwegs*; *Ermutigung zum Leben*; *Seelische Gesundheit und biblisches Heil*; *Für eine menschenwürdige Zukunft. Die gemeinsame Verantwortung von Biologie und Theologie*; *Die Sache mit dem Apfel. Eine moderne Wissenschaft vom Sündenfall*; *Biologie und Menschenbild*; *Zu wahr, um schön zu sein*; *Federlese an der Wissenschaft*; *Der Mensch zwischen Furcht und Hoffnung. Wissenschaft als Heilserwartung*; *Lieben, was ist das? Ein Grenzgespräch zwischen Biologie und Psychologie*; *Ehealphabet*; *Kulturbiologie des Menschen*, *Der Mensch zwischen Gesetz und Freiheit*.

21. Referring to the authority of the teacher or professor, Harry Hanke notes: "Its basis is then constituted by greater expertise, higher human quality and better founded arguments, to which the other person gladly submits because he has the insight to do so. He then voluntarily delegates his own rights to the bearer of authority because he puts complete trust in the latter's decisions. Thus authority is always 'mandated authority' (*Auftragsautorität*) which precludes the teacher from assigning himself authority solely by virtue of his physical superiority or of the possibility of being able to employ the means of power. See his "The Pedagogical Significance of Trust," in *Education*, 21 (1980), 73-89.

22. Franz Pöggeler discusses this problem in greater detail. See his "The Teacher's Ethos: A Reappraisal," *Education*, 30 (1984), 33-40. See especially his section "the ethos of science," pp. 38-40.

23. Kathleen Higgins has done some interesting studies along these lines. See her "Music in Confucian and Neo-Confucian Philosophy," *International Philosophical Quarterly (IPQ)*, XX (1980), 433-451.

24. See e.g., my "Students Teach Students: A Follow-up," *English Teaching Forum*, XIV (1976), 42-43.

25. See the section "Group Dynamics of/in the School Class," in Klaus Bartels' "The Personal Dimension in Teaching: The Neglect and Critical Discovery of this Dimension in Modern Theories of Teaching," *Education*, 21 (1980), 35-59.

26. Related experiments and teaching approaches have been described in my "Group Work in Foreign Language Learning: A Report," *English Teaching Forum*, XI (1973), 12-15.



27. *Die Pädagogische Atmosphäre* (Heidelberg: Verlag Quelle und Meyer, 1964). See also his illuminating article "On the Virtues of the Educator," *Education* (1979), 69-79.
28. "The Pedagogical Significance of Trust," p. 87.
29. See Kurt Singer, "The Importance of the Teacher's Personality," *Education*, 18 (1978), p. 95.
30. Otto F. Bollnow, "On the Virtues of the Educator," p. 77.
31. "The Pedagogical Significance of Trust," p. 74.
32. *The Origin and Goal of History*, trans. Michael Bullock (Taipei: Rainbow-Bridge Book Co., 1971), p. 214f. This book has been translated into Chinese by the Translation Center of Fu Jen University and published by United Linking Publ. Company, Taipei.
33. Trans. from the German by Joseph Theman and Herbert Burke (New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1956). This book has also been translated into Chinese and published by United Linking Publ. Company, Taipei.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 68f.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 76ff.
36. See his *Die Auferstehung der Metaphysik* (Hamburg: Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1963). The first chapter of this book is entitled "Die erdrückende Autorität Kants (The Overwhelming/crushing Authority of Kant)." Wust speaks out against Kant's approach to metaphysics which has had a devastating influence on the intellectual world up to our time (p. 18ff). Strong criticism of Kant's transcendental method is voiced by August Brunner in his *Kant und die Wirklichkeit des Geistigen* (München: Johannes Berchmanns Verlag, 1978). Brunner tries to show how in the aftermath of Kant spiritual values were lost sight of. I have dealt with this topic in "The Impact of Rational Thinking on Modern Man," in *Symposium of the International Congress of Philosophy* (Taipei: Fu Jen University, 1981), pp. 337-376. See especially chapter II "Rational Knowledge vs. Comprehensive Knowledge or the Reality of the Spiritual," pp. 358-384.
37. See her "The Problem of God in Confucianism," *IPQ*, XVII (1977), 3-32; "Confucianism: A Critical Re-Assessment of the Heritage," *IPQ*, XV (1975), 3-33; "Confucius and His Modern Critics, 1916 to Present," *Papers on Far Eastern History*, 10 (1974), 136-139.
38. Julia Ching, p. 3. Since Confucianism and neo-Confucianism in particular have been the main sources of educational philosophy in traditional China and are still an essential part of the educational system in Taiwan today, we are concerned mainly with Confucian metaphysics in this study.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 12f.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 14f.
44. See Chung-ying Cheng, "Religious Reality and Religious Understanding in Confucianism and neo-Confucianism," *IPQ*, XIII (1973), p. 40f. Thaddäus T.C. Hang discusses our topic by investigating the concept "Heavenly Mandate" and the changes in meaning it underwent in the course of Chinese history. See his "Vom himmlischen Mandat zum Fatum Aspekte der Chinesischen Religiösität," a paper read at the Wittgenstein Symposium in Kirchberg/Wechsel (Germany), August 1983. A Chinese version of this paper can be found in *Cong-Meng Monthly*, 45 (1983), 287-312.
45. Julia Ching "The Problem of God in Confucianism," p. 16.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 21f. In his paper "Chu Hsi's Religious Life," Chan Wing-tsit claims that *Chu Hsi* was an intensely religious person. Chan tries to show how Chu took prayer meetings seriously, and how he conducted himself privately in ancestor worship, in facing death, and in carrying out the mandate of Heaven. *International Symposium on Chinese-Western Culture: Interchange in Commemoration of the 400th Anniversary of the Arrival of Matteo Ricci, S.J. in China. Taipei, Sept. 1983*. Pp. 52-72.

48. "The Problem of God in Confucianism," p. 4.

49. See his chapter "Logotherapie und Religion" in *Der Mensch auf Suche nach Sinn* (Freiburg: Herderbücherei, 1973). Frankl's many books have been translated into more than 15 languages. Several million copies of the many editions of his books have been printed. It would be a worthwhile undertaking to have Frankl's most important works translated into Chinese.

50. "The Problem of God in Confucianism," p. 25f.

51. "In Christian mysticism, the end-purpose of life is not to know of, or about, God in rational terms, but to know Him directly and to feel His love intrinsically. The mystic's ultimate fulfillment and transcended state of being is his experiencing of pure consciousness in the *una mystica* with God," John T. Marcus, "East and West: Phenomenologies of the Self and the Existential Bases of Knowledge," *IPQ*, XI (1971), 10.

52. Romano Guardini, *The End of the Modern World*, p. 131f.

53. It would be interesting in this context to return to the critical remarks voiced by the two student groups and to the different points raised in the section on the educational system.

54. In a very well balanced article Isaac Asimov discusses the advantages and the dangers for a world that has to live with robots (25,000 already existing; 115,000 by 1990). He raises the following questions; "And yet there are dangers more dramatic than that of unemployment. Might not human beings be killed by robots? Might robots be designed and programmed to be warriors? Might the machines of destruction that now fight our battles be made the more horrible with the aid of computerization?" See his "Robots, Society and the Future," *Dialogue*, 67 (1985), 54-60.

55. I refer again to the *Encyclopedia of Bioethics* to remind the reader of the complexity of our problems.

56. For a detailed discussion of technology and education see Konrad Widmer, "Youth and Technology," *Education*, 25 (1982), 86-100.

57. I have discussed this topic on several occasions. See e.g., "The Impact of Rational Thinking on Modern Man," pp. 337-376, and "Science and Religion for Matteo Ricci: Science and Religion for Today" in *International Symposium on Chinese-Western Cultural Interchange*, pp. 703-727.

58. In *Zygon, Journal of Religion and Science*, 17 (1982), p. 351.

59. In his sections "Beyond scientific method" and "Religious truths for scientists," Richard Schlegel takes up this topic, *ibid.*, pp. 355-359. Another excellent discussion of the topic in question is offered by Anton Grabner-Haider, "Die Chancen der Religion in einer wissenschaftlich orientierten Lebenswelt", in *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift*, 132 (1984), 383-391.

60. Viktor E. Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning* (New York: Pocket Books, 1963), p. 212f.

61. See Hellmut Becker, "Persistent Contradictions on the Intellectual Situation of Adult Education," p. 94.

62. A. Th. Peperzak discusses freedom under two headings: I. Man as an Ego (Man as "Economic" Being: Culture as "Economy"; Man as a Poetic Being: Culture as Poetry) and II. Man as Fellow-Man (The Social order as an Extension of Self-Centeredness; Political Egoism; Social Economy; Aesthetic Egoism; Present-day Society as Mixture of Politics, Economy, and Eroticism;

Freedom, and Equality; Anarchism; Man as Servant of his Fellow-Man; Organization of Freedom and Ethics; Duties of Micro-Ethics with Respect to the Macro-Structural Reform). See his "Freedom," in *IPQ*, XI (1971), 341-361.



9.

## In Defense of Character Development

Kevin Ryan

Worrying about the young is probably genetically based: tribes or communities which do not worry about their young and do not act sensibly in response to their worries undoubtedly have but a short history. Recently it seems that Americans are worrying more about their young. Some years ago the economic historian, Robert Heilbroner, in his *On the Human Prospect*,<sup>1</sup> after sketching three near-term scenarios facing our species: nuclear holocaust, worldwide famine and destruction of the ecosystem, stated what was causing the middle-age population such great unease as it entered the last quarter of the twentieth century: "our inability to pass on our values to the young."

More recently, James Q. Wilson wrote the lead article in the twentieth anniversary issue of *The Public Interest*, entitled "The Rediscovery of Character: Private Virtue and Public Policy," with the statement:

The most important change in how one defines the public interest that I have witnessed--and experienced--over the last twenty years has been a deepening concern for the development of character in the citizenry. . . . A variety of public problems can only be understood--and perhaps addressed--if they are seen as arising out of a defect in character formation.<sup>2</sup>

Anyone familiar with Edwin M. Wynne's statistics on changes in the rates of youth homicide, suicide and illegitimate births from the years 1914 to 1982 knows exactly why there is this public concern about character development. While many are anesthetized to the plight of the young and have taken their moral confusion as a price of progress, many others are being jarred awake. Even political leaders seem to sense the public mood so that whether on the left or the right--a Cuomo, Reagan or Prince Charles--they urge the schools to be more aggressive in teaching traditional values. These men are but waking to the public's views registered in the 1975 and 1980 PDK Gallup polls in which 79% of the American people answered affirmatively to the question "Are you in favor of the public schools teaching morals and moral behavior?"<sup>3</sup> Concern there is, but what must we do to teach morals and moral behavior, to have a positive effect on moral development, to form good character? These are our issues.

Carl Beriter<sup>4</sup> has been urging public educators for some time to abandon this mission, claiming that in a pluralistic democracy, the schools have no right to attempt to transmit moral values or to attempt to influence ethical considerations. Recently, Kurtines and Gewirtz, in their book *Morality, Moral Behavior and Moral Development*<sup>5</sup> suggest that the multitude of psychological models of moral functioning mirrors the moral pluralism in the country, with the clear implication of questioning the viability of the public schools. Indeed, that is what is beginning to happen in our society. Recently, a small, invitational conference chaired by protestant theologian, Richard John Neuhaus, was devoted to exploring the policy papers of a few leading protestant thinkers around this issue. Its clear message was that, behind the Moral Majority's sloganeering about the public school's infecting the young with secular humanism, there is a solid core of protestant intelligentsia which believes the lack of moral training, on the one hand, and the a-theological world--if not an anti-theological world-view--fostered by twelve years of largely compulsory education, on the other hand, is a violation of First Amendment guarantees of religious liberty. In short, what is being suggested is the dismantling of public education as we know it.

Some have an increased awareness that the public schools need more vigorously to engage this issue, while others raise questions about the appropriateness of moral education. While everyone is pursued by their own set of devils surrounding this topic, I have a particularly troubling set. I teach eighty teacher-education students, most of whom will soon be in schools--largely public schools. My particular challenge is what to tell them, if anything, that will prepare them to assume the role of teacher. My work is very immediate and involved with practice; it is hardly the place for a purist.

The recent history of teacher education's efforts to prepare future teachers for their role as moral educators and character developers shows a quiet retreat during the past twenty years. Teacher educators--sensitive, fidgety souls that we are--took the student's cry of the Sixties, "Don't trust anyone over thirty," quite personally. As confused as anyone by the moral shifts of the period, we downplayed the future teacher's role as a transmitter of social and personal values and emphasized other areas. The last twenty years has seen an enormous growth in research and writing on teaching techniques, strategies, models and skills. There also has been a major shift in teacher education from the lecture hall and library to the public school. Its approach has become clinical, so that some students have two or three semesters of clinical experience before student teaching. Philosophy and history of education have been sacrificed on the altar of technique and practice: more and more the vision of the good teacher is the good technician, the skilled craftsman who has acquired those behavioral skills and strategies which research on the "effective teacher" claims to be related to achievement. The fact that "effective" is defined by the students' mastery of objective questions and without reference either to higher order intellectual processes or to concerns about the moral effectiveness of the students is, of course, no surprise.

Teacher education students, however, are exposed to a psychological view of man as educational psychology has become stronger. The focus of psychological man is the individual, separated out from his social context. In recent decades the three dominant schools of psychology--behaviorism, developmentalism and self-actualization (or Third Force) psychology--have struggled over the teacher, each offering distinctly different metaphors of man related to the teacher as technician motif. Behaviorism gives a few minutes in the curriculum to "reinforcing pro-social behavior." The developmental school is a little more generous with the moral, providing the future teacher with a smidgen of Piaget and a dollop or two of Kohlberg. The big winner--to the degree that this is winning--is self-actualization with its offering of values clarification, which in fact, has gone well beyond the educational psychology course. By and large, however, the moral realm has been marginalized to the point of insignificance.

If teachers look upon their work with children as containing a moral dimension, this is something they bring to teacher education, not something they are taught there. It comes from their religious and civil backgrounds, their lived experience as students and their knowledge that their moral sensibilities were certainly affected by their teachers. Whether or not they come to teacher education with a well formulated picture of themselves as moral educators, inevitably they will have an enormous impact on students, whether kindergartners or high school seniors.

What, then, should we do to prepare teachers for their responsibilities as character and moral educators. While it is tempting to describe an ideal program of selecting and preparing moral educators--a West Point of Moral Education, if you will--I believe that it is more useful to discuss what can be done now within the context of most teacher education programs. In effect, this means bringing certain ideas to the students' level of awareness and giving them opportunities to test and try out some of these ideas. Future teachers are in need, first, of a vision of the moral agent, and,

second, of an understanding of how they can and will affect their own students as each struggles to become a moral agent and to develop his or her own character.

### **The Moral Agent**

The teacher needs a vision of the moral person, some sense of the person as moral actor or agent. The view I will present is one that emerged from The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy (RVP) project on "The Foundations of Moral Education."<sup>6</sup> (Reported at the meeting of the Association of Moral Education [AME], in Boston, 1985.) The project had three ten-person committees, one of philosophers, another of psychologists, and a third of professors of education. The two-year effort of each committee was to carry out intensive corporate reflection on their dimension of the issue and to prepare an extended volume on its results. The philosophy and psychology committee volumes have been published as *Act and Agent: Philosophical Foundations of Moral Education and Character Development*<sup>7</sup> and *Psychological Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development: An Integrated Theory of Moral Development*<sup>8</sup> by The University Press of America (UPA). The volume of the education committee, entitled *Character Education in Schools and Beyond*, has been published by Praeger.<sup>9</sup> Subsequent volumes in the series from UPA are on the social context of values and the resources of Latin American and Chinese cultures for moral education.<sup>10</sup>

The education committee was composed of individuals such as T. Lickona, E. Sullivan, Clark Power, Edwin Wynne, Clive Beck, who were party to much of the discussion and all of the papers of the previous two groups. Out of the discussions of the education committee emerged an integrated model of the moral agent which contends that human character emerges from the workings of three components: knowing, affect and action.

### *Knowing*

Persons are reasoning beings, knowers. They have a natural telos to understand the world inside and outside themselves. Also, and quite important, they exist in community central to which is a moral heritage, for each community has found certain patterns of behavior, certain human character traits--a certain "bag of virtues" if you will--necessary to sustaining the life of the individual and the community. The moral person learns these values, not simply in a rote or passive way, but in a conscious, intellectual manner--indeed, they are the stuff of social consciousness: what is courage and when is it needed; what happens to me and to my community if I become irresponsible, what is kindness and what are its consequences? The moral agent also knows the behavioral referents to kindness: what does kindness mean within my family, within my fifth grade class? What does persistence mean in my life as a student, and later as a husband and father?

Emphasis upon the moral agent's knowing means that students need to come to know the moral wisdom of their culture, what has been learned over the years. It means that they need to know its best literature and the most important aspects of its history. They need to know these stories and accounts, not simply for form or for cultural literacy, but to assimilate the moral lessons embedded in them. What is to be learned from Homer's steadfast journey; what is to be learned about courage and human frailty from the soldier's heroic roller coaster in *The Red Badge of Courage*;<sup>11</sup> what can Gandhi's humble crusade tell us about the power of a moral idea whose time has come? Students need to know where we have been and what we have learned. This is not to be taken as the final word--far from it--but as the unfinished repository of our moral successes and

failures. This is why they need the best literature and the best history, rather than some hack attempt to socialize the young to the biases of the tribe.

To insure against moral passivity, the young need to know how to think morally, how to reason through an issue or problem, rather than receiving someone else's decision. What is the good and the right in this situation, how do I choose between competing goods; what are the consequences of this course of action? To be moral agents, students need to be ethicists. Over their years of education they need to acquire the skills of ethical thinking: is this really a moral problem; what are the facts; what are the positive consequences for various courses of action; what are the negative consequences?

Also involved here is the formation of a moral imagination in order to enter within the world of the other and to consider possibilities without having to be presented with concrete events. Finally, part of developing the moral agent is to develop the quality of good judgement or what Aristotle calls, "practical wisdom"; we need to cultivate in our students a judicious style.

### *Affect*

The moral agent is not raw intellect or disembodied reasoning, but has feelings, emotions and passions which play a great part in one's moral life. This affective component is one that many of us ignore or, at least, underestimate. In reality it is an energetic, vital moral engine which frequently takes over the life of the moral agent, drives him in directions his reason forbids, or gives energy to decisions to which reason points only timidly. We all know those who can talk a good moral game and can reason with the angels, but whose behavior is all too human. We need to help the child acquire not simply intellectual skills or habits of the mind, but habits of the heart: we need to help the young learn to love the good. Pascal said it best: "The heart has reasons, that reason does not understand."

Part of this learning to love the good lies in developing commitments--in particular, commitment to the moral life. This means developing a conscience or an inner voice, not merely of reason but of affect also, which calls us in a certain direction. It is a voice that can confront emotions of greed, self-interest and envy with a stronger desire to do what is right and good.

Another part of this moral affect is love of self or concern for one's own well-being. Moral education of affect involves the growth of self-love outward from the self, to family and friends, to communities seen and unseen, in order to develop a continually larger definition of what it means to love the good. Affect, though, has one other function, perhaps its most important, namely, to be a bridge between knowing and the third component, action: a link between thought and action.

### *Action*

This is the crucial point. Any effort at moral education or character development which fails positively to affect the child's behavior in some important way is doomed: moral action is the bottom line. Action has three elements or subcomponents: will, competence and habit.

The term 'will' has developed something of a bad reputation since the publication of Gordon Liddy's autobiography of the same name: his strengthening of his will as a young man by eating rats is not quite what we have in mind! Will is what is needed to mobilize and channel our moral energy; it provides the strength to push beyond our self-interest and laziness and fears; it will spur us to moral action and carries us forward to do what our mind and heart tells us we ought to do.



Competence refers to a repertoire of behaviors and skills which the moral agent needs in order to act effectively in the world. One needs to be able to listen and understand, to empathize with the troubled, and to serve those in need. One needs to be able to lead others to see and do the good, and to be able to stand up to injustice. These competencies need to be learned the same way the skills of decoding and encoding symbols, and the scientific method are learned.

Good will and the competence or the capacity to act are not enough; they must be habituated. Such moral action as telling the truth when a comfortable lie is handy, or saying the right but unpopular thing when silence is easy, needs to be a practiced response. One cannot stop and weigh consequences every time a moral event arises; they have to be practiced, habituated responses to life situations.

This, then, is our integrated model of the moral agent: a person whose understanding, emotions and behavior are fully developed. This is, we believe, an accurate, understandable and usable bases for preparing teachers for their roles in moral education and character formation.

### **What the Teacher as Moral Educator Should Do**

Our second question, then, is what teachers should be taught in order to fulfill this role. This is a huge territory which I have categorized into six areas (if not six stages). "The Six E's of the Moral Educator and Character Developer" are example, explanation, exhortation, environmental expectation, evaluation and experience. I am suggesting that heightened awareness and training in these areas should be woven throughout teacher education.<sup>12</sup>

*Example.* This is perhaps the most obvious, but the one that makes us least comfortable. One of the facts of school life is that children watch their teachers to discover how grown-ups act. While not suggesting that teacher must be saints, secular or otherwise, they should be people who take the moral life seriously. In the same way that teachers should be models of people using their minds, they should be seen as models of people responding to life in a morally admirable way.

There is another aspect to this moral modelling. As stated above, many of our most important moral truths are embedded in our stories and in the history of our species. The heroes and villains of our stories and of our history need to be brought to the attention of our young, who need to know about Hester Prunne and Richard the Third, Adolph Hitler and Martin Luther King.

*Explanation.* Emile Durkheim, the French sociologist, is often cited as an apologist for the school's socialization of the young into the dominant values of the society. He saw the school as a social vehicle to instill in the young the society's values and rules of conduct. However, Durkheim insisted that these efforts must be rational. He said, "To teach morality is neither to preach nor to indoctrinate; it is to explain." This teaching starts on the playground when the teacher explains why we don't duel with sharp sticks, and it continues through the senior year when the teacher explains to the soon-to-be high school graduates what their duties are to the Republic.

We need to educate morally through explanation--not simply to stuff students' heads with rules and regulations, but to engage them in the great moral conversation of the human race. Indeed, it is the very existence of this conversation that makes us human. Thirty-five years ago, as an undergraduate at the University of Toronto I was in a daze listening to a then obscure literature teacher named Marshall McLuhan carrying on about "The medium is the message." I see now how relevant was his point to schooling and the moral education of children. Our continual explaining of the rules is, in and of itself, one of the most important messages of school.

*Exhortation.* While the teacher's explanations are a crucial part of a child's moral education, the teacher's urging and exhortations also have a place in the process. A child who is discouraged by academic failure or by having been cut from a team, a cast, or a musical group often needs something stronger than sweet reason to ward off self-pity. A student who is quietly and passively slipping through school may need a teacher's passionate appeal to inspire him or her to shape up and use the opportunity offered by education. A youth who is flirting with racist ideas may not question this kind of sloppy thinking until he feels the heat of a teacher's moral indignation. A senior who has been turned down by a favorite college or denied entrance into an apprenticeship program may need more than the teachers nuanced explanation that life is unfair. He may need to be inspired or even goaded if he is to endure and transcend his disappointment.

Exhortation should be used sparingly and should never stray very far from explanation. Nonetheless, there are times when teachers must appeal to the best instincts of the young and urge them to move in particular directions.

*Environmental Expectations.* A classroom is a small society with patterns and rituals, power relationships and standards for academic performance, but also for student behavior. In a positive moral environment, students are respected and respect one another. The ability to establish a purposeful and civil classroom environment is what distinguishes the good, from the ineffective, teacher. A central factor in a classroom environment is its moral climate: are the classroom rules fair and fairly exercised; does the teacher play favorites; does good balance exist between competition and cooperation; are individuality and community responsibility both nurtured; are less able students protected, but also challenged; are ethical questions and issues of "what ought to be" part of the classroom dialogue?

I know of no handy guide to follow to establish and maintain an environment of moral expectation, and, once established, it is always moments away from collapse. But I have little doubt that the moral climate which exists within a classroom has a steady and strong influence upon the formation of character and of one's sense of what is right and what is wrong.

*Evaluation.* Perhaps here I have stretched alliteration past the bounds of good sense, but what I have in mind is allowing children to evaluate for themselves: Indeed, more than allowing, to create opportunities for students to reflect on what they value, what they think is the good, and what they believe is the right thing to do. If this sounds like an indirect endorsement of values clarification, I must plead guilty. As someone who has done his share of criticizing values clarification over the last two decades, I have come to appreciate its power to involve students in the kind of moral and value issues which have meaning in their lives. I have been so opposed to the idea of values clarification carrying the entire weight of the school's role in moral education that I failed to see its substantial contribution when used well and with the entire range of activities being suggested here. Of course, the same can be said for involving students in structured discussion of ethical dilemmas.

*Experience.* Twelve years ago, James Coleman, commenting on the enormous changes which have taken place in the world of children over two generations, wrote, "the modern generation of American youth is information rich and experience poor."<sup>13</sup> The world of U.S. children has been radically altered by changes in the economy, in the means of production, and in the size and structure of U.S. families.

Today's young people are members of smaller and less stable families than was the case two generations ago. A modern house or apartment affords few tasks for children other than doing the laundry and the dishes, putting out garbage and a few other light and brief chores. These are restricted routes by which to develop a sturdy self-concept. At the same time, by the standards of any previous generation, today's young people exist in a self-focused, pleasure-dominated world of turn-on escapism (through MTV, sexuality, drugs, or simply "hanging out"). Only rare and fortunate teenagers encounter the kinds of experiences that help them break out of this envelope of self-interest and learn to contribute to others.

Schools are increasingly responding to this condition by providing students, both in school and out, with opportunities to serve. Within such schools, students are encouraged to help teachers and other students. Older children often help young ones learn academic or physical skills; students help teachers, librarians, or other staff members with routine clerical tasks. But out-of-school programs represent a larger departure from the ordinary. These programs enable students to provide services to individuals in need, such as a blind shut-in or a mother with a mildly retarded child. Other students work (usually without pay) in understaffed agencies, such as retirement homes or day-care centers. The school serves as intermediary and trouble-shooter between student volunteers and the individuals or agencies in need of assistance. Such service programs teach the skills of effective helping and cause young people to define themselves as persons who are connected to others. Moral abstractions about justice and community take on immediacy and students begin to appreciate the need to couple moral thinking with moral action.

These are the "Six E's of Moral Education and Character Development." Together they capture for me the dimensions of the moral growth of children for which I should be preparing my pre-service teachers. Of course, these skills and competencies overlap and are somewhat arbitrary as categories; together, however, they represent what I see as the teacher's domain in the moral and character education of the young.

### **Character Development: Toward a Definition**

I would like finally to focus on character development, for undoubtedly some may be uneasy with my moving between such terms such as 'moral education,' 'character formation,' 'character development,' 'values,' and the rest. This last section suggests what I believe character development to be and what it represents as a movement; what it is not and how it differs from what I know of the cognitive developmental and other recent approaches.

First, character development is quite eclectic--and appropriately so, for the human is a complicated beast. We need all the sensible theories, all the angles of vision, all the illuminating metaphors we can find when it comes down to practice, to the questions of what schools and teachers can do to help a child become a morally mature person. Trying to build practice on one metaphor taken from only one of many relevant disciplines, such as the cognitive developmental metaphor of stages of growth would seem to do, strikes me to be loading more weight on the theory than it can stand. Character development is ready to select from many disciplines and to use many metaphors--the growth metaphor, the Skinnerian metaphor, the fill-the-jug metaphor. This gets a little sloppy at times, but then public education is not really for the excessively tidy.

Second, character development puts heavy emphasis upon culture. While it fully engages the transformational goals of schools to make the student an active agent in the positive transformation of society, it places more emphasis upon the traditional role of the school as transmitter of the culture. This springs from the conviction that civilization is a great human achievement, but a

fragile one, and that what we have learned must be conserved and vigorously passed on to the young in order that they preserve and improve the culture. Students need to know not only how to work their will through *Robert's Rules of Order*, but also the lessons of history about the dangers of banality, of wasting their lives on pleasure and self-indulgence and of human depravity, and about the need for human heroism. They have to learn that school is for them an enormous opportunity, that they have serious responsibilities to use the experience well and that there is life after high school, but also that it favors only those with such real skills and capacities as self-discipline and responsibility.

Further--and George Counts notwithstanding--the public pays teachers' salaries not to come up with schemes to change the social order, but to educate the young to a much more demanding idea, namely, to know the best of the past so as to preserve it and build upon it, so as to extend and improve it, and to make it available to more and more people. The vital and primary energies of the teachers and students should be centered around knowing what Edd Wynn calls the Great Tradition: the stories, myths and histories which represent our cultural heritage; its heroes and villains, real and fictitious, who have the capacity to ignite the moral imagination of the young. Cultural literacy and the traditional content of school is of central importance in character development.

Third, character development is more directive; it sees the teacher in a more active role than I perceive in the cognitive developmental tradition. Cultural transmission implies a flow of knowledge and skills from the culture, through the teacher, to the students. This is not to suggest a vision of schools in which teachers cram the cultural heritage down the throats of passive students. On the contrary, character education means vigorously engaging the students in the human story. This means that the teacher must help them to discover the glorious achievements of mankind, while being also the bearer of dangerous memory. "Things fall apart. The center does not hold."

Fourth, character development is more concerned with the collective life of the school, with providing a strong and positive environment for the student. It works hard to establish school spirit and a rich program of activities for students. Academic and social expectations for students are high, prizes and awards are quite evident, and grade, classroom and individual competition is encouraged. Students are expected to contribute to the welfare of the school, as a clear prelude to their responsibilities as an adult to look to the welfare of their spouse, their family, their community and their nation.

Fifth, in character development the teacher is more authoritative and more of an authority. He or she not only knows more, but has the responsibility to see that the students have a fair chance to learn what has been set out. The school and the classroom, therefore, is not a democracy: the rights and responsibilities of the students are quite different from those of teachers. To counter balance the demands for the teacher to manage and channel all the energy of the students and their diverse wills the teacher has power. Although this must be used in a just manner, the classroom and the school has not been designed for one man one vote participatory democracy. In my view, the high burnout or dropout rate of teachers in experimental "just-community schools" is related directly to confusion over this point.

Finally, character development appears to view the child, the student, in a somewhat different way from cognitive developmentalists. It sees the child as malleable, needing formation and a strong environment, for it sees the child as capable of both good and evil. Frankly, it is not as optimistic as the stage theory appears, for it sees the child as self-centered and in need of learning how to reach out beyond him or herself. It sees character development as cognitive, but also deeply

involving the emotions of the child; it sees, too, the need for action, the need for schools and teachers to give students the opportunity to practice the virtues that are essential to a good life in a good society. (Here, democratic decision-making is important, but only one among many dimensions.) Training in the virtues that support a good life in a good society, such as responsibility, consideration and honesty, are a high priority. Since the notion of character draws quite heavily from Aristotle, I will end with his famous answer to the question, "How does a man become virtuous?" "We become just by performing just actions, self-controlled by exercising self-control. We become virtuous by performing virtuous acts."<sup>14</sup>

*Boston University*  
*Boston, Mass.*

## Notes

1. R. Heilbroner, *On the Human Prospect* (New York: Norton, 1974), p. 15.
2. *The Public Interest*, 81 (1985), 3.
3. "The Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Public Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 57 (1975), 240; and "The Twelfth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Public Schools," *ibid.*, 62 (1980), 39.
4. Carl Bereiter, *Must We Educate?* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973).
5. W. Kurtines and J. Gewirtz, *Morality, Moral Behavior and Moral Development* (New York: Wiley, 1984).
6. Reported at the meeting of The Association of Moral Education (AME) in Boston in 1985.
7. Edited by Frederick E. Ellrod, George F. McLean, *et al.* (Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy and The University Press of America, 1986).
8. Edited by Richard Knowles and George F. McLean (Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy and The University Press of America, 1986).
9. Edited by Kevin Ryan and George F. McLean (New York: Praeger, 1987).
10. *The Social Context of Values: Perspectives of the Americans*, ed. O. Pegoraro and G. McLean (Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy and The University Press of America, 1989); and *Chinese Foundations of Moral Education and Character Development*, eds. V. Shen, Tran Van Doan and G. McLean (Washington, D.C., The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy and The University Press of America, 1989).
11. Stephen Crane, *The Red Badge of Courage* (New York: Bantam, 1981).
12. Much of this section appears in a slightly altered version in *Phi Delta Kappan* (November, 1986) in an article entitled "The New Moral Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67 (1986), 228-233.
13. James Coleman, *Youth Transition to Adulthood* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).
14. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, II, 1 1103a 35-b 3.



## Acknowledgement

Warmest appreciation is extended to Msgr. S. Lokuang, to Profs. Andrew Tsien and Bernard Lee, and to the authors and editors of this study whose generous support made possible the organization and realization of the study which this volume reflects.

Acknowledgement is made also to Penguin Books for permission to quote from the D.C. Lau edition of "The Analects" of Confucius; to The University of Hong Kong Press for permission to quote from the "Chung-yung" as found in James Legge, *The Doctrine of the Mean* ("Chinese Classics," 1960); to McCutchan Publishing Corp., Berkeley, CA, and to *The International Philosophical Quarterly* for permission to quote from Julia Ching, "The Problem of God in Confucianism" (1977).

Deep appreciation is extended as well to Mrs. B. Kennedy who prepared the manuscript and to the James A. McLeans for their support in this extension of the research project on The Foundations of Moral Education and Character Development.