LOVE AS THE HORIZON OF MORAL EDUCATION AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT
A Latin American Contribution for the 21st Century

Edited by
Kuis Ugalde
Nicolas Barros
George F. McLean
Timothy Ready

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART III. MORAL EDUCATION AND THE HORIZON BEYOND JUSTICE

INTRODUCTION

This work makes a special contribution to the effort to understand the crucial field of ethics, morality and moral education. Written in Venezuela, it reflects the special heritage of Latin America with its rich Amerindian, Spanish and Third World traditions.

It brings these to the world's deepest contemporary concern, namely, the need to develop ethics and moral vision in a manner appropriate to the great changes through which we are passing at this turn of the millennia. To the reductionist turn toward the programmatic, this work responds with the tradition of Don Quixote to reaffirm the importance of ideals and imagination, to the pragmatist and utilitarian it promises not only to make human life practical, but to take it beyond the mundane; to concentration upon wealth, production and enjoyment, it brings the Third World voice of the poor and the exploited; to models of moral education built on justice, it adds the newly appreciated and deeper realities of care and concern; above all to the inward concentration of a triumphant individualism, egoism and profit, it recalls the open Christian vision of community, solidarity and love.

It is, then:
- a work of interpretative socio-history,
- a search for the foundational meaning and dignity of the human person,
- a surprisingly positive appreciation of the values of the poor of this world,
- an essential contribution of a thusfar missing dimension in the debate over moral education focused thus far on justice, and
- a concrete restatement of the missing principle of love drawn from the long Christian tradition as key to the life of community today.

It approaches this task in three steps: first, an historical analysis of the cultures; second, a metaphysical and anthropological search into the nature and dignity of the person and their implications for moral theory; and third, an enrichment of the relatively recent developments of approaches to the work of moral education.

In all of this the key contribution of the work may be a new equilibrium which moves beyond mind to heart, beyond matter to spirit, beyond the individual to community, and beyond justice to love. In the process it expresses the rich cultures and traditions of the Spanish Catholic tradition and does so especially from the lived experience and concerns of the Southern hemisphere.

Part I studies the cultural history of the issue. Chapter I of L. Ugalde describes clearly the alternatives which we confront in our day. He reviews the rich cultural resources from the past and describes the gifts they bring: first, a strong classical awareness of transcendence; and second, a rich appreciation of the dignity of persons and communities. He points also to the systematic and technological organization of life and human development in terms of economic productivity and commerce.

In the light of this panorama he points out the challenge proper to our times, namely, (a) not to return to the past, but to humanize our contemporary technical culture; (b) to move from a heteronomous ethics, by way of an ethic of the autonomous person, to a theonomous culture; and (c) to reorder the modern matrix of logos-eros-thanatos to a future model of agape-logos-eros.

This daunting but hopeful challenge is followed by a series of papers which provide further detail on the components from the past, though often without Ugalde's challenge to develop a more adequate vision for the future. Thus, Chapter II of J. Vethencourt traces the move from ethics in terms of the gods to attention to human freedom in Greek philosophy and its interiorization in Christianity. This, however, is seen as having become too other-worldly, and hence as having left open the way for a modern hedonisin in which firm principles are substituted by the aesthetics of life-styles and tastes.

Luis Castro Leyva in Chapter III shifts the focus to the Renaissance and early modern times. He does so in terms of the crucial development in human self-understanding from that of servant of God and monarch to that of responsible citizen. In this he gives special attention to Rousseau's *Emile* as a key text for education in modern times. It implied a change in epistemology from belief and memory to exploration and discovery, and in ethics from obedience to the management of freedom. J. Sanchez in Chapter IV also contributes a description of the shift to a naturalist ethics and to its tendency to enclose itself in an egoistic ethics of self-fulfillment with little recognition of the transcendence of the human person.

Powerful descriptions of this problematic come in the papers of H. Johnson and J. O'Sullivan. In Chapter V, "The Nature and Role of Education in Peaceful Development," H. Johnson paints a bleak picture of the dehumanizing effect of much education carried out in terms of attempts to objectivize not only the process, but the subject of education. Chapter VI by J. O'Sullivan carries this analysis into a study of the broader community education effort of advertising with its sophisticated use of psychology to focus the human mind on objects of consumption. Menacingly, it does so through manipulation of the symbol system with which a culture lives and breathes as a human entity. Just as the industrial evolution chained the human person to the machine, the advertizing revolution through the media threatens to enslave the human spirit to the objects and terms of commerce.

This helps to understand Ugalde's option not to try to return, but to go forward in ways that would bring past cultural insight regarding dignity and transcendence into present forms of democratic life and to personal and social self-understanding. This is possible because our cultural heritages bear an awareness of the foundations for human life which have been discovered by experience through the ages. These are truly sacred in origin and dignity, but it is for us to unfold and extend the meaning of their content for new times.

Three volumes, especially, in the present series study this issue in more detail: *Ethics at the Crossroads: Normative Ethics and Objective Reason* (1996), ed. George F. McLean and *Ethics at the Crossroads: Personalist Ethics and Human Subjectivity* (1996), ed. by George F. McLean. A third volume on their implications for the increasingly technological character of present day life is: *The Humanization of Technology and Chinese Culture*, ed. by Tomonobu Imamichi, Wang Miaoyang and Liu Fangtong (Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1998).

Part II takes up this challenge both at the basic levels of the theoretical understanding of the person and at the practical levels at which life is lived, often in the most challenging circumstances of the poor. In Chapter VII A. Munera leads the way with a brilliant paper on the humanizing resources of the primitive Christian community. He sees these as being reified and objectivized through Greek philosophy in ways detrimental to their life-giving vision. Recent developments which have freed this latent power are the Second Vatican Council and liberation theology. Together, they have shifted the focus to the historical and existential process and to the

fundamental realities of human consciousness and of freedom. In this what has been essential is the renewed recognition of the central position of life lived not only as freedom to choose objects, but as service to the community in the image of the cross. In this light, the essence of Christianity emerges not as a belief system regarding divine law, but as mutual concern which transforms the human person from a self-centered competitor to a creative member of his or her community on the local and world levels.

Chapter VIII by J. Ayesteran develops the contribution of liberation theology in shifting the horizon from abstract principles to the historical Jesus as living though time and as savior of all peoples in their concrete circumstances.

The subsequent papers develop this theme in more specific terms. Chapter IX by N. Barros follows the development of the thought of Karol Wojtyla, later Pope John Paul II, on the human person. This Chapter also contributes a corrective to some previous chapters by showing the essential contribution of the classical Graeco-Christian philosophy of substance and supposit. It goes further, however, to unfold the contribution of John Paul's phenomenology to an appreciation of the essential role of action in being human and its implications for the notions of participation and hence of solidarity, which certainly has been the most concretely liberative notion of our times.

Chapter X by G. McLean attempts to mediate between those, on the one hand, who would see the cultural vision of values and virtues as a pattern of obedience and memory in tension with the exercise of freedom by the democratic citizen; and those, on the other hand, who would look simply to a naturalist, utilitarian response to one's environment. For McLean, the values of a tradition are learned in the exercise of human freedom through time, of which they represent the cumulative result. This is not a mere physical reaction to material conditions, but a creative aesthetic mode of realizing human dignity as the image of God in time. Practiced through the ages this develops the virtues of a people which they adapt in facing the present and perfect in passing on these capabilities in lifegiving forms to the following generation.

This is made concrete in the marvelous Chapter XI by A. Moreno which reflects his life with the poor of Caracas. He notes the combination of strong expectations of responsibility for one's action, even on the part of one inebriated, and its exercise in terms of service to one's neighbor when infirm, orphaned or in special distress. He finds there neither the patronizing accusation of a premoral state which dehumanizes the poor as incapable of moral life, nor a dismissal of the norms of social relations. This morality of the marginalized must be read not in terms of penance, but of the gift of life which is to be shared. Chapter XII by H. Rodriquez is a more negative reading of the situation of the family in term of a traditional normative and structural analysis. The future may depend on the way the messages of these two papers are combined in order to overcome present truly disastrous social dangers by new applications of the moral resources of the tradition found among the poor and marginalized.

Part III faces this challenge by means of moral education: what can the schools contribute by a new formation of the next generation which will take account of the present situation, but not entrap them therein? It is characteristic and significant that these chapters relate to the work of L. Kohlberg, which they enrich with the sense of love described in Part II and point ahead through the emerging role of moral imagination.

The excellent Chapter XIII of A. Puente turns directly to the work of Kohlberg which she reviews positively, but to which she addresses a number of important question regarding its

seeming lack of a place for affectivity and role playing, as well as for the central importance of the social dimension of moral life developed above by A. Munera and N. Barros.

A major contribution of this entire volume is the introduction of the dimension of care and concern. This is initiated in the very sympathetic Chapter XIV of R. Zapata which develops the rich positive contribution of Kohlberg while citing its formalism and the importance of its omission of the dimensions of care, love and habit.

This absence is shown by M. Brabeck in her important Chapter XV to reflect the bias, pointed out by C. Gilligan, toward the "male" virtues of self-autonomy, independence, and rights in contrast to the more "female" virtues of relatedness, duty, care and compassion. These, in turn, point beyond the self to the group.

In sum this means broadening attention beyond, but not away from, justice and rights to the horizon of love, whose deep ontological roots were identified in the chapters of Part II. The superb concluding Chapter XVI by H. Johnson suggests that this is not merely an incremental addition, but calls for a new recognition and engagement of the full personality, of the older generation as well as youth, and of society as well as individuals. This points beyond techniques and technologies of education, beyond the social, psychological and philosophical sciences, to an enriched engagement in human (and divine) life. This calls for a new attention to the moral imagination and promises a restoration of the polis. These, indeed, will be the burdens of two forthcoming volumes in the present series.

Hence, the present volume is an essential development of the series on moral education, which volumes are listed below.* It contributes to the global effort to overcome corruption and reconstitute personal and public morality. It stresses the essential element of love without which concern for justice can become the basis of conflict rather than of peace. In this sense the volume reflects the hopes of John Paul II, namely, for a state in which violence cedes to peaceful transformation, and conflict to pardon and reconciliation; where power is made reasonable by persuasion, and justice finally is implemented through love.

Philosophical Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development: Act and Agent, G. McLean and F. Ellrod, eds.;
Psychological Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development: An Integrated Theory of Moral Development, R. Knowles, ed.;
Character Development in Schools and Beyond, Kevin Ryan and Thomas Lickona, eds.;
Research on Culture and Values: Intersection of Universities, Churches and Nations, George F. McLean, ed.;
Values in Philippine Culture and Education: Philippine Philosophical Studies, I, Manuel B. Dy, Jr., ed.

All volumes are published in Washington by The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy (details at the back of this volume).

MORAL EDUCATION AND
THE CHALLENGE OF THE XXIst CENTURY
LUIS UGALDE, S.J.

INTRODUCTION

The Death of Morality?

Let us begin with a commonplace: moral education is in crisis; indeed, society itself is in crisis due to a lack of moral values in its citizens.

The sense of moral development is sustained by two complementary elements. An external element which comes to the individual from society and is conveyed in terms of an *ought-to-be*: `Do the good imposed upon you and avoid evil.' The other element is internal and has its roots in the structure of the person: the search for the good perceived as a way of achieving one's own identity and happiness. The moral *ought* or norm shows itself as something desirable and the good appears as that which orders the totality of human life. So important is the highest good, and so strong is our adherence to it, that it is able to direct all other factors and subordinate the other partial goods, instincts and personal inclinations. This is not because of its being imposed upon me, but as a result of the very meaning of that superior good for me. Indeed, I may give up my own life in order to attain it. This is what happens, for example, when someone is executed or is tortured for refusing falsely to accuse an innocent person: love is stronger than death.

We do not like to say that the moral norm or *ought*, which comes to us from the outside, coincides with internal moral sensibility. Certainly, it does not simply strive to submit externally to the current norms of a given society, but seeks internal adherence to its own conscience. However, we are cognizant that the possibility and the historical fact of a profound contradiction exists between these two areas. Frequently, the discovery of this contradiction emerges only many years after one had been convinced of their compatibility. For example, when a lady -- who for most of her life had internalized and faithfully lived the role that society traditionally expects of women in the home and in society -- discovers the possible immorality which may affect such a role and the obstacle that it may present to her own realization as a human person, she not only enters into conflict with, but may develop a profound hostility and lack of confidence toward all guardians and conveyors of that moral *ought*.

The fact is that in Western society -- and via its influence throughout the world -- the traditional formulators and guardians of that *ought* have lost significantly their prestige and capacity to inspire a moral sense of life -- their moral authority. Also they have lost their effective power for social control and coercion. Traditions, churches, parents, teachers, civil authority, the Bible, God, nature and metaphysics seem impotent.

There are two possible "readings" of this situation. One says that today people are so immoral that they neither respect, nor feel any esteem for, moral authority and its representatives. The other "reading" is that today in order to be moral we must liberate ourselves from those which have dominated and denied men and women personal realization by imposing and inculcating a moral *ought* now seen as immoral.

We are in a pragmatic, hedonistic, changing, pluralistic, permissive and secularized society. This society nourishes personal attitudes which question what constituted the traditional

moral *ought*. The result of this indictment is the lack of authority and stability of social norms and institutions. In consequence, as long as one is not dealing with clearly criminal behaviors, morality is left to the subjective determination of each individual. But there is something more. The long struggle toward modernity has been lived in the Western world by its protagonists as a struggle of liberation from the slavery of the pharaoh: in general, the guardians of morality were seen as the warriors trying to impede liberation.

The modern world has brought about a completely different human reality regarding the conditions and ways of tackling the questions concerning what ought to be, good and evil, and the sense of human realization. In sum, it has brought about four decisive situations:

1. It has discredited the traditional underpinnings of heteronomous morality.

2. It has relegated to the realm of individual subjectivity the search for an internal and autonomous meaning.

3. It has brought about the development of an amoral scientific-technical rationality prodigiously capable of providing goods and services viewed as highly desirable. With its actions -- not with its theory -- it proves or pretends to prove that scientific-technical amorality -- and the humanity modeled by it -- is infinitely more moral than the conditions under which moral societies maintained the human being.

4. Modernity has shown the global unity of the person and society in different areas such as science, technology and human behavior. Each area has its own logic with the object of realizing the means that lead to the achievement of its proposed ends: to produce wealth, to cure cancer, to reach the moon, to extract a confession from one under arrest, etc. In each area what is considered good is that which achieves its proposed ends. The ability to furnish the means is the necessary condition. Each one is at liberty to accept those ends and to determine whether one is willing to furnish the means that lead to their realization.

Today, modernity is coveted and highly esteemed by those who have reaped its fruit and by those who visualize it as the promised land toward which they are directed. Modernity seems to demand as payment the acceptance of an utilitarian rationality. In each area, what is good is that which efficiently leads to the achievement of specific ends.

What Task Lies before Us?

There may be several.

1. In the name of traditional moral guardians, to lament the moral disasters that modern society has brought about, and those that postmodern society will produce if we do not undertake a great crusade to avoid them.

2. To undertake a dialogue, as if nothing had happened, trying to see how we can strengthen the personal sense of morality in more or less conventional terms. This is to say a morality of individual rectitude and interior honesty, without considering objective conditions in society which encourage or discourage it.

3. The third alternative is to take seriously modernity -- and all its marvelous productions in benefit of humanity -- in order:

- To appreciate the formidable authority of its amoral logic.

- To appreciate the great objective possibilities which it offers for human development and for the consideration of new alternatives not available in traditional society, which limited itself to commending or rejecting whatever it already had defined as good and evil. The liberation of

human behavior--for good or evil--from external coercion and a forcefully imposed heteronomous morality opens up new moral possibilities which thusfar have not been developed.

- To examine carefully the theoretical criticism and, above all, the factual disavowal of traditional morality from the viewpoint of modernity.

- To understand, at the same time, the new human misery that this society brings about: the incapacity of this culture to nourish a transcendent moral sense; the profound inhuman condition of this second nature produced by scientific-technical rationality; the need for establishing a public space and the possible conditions for development in the person of a rationality of interpersonal relations and of the gratuitous gift that persons may represent for each other. In other words, we need to appreciate everything that the untying of *Logos* and *Eros* have accomplished on behalf of man, and at the same time to acknowledge the contradictions between them and how they lead civilization to *Thanatos* (death). This requires a discovery beyond a *Logos* reduced to one of its aspects -- instrumental rationality. Rather, it requires *Logos-Agape*, i.e., the love that transcends objective knowledge. This is derived from interpersonal relations; it arises in the affirmation of the other as gratuitous gift. It is an *Agape* capable of assuming and respecting instrumental *Logos* and *Eros* in order genuinely to make us creators of a life qualified as human.

This third alternative represents our preference. We do not believe that the solution to the problems of profound dehumanization derived from a scientific-technological culture lies in a return to traditional society, with its connection to nature and God and its interpersonal relations. The question lies in how to humanize the formidable marvel of scientific-technology, rather than in its rejection.

We do not accept -- in contradistinction to many authors -- that inhumanity is inherent to this form of technological rationality; that this rationality necessarily destroys, dominates, and turns the human being into an instrument for the accumulation of wealth, power and pleasures. But we consider that it is possible to change the perverse character, with which it is imputed nowadays, only to the extent that a different rationality be developed. This is a rationality of interpersonal human relationships understood not in separation from society's objective logic nor solely in terms of a person's inferiority, nor as confined within churches, but as a loving rationality capable of assuming and reordering the whole of society and human life.

We believe that this is impossible so long as Christianity does not recover its identity with the God of the Gospel, not with just any God. This cannot come about as long as the God which is Love as gift and life remains undifferentiated from the heteronomous God, i.e., the God of fear. The latter is a legitimizing guardian of dubious social and personal moralities, unable to transform modernity in service of a really human quality of life. Accordingly, philosophers, educators, psychologists, sociologists, theologians and social communicators face a difficult challenge, albeit one that has the most transcendent importance.

THE MORAL IMPACT OF MODERNITY

The response to the moral impact of modernity is not a matter of showing concern for norms that have shifted in different areas of human behavior. Modernity has produced a type of society in which the sense of the *ought-to-be* itself has been challenged. Beyond scientific laws developed within each field of knowledge, and instrumental rationality with its legitimizing criterion, i.e., its capacity for securing the specific ends of each field, does it make any sense to

raise the moral question? If morality can still be defended, what is its proper scope in satisfying a particular exigency of the human being or in ordering those fields that modernity has, with much effort, endeavored to isolate?

Modernity has proceeded with an implicit or explicit assumption which affirms the rationality and goodness of the universe and of the human being. Rationality and goodness are expressed by laws. To the extent that the human being discovers and applies those laws in every field, the moral *ought* and *being* become identified. Reason is understood as the source of knowledge and the good, that is to say, of happiness and human fulfillment.

On the one hand, there is an implicit logic which rejects moral statements as counterproductive. But today the bitter results of inhumanity which have been the by-product of scientific-technological rationality are also evident. Here, there is always the possibility of making a moralistic and catastrophic "reading" of the contemporary world, e.g.: threats of total destruction, the misery of the poor majority, corruption, drugs, the meaningless of life in opulent society, sexual licentiousness, etc. In fact, young people often develop a profound resentment against this type of society, which is perceived as capable of producing everything, but unable to offer an appropriate cultural habitat for the flourishing of human love, tenderness, understanding, and unselfish concern for every human being. In contrast to this unbearable daily life of the technological worldview devoid of human warmth and fraternity, stands the search for religion, metaphysics, interiority, the sacred and the esoteric returns.

But these limitations and even disasters resulting from modernity do not of themselves provide a legitimate moral alternative with a real possibility of acceptance: the indubitable human disrepute of the liberation produced by technocratic abundance and utilitarian society is counteracted by its immense capacity for seduction.

The articulation of a viable moral vision, that is, one capable of producing a civilization with a genuine quality of human life for all peoples, requires grasping the irrationality of a humanity that destroys itself, as well as the powerful human contribution made by scientific-technological instrumental rationality with its capacity to achieve its proposed ends.

Today, many young people develop a clear sense of the immorality of modern society, in addition to the absurdity of traditional heteronomous morality. Clairvoyance, together with the incapacity to build up a different world where it would be possible to develop and dwell upon a transcendent moral sense, may lead in the direction of an unbeguiled cynical evasion.

Without surrendering to modernity, its reorientation or substitution does not seem possible. Let us see some of its elements and effects on morality.

The Long Struggle of the Enlightenment

As is the case with every profound change in society, the triumph of modernity has involved a long struggle (in this case, several centuries in duration) with great conflicts and resistance. The ability to know and dominate nature seems to have been fundamental for the success of modernity. By means of modernity, humanity went from a state of adaptation to nature, with a relatively reduced transformation, to a state characterized by its ability to provide an abundance of goods and services previously unsuspected. This means that modernity -- beyond its European development -- has a universal character. Without engaging in value judgments -- Is it better or worst than other civilizations? -- it seems that all peoples in a few decades will follow the modernist path, either spontaneously or by external influence.

The transformation of the Western world derives from Greek rationality and Judeo-Christian inspiration, which desacralizes nature and promotes man's transforming action in history. Accordingly, Western man "dominates the earth," discovering the laws of God operative in nature. However, the relationship between enlightened modernity and the traditional Christian matrix undergoes a confrontation which supposes the rejection of authority, ecclesiastic wisdom, and morality, as historically defined by the churches.

The modern Enlightenment struggle against traditional society appeared in the 18th and 19th centuries as a liberation of humankind. When Adam Smith, professor of morality, proposed an economy which may follow scientific laws without interference of any moral *ought* (civil or ecclesiastic), he was proposing an amoral mean for achieving the moral end of better production and distribution of wealth.

For that generation of learned men and scientists, the human spirit, particularly reason, was the brilliant, almost lightning expression of a creative Divinity through a positive, ordered and rational world. However, they found that in the traditional world in which they lived evil and ignorance imposed limitations and poverty, social discrimination within a stratified society, and the subjection of persons to heteronomous impositions which reduced the human individual to merely carrying out directives. In defense, an indisputable religious-civil authority allegedly consecrated by God was proffered as supreme guardian in this irrational order.

Certainly, this inherited society was moralistic, which does not mean that it was moral. Sometimes, this moralism maintained and protected deeply immoral realities. But, even in cases in which the prevailing morality postulated the good for everyone, it did not have the means for its production. For example, when health was desired, one prayed for it, without possessing the scientific-technological knowledge to fight against plagues or to produce penicillin. Hence, they lived in a moral society which in many aspects was deeply immoral. Facing this, the Enlightenment tried to create a space for science and technology governed by its own laws -- without the interference of any external moral *oughts*.

For them, this was another way of obeying God, supreme Lord of the Universe, who ordained all according to rational laws and endowed the human beings with the capacity to discover and adjust themselves accordingly. Whenever subjective and objective reason met, the Kingdom of Reason would be established, i.e., the True and the Good, as well as the ability for producing the desired abundance of goods and services through the domination of nature. Domination here is achieved by obeying nature, that is to say, by adjusting oneself to its laws. The mystery of evil for the human being -- who does what he does not want to do and does not do what he thinks to be good -- will be solved (so they thought) to the extent to which we liberate reason from obscurantist guardianships which kept it under subjection.

There are two aspirations in this long movement of Enlightened modernity: the liberation of scientific-technological reason and the liberation of individual conduct. Both were tied up through extrinsic constraints; both needed to be guided by intrinsic laws inscribed in the very nature of things. The confrontation with those extrinsic powers, which bound humans and hindered the free development of reason and science, was brought about in the 18th and 19th centuries. In this respect, the church, metaphysics, theology, absolute monarchy, male or patriarchal authority, or the intervention of economic rules are understood as extrinsic to the laws and the nature of each sector of created reality. Irrational adherence or subjection to those external impositions was considered as the source of evil.[1]

The economy was freed from regulatory norms and left to function in accord with intrinsic laws whose free action, according to the theoreticians, would generate a maximum production

and distribution of goods, which, in turn, would reward the better servants, that is to say, the better producers.

Kings were desacralized and politics was understood in terms of a more scientific and participatory conception of power. Advances were made in the natural and human sciences; psychology, sociology and anthropology came into being. This liberating process towards an adult humanity promised freedom, equality, brotherhood and material affluence for everyone.

This long struggle -- hard and sanguine at the beginning, quiet and tranquil during the second half of our century -- has brought about a prodigious world. Its unquestionable and unbelievable achievements are its justification. At the same time, these achievements are the disavowal of the old order guardians, who, in spite of at least some good moral principles, were not able to produce anything comparable to the miracle of modern society and the liberation of human conduct. What, it is asked, have metaphysics, religious authority, tradition, paternal authority, inherited taboos, etc. produced which is comparable to the products of scientific-technology free from any moralist interference? In a nature well-ordered by Supreme Reason, everything is guided toward the good. The categorical imperatives must be desacralized and subjected to reason; it is the Truth of Reason that begets the Good.

Morality Loses Moral Authority

With the subjection of all to reason, the logic which governs modernity uncovers the inconsistency and irrationality of much which was defended as "untouchable." This debate emerged initially as confined to the theoretical order and properly concerning intellectual trends. In the last decades, this is not so: secular human society was inexorably established. Moralist positions were discredited for not only theoreticians but praxis itself had proven their falsehood. Individual rationalization mechanisms and societal legitimization processes were appraised as false, as concealing reality. The liberation of egalitarian social aspirations, of individual trends against imposed social patterns, of sexuality, of women -- against any heteronomous imposition of a subordinate role -- have greatly diminished, if not altogether demolished, the foundations of traditional morality.

There is a deconstruction of the super-ego, and a generation lives with a lack of security because, with a single stroke, all the learned moral norms have been discredited. Additionally, part of this generation harbors hostility and resentment toward a past to which it had paid the tribute of morality. At the same time, another generation is born and grows, one which no one dares to guide explicitly toward a way of life considered as good in opposition to another considered as bad, or to influence by means of explicit moral preaching. Guidance is through the communications media, by the existing systems of rewards and punishments, and by celebrities who serve as role models. Their behavior is presented as reflecting alternative lifestyles, even in cases which are clearly immoral.

If anthropology has suggested a cultural relativism of moral norms; if psychology has disclosed the different subconscious mechanisms which challenge freedom, responsibility, motivation and morality itself; if the critique of religion from the viewpoint of psychoanalysis and Marxism argues that the object of religion is not a supreme reality but a reflection of inhuman alienation; and if rapid mobility and cultural changes indicate that whatever at one time was considered transcendent and everlasting is no longer so considered -- then in view of all this every heteronomous morality seems to crumble. It is not concrete moral categories that change; rather it is the possibility of morality itself. Is there any adequately certain and stable reality, of

sufficient value, capable of sustaining a moral imperative, a moral *ought*, and of demanding sacrifices to which we may adhere absolutely? Is there any non-negotiable good? If nothing has an unconditional value, good and evil become, at best, that which in each moment one's subjectivity considers to be such. Good and evil will be a feeling, an intuition, a need in a given moment for a given person. As in the case of religious feeling and its accompanying meaning, morality is understood as properly stemming from an ascientific subjectivity.

Amoral Autonomous Knowledge Claims

When the religious and metaphysical views of human wholeness and a unitary civil and religious authority gave way to a multiplicity of sciences each with its own internal logic, this removed the foundations of a unique view of humankind as endowed with a transcendent orientation with respect to the areas of knowing and action. The effects of scientific advances and the new ways of knowing reach the moral field many decades later. Normally, persons, including scientists, ground their personal morality on surviving elements taken from another type of society. Today, the effective (non-theoretical) logic of amorality and secularity is more strongly perceived. Yesterday was the time of theoreticians who frequently were without any suitable practice; today is the time of practitioners who, without a need for theory, render suspect heteronomous morality.

Each area of human knowledge has its own rationality and instrumental valuation which judges the capacity of a technique or of human behavior in terms of its ability to achieve its proposed ends. The deistic faith (as well as the atheistic one) made us think of a harmony in the universe such that if each part follows its own intrinsic rationality, it can be integrated within a rationality underlying the whole totality. Therefore, there is no need to consider the totality or the ultimate foundations of things and the meaning of human life. Neither is it possible to make objective valuations on the appropriate ends of each field of knowledge and action (e.g., of nuclear physics or organizational efficiency). All this pertains to subjective knowledge.

The intrinsic rationality of each field ought to be questioned only if we want to advance in that field and achieve its proper ends. Thus, the end to be pursued begets an instrumental *ought*. If you wish to win the elections, you must offer such and such to the electorate; if you want the arrested person to talk, you must torture him. . . . This rationality sets aside a transcendent moral sense and, on the other hand, gives a certain moral character to instrumental effectiveness.

The revolution brought about by instrumental rationality has in its favor the production of astonishing achievements in its mission of offering effective means for achieving coveted human ends in medicine, food, communications, etc. At the same time, it has developed an immense capacity for manipulation, control, and transformation of nature, including human nature. Consider biogenetics, psychology and information theory. In former cultures there was a different world consisting of a subject acting who accepted a transcendent sense of life and a way of acting recommended as moral so as to dissuade him from pursuing a contrary conduct. A particular combination of coercion, dread, punishment, love, and persuasion made possible the assimilation and respected for the moral *ought*. Metaphysical and religious conceptions, traditions, educational practices, the system of authority, its means of coercion, and rewards were oriented toward the maintenance of behaviors which were conveyed as desirable. The conception of good and evil, and their system of rewards and punishments respectively, did not end with death, because it was assumed that there was a unity of this life with that of the "next." In some cultures, this life was a trial while the "other" was viewed as the definitive life, which rewarded

faithfulness in this life to the moral *ought*. Accordingly, heteronomous morality depended not only on external social coercion, but also on the fear of eternal punishment and the promise of eternal reward.

In Western culture, with its influential and dominant pragmatic rationality, some of these dimensions and views have lost their viability. Reward and punishment for actions are empirically verified in terms of whatever is possible to achieve; there is no need for metaphysical or religious justification. This society has created other ways of guiding and persuading, a functional mode of persuasion which points to effective means for achieving definite ends. This is not a moral mode of reasoning, but a utilitarian one.[2]

Instrumental Enlightenment rationality is common to both capitalist and Marxist perspectives, despite their historical confrontation. In both systems, it is a matter of discovering and supporting objective rational laws, so that automatically they will produce happiness and the good.

The Marxist enlightenment offered to end evil on earth thanks to the discovery of certain scientific laws. There are laws inherent to societies which account for alienation, human exploitation, misery, and evil. These laws disclose a connection between the economic fact and all such other dimensions of human life as politics, religion -- in a word -- the whole culture. According to these laws, the overthrow of the private appropriation of the means of production necessarily brings about the disappearance of social classes and overcomes alienation and misery. A new socialized economy signifies the emergence of a new society and a new humanity. Labor loses its present character and becomes a catalyst for the realization of the human being and brotherhood. Humanity is liberated from the alienating relationship between capitalists and proletariat and is transformed into a classless mode of life. Once the cause of evil (the private appropriation of the means of production) is eliminated, the moral *ought* and being become identified.

Both capitalism and Marxism are products of the Enlightenment, and uphold that respect for laws which governs economics and history. Without interference of the moral *ought*, this begets the good and happy society. In essence, it is a matter of finding any mechanical failure which may hinder the good functioning of society. The problem of evil is too serious to be left in the hands of human subjectivity, whose freedom -- for good or bad -- does not have any more certainty than its own preference and absolute valuation of the good.

The Part for the Whole

The problem here is not in the development of instrumental rationality, but in the lack of an equally strong development of the rationality of ends, within the context of a non-utilitarian and non-instrumental rationality of human relationships. The radical affirmation of the human person who cannot be reduced to an instrument, the full "quality of life" and living together as the soul of culture, and the real power to shape and guide instrumental rationalities -- all have been relegated to the sphere of marginal and marginalized groups of human rights.

The sense of human life is endured so long as it does not attempt to guide the totality of the human reality of our culture. But to the extent that an attempt is made to affect the direction of social life, politics and the economy, its supporters are treated as delinquents and subversives. Instrumental rationality -- which is only one aspect of the whole of human rationality -- is imposed as a totality which relegates transcendent morality to private life, religious communities and minority ethical groups.

A duality or sort of "schizophrenia" is formed in those engaged in moral education for the young. Such an education is not expected to judge or transform the logic of the ruling power in today's society. Hence, as those who receive a moral education in accord with a transcendent orientation enter adult life and act in society, they discover that in practice its morality has very different utilitarian logic and rules to which they are expected to adjust.

From Homo Faber to Homo Fabricatus

Homo faber -- the scientist, the technician, the "organizational man," and the productive man -- has deeply shaped nature, society, the worldview and its relationship (if any) to God. But, one also shapes oneself as well, to the extent of becoming *homo fabricatus*. The ruling instrumental rationality is such that it transforms the human being into a product, in its own image and likeness. Society has a tendency to produce in humans a sort of second nature in which the utilitarian aspect is the determining factor.

Of all the utilitarian rationalities, economic rationality dominates this era of humanity, characterized by a move from an economy of subsistence (with relatively little transformation) to an economy of accumulation in a state of permanent productive revolution and transformation. Not only will the habitat of a XXI century urbane man be artificial or built by humans, but in a certain sense the human being itself will be artificially produced and shaped by an instrumental combination of economics and hedonism. The strong convictions of a deep moral sense in favor of living together and of non-instrumental human relationships wane. Anyone who wants to survive and to be successful in this society must be subordinated to the dominant rules of the game. In spite of the inner resistances, the productive achievements of this society are their own justification, and persuade us regarding the convenience of paying a price for them. The economic design not only pertains to economic life, but shapes family relationships. Perhaps the most radical move from *homo faber* to *homo fabricatus* will be brought about by recent developments in the field of biogenetics.

Today's society, greatly determined by economic factors, on the one hand, tries to liberate itself from primary economic deprivation (with fundamentally serious scarcities which threaten existence), and, on the other hand, develops a secondary economic dependence which shapes humans and their behavior with needs induced and guided by an instrumental logic.

Given that in their fundamental structure humans are indigent beings, subjects of needs and aspirations, one's search for realization can be manipulated and tied to the dynamics of supply and demand with profit as the main motivation. Given the openness and indeterminacy of human "spiritual" aspirations, there exists the possibility of artificially relating them to the consumption of goods and services which are for sale. In terms of primary material needs, however, one is less changeable; there is a more direct relationship between needs and the objects that satisfy them. In practice, the need determines the object: one who is thirsty needs water, one who is cold needs clothing, which objects do not admit of facile substitution. In contrast, the means that satisfy a person's aspiration to love, happiness and self-esteem may be diverse, contradictory and have almost no objective relationship with one's aspiration.

In this sense, the demand is not that which governs the supply, but the supply induces the demand. On this basis is built the huge industry of behavior motivation and the production of *object-means*. This industry gives the illusion that it can realize human aspirations; money is presented as the universal mediator between humans and their needs and aspirations, be they material or spiritual.

Even one's religious aspirations may be manipulated and satisfied via "electronic religion." There an actor -- who need not be religious -- and limited television scenery provide the whole of religious depth. The same can be said about drugs and commercial sex; they are capable of producing sensations which momentarily fill the affective emptiness of human life.

The Influence of Mass Media on Human Behavior

Scientific and technological advances so revolutionize the mass media and entertainment that they emerge as the producers of the image or mirror in which human persons look at themselves and endeavor to shape their behavior. The power of the communications media to influence human behavior seems unlimited. Although not necessarily used in an anti-human way, at present it functions as a huge industry in the hands of powerful consortia whose principle aim is profit. The dialogue of supply and demand with regard to programming tends to turn into an encounter between economics and individual hedonism.

In this way it fosters the direction of definite behaviors, an efficient social direction without norms or any explicit moral *ought*. Likewise, its amoral language blurs the differences between what is moral and immoral, human and inhuman.

The Praise of Amorality

Certainly, we are not referring to all the diverse trends in society today. Many social trends are deeply moral. Rather, we are attempting to develop certain consequences from the dominant logic and the conditions which it imposes for the task of moral education.

We are in an economic society in which selfishness is not an evil, but the motor of progress, the fundamental law of the productive revolution. Accordingly, it is said that the free play and interchange of selfish economics has internal laws which, carefully respected, can lead the world to the greatest productivity and distribution of goods and services. Hence, the radical human economic tendency to have more succeeds, for the economy produces what never was achieved by the moral *ought*.

This fundamental trend of human selfishness, presented as the cause of every evil by a non-enlightened heteronomous authoritarian and interventionist morality, may turn into the fundamental principle of economic morality, the motor of the optimum production and distribution of profits and services. Accordingly, backward countries living in subhuman conditions that want to better their situation must revise their laws in order to be guided by laws leading towards economic and social liberation.

Some suggest that there is something similar in the world of subjective happiness, namely, that we must search for rational laws or natural tendencies and liberate them from any *ought-to-be*, and that this will lead to happiness and the good for everyone? This mode of reasoning is more implicit than explicit.

Within an Enlightenment logic this would appear evident. If nature is rational, a product of an ordering rationality, man will not be less than this. Hence, let us remove every restraint, taboo and imposed authoritarianism and heteronomous morality so as to achieve the desired good and happiness. It is not a matter of looking for a philosophical theory to support this position, but of making explicit the implicit logic of the daily life of our society which shapes thousands, indeed millions, of human beings. The theory of such a daily praxis, imposed by the culture, is that it is

necessary to discover the fundamental laws of human happiness so as to liberate human beings from the prohibitions and taboos which hinder their accomplishment.

Accordingly, selfishness must be redeemed from the impact of moralist disqualifications and liberated from the prohibitions that repress it. Selfishness is the fundamental law of nature, and for this reason it leads to the good; only evil is produced by the repression of natural tendencies. For the happiness of humanity, selfishness -- long repressed by religion, ignorance and static traditions -- should be freed. It is necessary to recover the instincts as fundamental laws and guides of the theistic project: if Creation is a marvelous work of creative transcendent Reason, so are humans as its crowning achievement. Therefore, the instincts which determine the tendency toward desired objects ought to be not only liberated, but also taken as natural guides. For that purpose, laws referring to the human being within each field of knowledge need to be examined in order to liberate human behavior from any hinderance that may prevent its realization. Following this logic, instincts as laws of nature do not require a moral *ought* which always is understood as an internal, absolute, irrational imperative which subdues humans as objects of the norm.

At the same time, in what may be called the objective logic of society, the enterprising sense of profit which controls the availability of goods and services, and the hedonism of individuals which demands the satisfaction of their needs and aspirations, shake hands. Given the malleability and the indeterminacy of individuals regarding the satisfaction of their aspirations, the fabulous technological capacity for programming, and the association of aspirations and consumer objects, hedonism and economics socially determine tastes, aspirations, ideals, desires and the images of men or women.

Thus, ever since the ruling criterion came to consist in the combination of economics and hedonism, and electronics became capable of shaping desires, projecting images, and domesticating sublime aspirations with almost unlimited efficacy, the subject has been left to some degree at the mercy of external stimuli with limited capacity for processing and evaluating one's inwardness.

To this we must add the logic of power domination -- that other formidable instinct -- by which superpowers and states develop a mighty capacity for manipulating and controlling humans. Economic resources, technology and the power to dominate, unite with a strength never before encountered. In not a few people, this promotes the logic of the impious in the second chapter of the book of Wisdom:

> We came into being by chance and afterwards shall be as though we had never been. For our days are the passing of a shadow, our end is without return, the seal is affixed and nobody comes back (Wisdom 2:2 and 5).

From which consideration of death is drawn the immediate hedonist conclusion:

> Come, then, let us enjoy the good things of today, let us use created things with the zest of youth: take our fill of the dearest wines and perfumes, on no account forgo the flowers of spring but crown ourselves with rosebuds before they wither, no meadow excluded from our orgy; let us leave the signs of our revelry everywhere, since this is our portion, this is our lot! (Wisdom 2:6-9)

For those who do not enter upon this way, there is offered the possibility of looking for other alternatives, but only provided that this logic of power and wealth, congruent with individual hedonism, is not altered.

It is not necessary to consider the destiny of the weak and retarded of the world, that is to say, of the three-fourths of humanity which do not possess power, wealth and technology:

> As for the upright man who is poor, let us oppress him; let us not spare the widow, nor respect old age, white-haired with many years. Let our might be the yardstick of right, since weakness argues its own (Wisdom 2:10-11).

The objective dynamics of our society cultivates, nourishes and exacerbates hedonism. While our society does not prohibit morality, it has downtrodden its basic supports without offering any other foundation. From here, amorality establishes itself as a criterion and immorality as a practice, so as to reach the conclusion: "Eat and drink that we shall die."[3]

The amoral contemporary world sees in its favor achievements in the production of goods and services, but by not considering the counterweight of morality it becomes immorality. Paradoxically, human liberation ends in the actual dehumanization of life. Such rationality ends in destruction and death.

In sum, the formidable adventure of *Logos* and *Eros* disconnected from the old guardians ends in *Thanatos* because the *Logos* developed by the Enlightenment and modernity is not *Agape*. It is not the biblical *Logos*, which gives absolute value to the person, but only the objectivizing part of knowledge. It is not intersubjective knowledge, which does not instrumentalize the other; such knowledge of the other and self-knowledge are given only as a gratuitous interpersonal gift.

MORALITY AS AFFIRMATION OF LIFE

We are convinced that today the conditions for moral education are deeply altered in relation to what they were forty or fifty years ago. A traditional moral education has few possibilities of inspiring anything new, nor has it the moral strength needed to humanize effectively the most diverse dimensions of life.

On the other hand, there is a growing conviction (contrary to initial expectations) that the culture of scientific technological rationalist modernity and omnipotent economicism does not bring about a development that may be viewed as leading to a humanizing progress. Many thinkers, from different ideological and philosophical perspectives, agree with Pope John Paul II in his encyclical *Solicitudo Rei Socialis*: "The panorama of the actual world, including the economic, instead of causing concern for a development which is genuinely human -- as the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* hoped -- is leading us more rapidly toward death".[4]

There are conditions under which the rebirth of a renewed morality may and must contribute to reorienting humanity's movement as a whole. It must offer new generations a life with meaning and with challenges for human growth which are worth living for. The following are some recommendations in this direction.

The Challenge of Amoral Knowledge

In the first place, it is necessary to take seriously all the possibilities for man produced by modern society and the different fields of scientific knowledge, technology and rational organization.

The pretension that these fields of knowledge by themselves tell us all there is to know about human behavior and about how man should use such knowledge appears unacceptable. All technological know-how, all forms of efficacious organization oriented to the production of proposed ends, should be reduced to their appropriate instrumental role, not converted into supreme laws of life.

One trend holds that instrumental rationality is in itself dominating and alienating. Certainly, human work, science, and social organization and interaction have maintained their role in overcoming natural resistances. This said, humanity's desirable ends are not achieved by the free and spontaneous development of the pleasure principle, for from that perspective we cannot deduce that oppression, alienation, and death are the fundamental signs of instrumental *Logos*. Habermas notes that scientific-technological reason has a great liberating potential provided that it be ordered by a superior *Logos*, which turns it into an instrument for the production of suitable living conditions for all persons.[5] For that reason it is necessary to develop a rationality which searches for the good, namely, the rationality of human communication, which affirms the other not as an instrument, but as a person: an affective loving communication based upon the sense of the person as gratuitous gift. These would seem to be two opposed rationalities, but they are not, although they are different and irreducible one to the other. We must set up the proper relationship between them within a new equilibrium. Young people need to imagine and visualize this utopia, and to find themselves in realizing it, although the surrounding environment does not encourage this.

Christians believe that the *Logos*, which understands the whole divine reality, is *Agape* or love. The center of the mystery of life is that *Logos-Agape* made itself flesh and set up its tent amongst us.[6] This is God's tenderness which is conveyed to us as a great joy and "good news" to all people. This is more valuable than all else for human beings. Here we are not talking about a God viewed reductively as ruler of the Universe, or as a guardian of heteronomous laws imposed on man from the outside -- one who is ready to punish severely anyone who disobeys his laws.

In God there is no contradiction between the rational *Logos* and the *Agape-Logos*, but this contradiction is found in human history. Humanity today enjoys a privileged moment for searching for a new morality with a new relationship between these components of the human condition. Christ is the "first-born of the whole creation."[7] The key to human liberation is the lordship of love, *Agape*, which does not annul *Logos* and *Eros*, but guides, orders and brings them to their plenitude. Amoral scientific knowledge offers the enhanced possibility of being good or bad. *Agape* saves this from its ambiguity and turns it into abundant life for everyone.

The Irreducible Moral Structure

Even in a society such as ours where at times the term `moral' may seem like a dirty word there is an unquestionable fact. In the person's identity, in the depth of one's being, there is a moral structure which calls one from the inside toward the good, the Supreme Good, as the horizon of one's identity and complete realization. Even in the most arid desert of an inhuman society or an immoral personal life, this inner source of morality never dries up. This is in accord with the utopian conviction that love is stronger than death, that to give one's life for the other, including for a foreigner, is to find it. Indeed, the establishment of a just and fraternal humanity

is the last transcendental word about man; it is a fire that never goes out. Within our being, at its constitutive depths, is *Love*. By the initiative of this original love, the creature comes forth and is called to humanize oneself, to become a person through love. "It is not that we have loved God, but that he first loved us and sent us his Son."[8]

It is this positive moral sense that must be nourished so as to unravel all its transforming possibilities in today's world. Before any other moral norm or instrumental handling of Christianity for the support of repressive realities -- whether social or personal -- or the legitimization of doubtful social, political and economic orders, the living of this reality must constitute the aim of all moral education.

From a Heteronomous to a Theonomous Morality via an Autonomous Morality

In a permissive, relativist, pluralist and changing society, there are not many supports for an heteronomous moral sensibility, for an external norm which is imposed unquestionably as an absolute value. Neither is this the morality of a humanity which aspires to adulthood. In St. Thomas's words: "The one who avoids evil, not because it is evil, but because he is commanded, is not free; but he who avoids it because it is evil, he is free."[9]

Autonomous morality, in which the individual looks to himself as the center of his decisions, appears as one of the supreme achievements of the modern world. But in the long run, such a morality has the tendency to make one's own subjectivity the law and supreme arbiter with catastrophic effects for human living and for the fullest sense of human life.

In morality there is always a transcendent and absolute value as affirmation of the person in relation to other persons. It is not subjection to the norm as norm, but rather the attraction of constituting oneself as a person in relation to other persons.[10] In theonomous morality, by going outside of ourselves, we affirm ourselves; affirming the other as another self, we discover ourselves. But this affirmation of the other is not obedience to an external norm, but love, interior tenderness, a gift which is realized in and with the other.

The absolute character of the ethical commandment consists in self-love and in love for the other. It is not a selfish act, but one in which we answer a call to affirm ourselves as a gift, as gratuitous relationship with the other. Theonomous morality is based upon transcendent love and the inner calling towards full realization in the personal encounter, in which the "I" finds himself with *Love*. Not every theistic morality is theonomous. A God perceived as a superior or external being that commands us, maintains controls over us, and punishes us whenever we do not obey him, is a God of heteronomous morality.

Theonomous morality conveys its meaning in the ecstasy in which God is perceived as highest being, plenitude and gift who in his tenderness accepts us as we are and, for that reason, makes us capable of transforming ourselves into a gift for others. The encounter with God is perceived as the encounter with our own identity. Every image is limited (God-father, God-mother, God-friend) but points to one reality: God as the supreme Good that concerns us absolutely because in that plenitude of love one affirms the plenitude and meaning of life. This, in turn, leads to the humanization, i.e., "domination," of the earth and affirming others -- every human being -- as we affirm ourselves.[11]

Hence in a theonomous morality, God is not perceived, primarily, as a being foreign to us, who has the power to command and impose his rules on us. In this context, God is not law, but Spirit which gives us the inspiration and strength to pursue the good. It is a gift conveyed to us

which makes us free to accept ourselves and to turn ourselves into a gift of tenderness and creativity for others. Theonomous morality is supported by the dynamics of *Agape*.

Before consideration of ourselves as atheists or not, as members of a church or not, there is the transcendent structure of the identity that constitutes us as persons, in which the Spirit makes present our vocation and moral life. "God is love and he who abides in love abides in God and God in him. There is no fear in love, but perfect love drives out fear for fear looks at punishment; he who fears has not reached the plenitude of love."[12]

St. Paul tells us that in heteronomous morality we are still slaves, or under age. Moral adulthood is received not from a law which orders what has to be done without providing the strength with which to do it. Rather, the Spirit communicates love. More than an extrinsic commandment, morality is an inner force which leads us to plenitude. This morality is neither heteronomous nor autonomous, but theonomous. A morality of *God as Love* conveyed to every person in the Spirit as a gift oriented to achieving its plenitude. Thus we understand morality "as dynamism which launches man toward his personal self-realization."[13]

The particular contents may vary according to the circumstances of space and time, but not the transcendent source of morality which never is sufficiently domesticated by any social determinant nor by immoral nor amoral life itself. This source of morality transcends all human reality. Its objectification requires reason, analysis, technique and organization in order to achieve a theonomous morality which is objectifiable and socially effective, not merely an arbitrary and inoperant sentiment.

From Logos-Eros-Thanatos to Agape-Logos-Eros

Modernity has separated *Logos* and rationality, but only in one of their senses: knowledge and instrumental reason. However, in theory and even in practice modernity has emphasized the part for the whole as if this were the whole of rationality, and as if the product of its historical praxis were capable of attaining human fulfillment. For example, in the universities all other forms of knowledge are excluded. But the Logos is person; it is knowledge-love-creation; logos is love. It is imperative to recover this integrity of the Logos. Scientific and technological reason is only one dimension of reason and attains its full and constructive sense to the degree that it is ordered by love. It is true that the human being in history needs to unfold the *Logos* in its different aspects and needs to distinguish different areas of knowledge. But this differentiation of our culture without a corresponding growth in the integration and humanization of the whole, threatens the whole with death. Law and science are not bad, but they must be assumed and ordered by love; they must be guided by free and responsible subjects. In this global sense, rationality is a synonym for humanity, and humanity means love rooted in God's love which is communicated to us.

Love-Agape has the peculiarity of affirming itself by affirming the other, by affirming what is different, not by denying or supplanting the other. For that reason, this transcendent love does not deny the other forms of knowledge or the other forms of love and of tendencies of the human being. It assumes, transforms and brings them to fulfillment. *Agape*, as the "movement which affirms the other without condition" assumes and affirms: *Libido* understood as the "movement of the needy toward that which meets its needs," *Philia* as the "movement of a fellow human to unite oneself with one's neighbor, and *Eros* as the "movement of what is minor in being toward what is higher."[14] *Agape* is realized among persons, joining the lover and the beloved by their wish for plenitude in communion. *Agape* among human beings includes *Libido*, *Philia* and *Eros*,

and God's love as present. But, also, in a sense there is a loving, contemplative relationship of communion with nature as well, a non-instrumental, non-dominating relationship that is in some way dialogical. Instrumental Western culture has suffocated this to the extent that ecocide is not a remote menace, but present in the lack of a loving relationship with nature that threatens humanity with total destruction.

The Personal and the Subjective: Molders of the Social and the Objective

The radical foundations of morality need to be nourished. For that purpose the family and society in general need to be strengthened. However, if contrary values prevail within a system which fosters only hedonist tendencies, they do not find this nourishment.

Within the present compartmentalization of life, it is not enough to have a special sector of society where those feelings might be developed. To permit and even prize a sort of inner haven so long as it does not transcend its limits so as to guide the economy, politics and human relations is not acceptable. Although those realities need their own autonomy, this is not true with human behavior. Transcendent morality is one and total; it is for all dimensions of human life, for all persons, and for all kinds of behavior -- it is *indivisible*. Morality does not refer to a desire for peace, justice and a certain abundance of necessary goods and services for one's own well-being as well as that of one's family. Whoever does not feel pain for the misery and scorn of half of humanity has never known morality.

The person's subjectivity -- the responsible and conscious subject -- must shape all the dimensions of life. It must transcend its inner world and private life so as to assume and shape the whole society without denying its own specificity. John Paul II says that the huge accumulation of goods and services produced by science and technology have not produced liberation:

> On the contrary, the experience of the last years demonstrates that if all this considerable amount of resources and potentialities offered to man is not directed by a moral objective and by a course oriented toward the true good of the human person, it may turn against humanity to oppress it.[15]

In this sense, it is necessary to break the barriers of different areas of human acting which acknowledge no orientations except those they themselves advocate in agreement with intrinsic laws useful to the achievement of their own ends.

If we are overwhelmed by the resistance of society's own dominant logic and take refuge in a moral shelter or small ghettos, we shall compromise the totalizing dynamism of the moral sense and deny the conditions for its existence. In the majority of cases, moral sensibility will die by social suffocation, and society will die for lack of this morality which comes from this inner sense of the person.

How does one achieve a morality that will not hinder the specifications of knowledge and social dynamics and develop them in such a way that the moral sense is not down, but instead is placed at the center of life and society?

Conditions of Possibility for a Postmodern Morality

The possibility of a postmodern morality is a complex topic. Starting from the notion that today the moral sense is a foreign land, there is, nonetheless, an increasing awareness of its urgent necessity. Therefore, I would like to end with a few notes concerning some conditions for its revitalization.

A positive moral sense needs community to nourish it with life; this will transform society, in turn, into a pleasant and meaningful reality. Perhaps it would be better to say that it needs communities which expand in concentric circles, starting from the family nucleus, until it transcends the wide world of the *polis*. This moral growth requires a public space for its realization without partisan segregation -- the good is not limited to only a few and should not be reduced to one or another area of reality, as would happen if one were to fight against drugs but not against political and economic corruption. The partial goods are not solidly sustained if they are accepted as a result of a mandate or because their contraries are ill-viewed by society. They are based upon vivid communication with the Supreme Good, apprehended in religio-ethical awareness which perceives Him as supreme gift, as Spirit that endows us with capabilities for the good. Such a God does not force us into submission by coercion and condemnation, but offers himself to us kindly in a spirit of service, as a gratuitous gift. In this way we must recover and make effective the moral dimension of life.

Universidad Católica Andrés Bello

NOTES

1. On the topic of rationality, see Max Weber, *Economy and Society*, I and II.
2. Cf. Luis Ugalde, "La racionalidad irracional de la sociedad post-industrial segun Jürgen Habermas," in O.E.S.E., *Valores, estructuras y sociedad* (Caracas: Fondo Editorial Común, 1974).
3. Isaiah 22:13; 1 Corinthians 15:32; Wisdom 2:7-9.
4. Cf. Mijail Gorbachov, *Perestroika*, no. 24 (Edit. Oveja Negra), pp. 9-10 and 22.
5. It might be of interest to see J. Habermas's books on this topic: *Theorie und Praxis, Techik und Wissenshaft als Ideologie, Erkenntnis und Interesse*.
6. John 11:14.
7. Colossians 1:15-20.
8. 1 John 4:18.
9. Aquinas, *In Epistolam II ad Corinthos,* III, Lect. III.
10. Cf., Paul Tillich, *Systematische Theologie* II, p. 186.
11. Genesis, 2:18, and 2:24.
12. 1 John 4:18.
13. E. López Azpitarte, *Praxis Cristiana*, I (Madrid: Ed. Paulinas, 1980), p. 274.
14. Since these terms are used with different meanings by authors, we have specified the sense we use here.
15. Encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, no. 28.

CHAPTER II
ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON CULTURE AND MORAL EDUCATION IN A CRITICAL ERA
JOSÉ LUIS VETHENCOURT

The discussion of morality in the last decades of the 20th century is the most urgent present problem confronted by philosophy, cultural anthropology and psychology. Ethics is now the only place where philosophy can be really creative; having gone through all the other possibilities of rational theory, only in ethics does it have something new to offer. To do so, however, philosophy must cease being too introspective and self-critical. For their part, cultural anthropology and psychology must overcome the positivism which has excluded matters of "value" and "meaning" and which make their descriptive, reductionistic and purely functional methods appear as aberrations. It has never been as necessary as it is now to have communication between moral philosophy, philosophical and cultural anthropology and psychology in order to clear up the confusion that reigns in the field of ethical precepts.

There is need for a universal ethic of justice and kindness between men in which the spiritual perfection of each human being can be achieved based upon a transcendental source of love. In other words, the love of a unique transcendent God demands the universal practice of an ethic of justice and love in the exercise of human freedom.

This ethic is not stoic, heteronomic, autonomous or humanistic. Nor is it a penitential ethic, for we suffer not as a punishment, but as a result of two realities. The first is the laws proper to material nature with its terrible randomness. The second can be called psychic nature which, through history, has constructed a world that induces all kinds of alienations, unfairness, lack of love, idolatry, envy, egoism, vengeance and finally, the negation of responsibility. All this leads to our being engaged in structures, functions and social systems which are closed in upon themselves. Hence, from the psychological point of view, moral education requires a clarification of the real origin of evil and suffering.

Further, the universal ethic of love, justice and peace is weakened by the fact that men seem not to need it. Daily, it is rejected practically by individuals and institutions; on the theoretical level it has been rejected by a great majority of philosophers as well as by scientific thinking. I will discuss some of these refusals, for when a universal ethic based upon love, justice, the affirmation of life and respect for the dignity of others crumbles due to being refused philosophically we are left with only rigid moral precepts, which mock morality; increasing narcissism and idolatry for technology; and democracy as a fight for radical changes of the dominant and unfair economic structures, and a struggle for freedom and human rights.

PARTIAL OR SECTORAL ETHICS

The rejection of moral obligations based on the spirit brings a partial or divided ethics proper to a limited vision and a logic of its own sector; these are closed ethics, like those described by Bergson, which live in contradiction. But even the closed morals described by Bergson which always had a religious facet differ from the partial ethics of today which remind us of what Anna Karina wrote of the pre-columbine tribes: "only the Caribe is man": only my fellow policemen, the members of my company, or the followers of my religion are human. Purely functional and merely utilitarian ethics have shifted attention from what is good or bad for

all, to what is convenient for my company, ethnic organization or nation -- everything that is not convenient is bad.

The theoric refusal of the capacity of persons for internal freedom, substitutes moral obligations upon free and responsible persons by the auto-regulation of an individual system. Then self-direction by the individual is demanded in the place of self-determination with the result that ethics becomes merely operational, functional and utilitarian. Rarely, however, is a person absolutely enclosed in but one economic, political or social structure; what is self-regulated may be closed in upon itself, but it must function in two or more structures. Then, there appears the phenomenon of the perfectly conscious ethic which permits the individual to identify simultaneously with two or more operant ethical codes. Sometime the same person functions as a member of a cruel organization and at the same time belongs to a wider social group which demands kind and considerate behavior. This great contradiction seems well tolerated, with no apparent internal conflict.

The contradiction between positivism's criticism of the possibility of internal freedom or responsibility on the part of the person, and its insistence upon external freedom, license, absolute autonomy and upon transcending good and evil is solved apparently by the regulation imposed upon the individual for the good of the operation of the system. But these purely psychological systems, for lack of a frame of superior ethical values, permit a broad array of possible conduct responding to the different conceptions of life according to various psychotherapeutic schools.

Western societies today, whether developed or not, are characterized by a phenomenon that is not new in the history of humankind, but recently is acquiring a more terrifying character, namely, the many merely operative and functional rationalities that have divided the social world. Cold logic disintegrates the notion of humanity so that the general unity of human, social and cultural life disappears within a series of subsystems, each with their concrete goal. At heart these sectors work with cynicism and a total lack of scruples. Another study would be needed in order to comment upon and define in detail the characteristics of some of their rationales. For now we can only list them: the logic of money, the logic of the political party, the penal process, preparation for war, multinational corporations, etc. As can easily be understood, humanitarian ethics is almost empty, becoming seemingly unreal, abstract and sentimental. From these sectorial perspectives there is no general duty for mankind, nor any global commitment -- functional ethics alone is possible, its only purpose being a more efficient system whose subsystems possess their own secret rewards.

Some historical factors supposed to influence actual cultural attitudes regarding morality include the following: a) the tremendous political and economic abuses against people in the name of religion or of Christian morality, b) the rise of humanism, technology and science, c) the struggle for political freedom, d) the excessively negative traditional ethic, e) the degradation of ethics, and f) science and technology.

STAGES OF ETHICAL AWARENESS

Penal Ethics

The ethical ideal of Christianity today faces two great difficulties. The first involves two negations of transcendental morals: one philosophical and aesthetic, the other pragmatic. The other great difficulty resides in the absence or weakness of the strength necessary for superior

and universal moral conduct. We must reflect on this second difficulty because it entails the principal moral problems in our world.

We know that a sense of "ought" (that one ought to do this or that) forms part of a human being; along with knowledge it is the immediate distinctive characteristic of humankind, and any human action which is not purely physiological implies some sense of "ought." This is shown in many ways: as wanting to have, wanting to change, and as duty in regard to others and oneself. In other words, the feeling of "ought" is the contrary of an entity being closed in its own compact being. Any behavior which refers to moral duty necessarily restricts the determined tendencies and needs of the individual. There is no moral without restriction imposed either from the outside or from within. In both cases, the source from which the restriction arises is always supra-individual. Two great sources of moral restriction exist; one obliging and the other attracting. The first one is manifested as a strength that pushes the individual to behave in a determined manner -- or else! Its strength comes from the punishment of any infringement: it is a moral identified with the objective justice of a penal law, with its prescriptions and rules, whether written or not. It is then a penal moral whose main objective is the survival of the group.

Morals of Aesthetics or of Style

Having obtained penal justice for survival and for minimal association between equals and unequals, with properly urban life and its civilized refinements the luxuries of life in society appeared. With them come manners and style so that a certain degree of ritual becomes necessary. In the majority of ancient societies, ruled by one or more superior castes, these manners, styles and rituals quickly became immoderate in ostentatious luxury and richness so that even religious life was strongly shaped according to the style of the caste. It is possible that in these caste societies aristocratic mores which in their beginning had an ethical character were quickly absorbed by no less demanding aesthetic rules. As the ethical precept disappeared the demands of a more refined aesthetic level came to dominate.

But there were at least two societies in which this typically decadent process was stopped or kept under control for many centuries, namely, Greece and Rome. The Greeks had humanistic ethical concerns which in the end became purely aesthetic categories. Concretely, in the 6th century (BC) in Athens a humanistic ethic appeared, the real source of whose power was the "polis." "Arete" acquired an ethical sense as did the "sophrosine," the avoidance of the "pleonexia," self-dominion, austerity and "economy" by the practice of "askesis." All these were to tend toward a mean or middle point avoiding "stasis" in a city full of economic problems and proud people. Obviously this moral for living together always transforms itself into a kind of aesthetics of ethics and later gives birth to the appearance of living on an aesthetic level, completely free of properly ethical duties. The moral tone then becomes that of an aesthetic custom; in these sectors of life "good" and "bad" disappear, appearing rather as good and bad taste.

When applied to our times this absorption of the ethical by the aesthetic hides unexpressed moral concerns behind the aesthetic worries which are permitted to appear. Also, for an increasing number of people, besides the fear of committing crimes, the only thing which rules their normal behavior are the ethical precepts implicit in a certain mode of life -- or life style. This means living for appearances. Humanistic morals then convert into an ethic of elegance and instead of their intrinsic value, acts are praised by such phrases as: "a noble act," "a beau geste";

on the contrary, unless it be a crime, we usually do not say that it is a bad act, but that it was unkind or inelegant. This is the moral practice of elegance; it is only a question of style.

It cannot be denied of Greek humanism, however, that it invented political democracy. This, too, has come with the humanism of Western modernity which, despite its great and inevitable stumbles, has given us as its fruit political democracy and universal human rights. Democracy demands an ideal, and this ideal is moral in nature.

Attraction and Superior Justice

Besides these morals of survival or of life with a minimal of social order, and of sacred duties towards the gods, the hierarchy of the church, high political authorities and groups in economic power, from another source there appears another moral order in terms of new and more strict justice. This is the moral of attraction, contrary in principle to that of obligation by which one is pushed to fulfill a determined duty. In this new moral a person is attracted by an object or situation of superior joy that must be reached freely by refusing the enjoyment of objects or situations which are lesser in this regard. This implies a more demanding justice, a love for others strengthened by a universal source of love and a sense of the fulfillment and realization of each person. This moral of attraction is not a matter of forcing one's way towards what is loved; rather, it pursues an ideal justice of respect and love based on ascending towards a superior sphere of perfection that is desirable for all men. Hence, Christian civilization implies a sense of sin and subjective guilt, for the moral of attraction demands a refusal of certain legal pleasures. This is why the Christian ethic speaks of restrictions upon sexuality, pride, power, riches and many other things.

It is very difficult to talk about how and why the kindly appeal to a superior and free moral conduct has been accompanied in history by a special kind of excessively authoritarian subjection. This is similar to secular penal justice, which in many cases transforms subjective guilt and spiritual punishment into objective guilt and purely social and penal punishment (e.g., the inquisition and its much regretted excesses). Worse than anything, the temporal powers took over the implications of moral attraction which they converted into penal obligations, confusing the name of a loving God, punishment of the people and the excesses of political and economic powers.

It is difficult to be fair to the Catholic Church in this matter. Was it necessary that the appeals of Christ to purify the soul be converted into judicial orders -- perhaps, yes. Was it necessary that the precepts of the Church were converted into a penitential system emphasizing the fear of eternal punishment given by an angry God -- perhaps, yes. It is possible that only few were initiated into a religion of love for an entirely transcendental God, that these people would feel an irresistible passion to give people the way to salvation, and that their impatience could drive them to impose what should have been a spontaneous moral arising from numerous enlightening and inspiring experiences.

We cannot suppose that the source of a moral which by free decision discards certain enjoyments to prepare the soul for salvation as a loving union with God can be found in the experience of offense and punishment. The punishment is given to man by himself in order that he be capable of salvific union. Remaining alone, incomplete and lost in one's own labyrinth of commitments is very different from eternal revenge from God. Mortal sin is the kind of act which does not allow our internal transformation and closes us more and more in egocentric and psychic habits which take us far from God and leave us in the most complete loneliness.

Let us return once more to the urgent problem of how the morals of attraction has been contaminated by a morals of compulsion. The search for explanations takes us back to the religions before Christianity: to national religions in which the gods held positions in their systems of penal justice. These cosmic gods, at times fearful and arbitrary, were behind the established powers (clergy, hierarchy, monarchy, etc.), imposing their morals of survival, living and domination; these gods were absolute executions of punishment. It is not easy to rid oneself of this feeling of primitive religion which is mixed with the duty of survival, internal order and growth on the part of the group, city, nation and empire. A religion of love can be contaminated by psychic immersion in those primitive religions. Above all, the temporal powers will try to use it, thereby confusing a God of justice derived from love with a penitential God at the service of the most powerful.

In the church there always has been and still continues a struggle to rescue the life of religion and its superior morals from the hands of those secular structures of domination. However, in the name of Christ the temporal power of the Church, as well as the secular economic and political powers, fell more and more into a moral of domination that is precisely its contrary. Wherever it appears this moral of domination creates material conditions of life which greatly compromise the disposition to a superior spiritual life. From the beginning the conflict between those two moral attitudes broke down the heart of Christianity.

At the same time Christianity with its insistence upon the individual self with its liberty and ethical responsibility, when combined with desacrilization, provided ideal conditions for the development of self-consciousness, critical thought and scientific knowledge. It was not easy to oppose ascetism and erase the difference between the secular and the religious. However, this developed and became more and more organized until the establishment of humanism. At first this was parallel to, and in a way conditioned by, the religious; then it became independent; lastly, armed with science and a philosophical epistemology it entered into open war upon religion. In the history of man this humanism manifests a more logical and powerful character than that of classical Greece or Rome. It produced all the revolutions we know in the Christian West, and broke down the powerful and authoritarian church and the aristocratic class. This breakdown of the authority principle, which had emphasized a socialized moral of domination and suggested the image of a mediocre and unfair God, meant for many the death of God. Hence, the West found need for a universal humanistic ethic.

The impact of this has been horrible, for it has meant that any humanism is a good substitute for the superior justice ethic based upon the universal love of man for God. To fill the emptiness produced by the weakening of the Christian ideal people have turned to science and technology so that we now live in a techno-industrial civilization. Humanism fails to provide a rational ethic because its sphere is by definition rationalized, and not rational. Thus, ethics depends upon a stoic attitude, and values conceived in this way are like car batteries which work while new but run down and have a short life. There appear the theme of fanatical nationalisms, the theme of progress, the totalitarian state, the mystic of a superior race and the ethic of pure science. Today the aesthetic attitude through which many sought to justify life seems to be looking upon "nature" as a mystical sphere, even considering earth as a personal divinity at the same time that the Eastern mystical search for the absolute appears to have broken down due to narcissism. Today, the plastic arts, poetry literature, philosophy and even science look fundamentally to one another; there is a weak sense of immanence, but none can give what they do not have. Meanwhile, the majority are left in great confusion between contradictory morals without

knowing what to do and, in general, spiritually too weak to confront the limits of their existence: to these peoples technological progress seems the only compensation.

When we talk about the great present-day crisis of morals and of the sense of life, it is important not to exaggerate the negative, nor to forget the positive. Thus, the work of the humanist and the anti-religious rebel remains important for the complex and exhausted world in which we live. For example, despite some consequences, political democracy, the revolutionary positions of Marxism's naturalistic ethic and such political and economic ideals as a sense of justice have done much for mankind in our time. Indeed, they are the only obstacle to a complete human mutation to a limited technological rationality.

The major goal of our analysis of this situation is to clarify what is distinctive of the ethical attitude and conduct of our time. Always there has been economic injustice, violence, abuse of power and immorality. What is really characteristic of our problems is that veneration of technology and compulsive consumption have become the most powerful rivals of spiritual development and its corresponding moral. Technology has overshadowed morality. The absolute dependence of human life upon technology imposes its own rationality, its own forms of life and ethics. Big changes are required in order to achieve spiritual and psychological independence from the need for and the enjoyment of human products. The relation between the products of technology and us has become one almost of companionship and the possession of those products is a matter of social prestige for those who possess them. Inhabitants of big cities personalize such objects as a substitute for weak and mediocre human contacts.

All these factors lead to a compulsive narcissism as a way to evade or escape reality. Psychoanalysts tell us that a little narcissism is necessary for proper human development, but that beyond that point it becomes highly destructive as men become highly egocentric. In products of technology they find automatic satisfaction without danger of negation. For the narcissist who considers those things to be projections of him or herself in a world full of injustice and loneliness, technological narcissism becomes a solution.

Specific characteristics of the present cultural life are then: the use of technology just described, incompatible morals lived without apparent conflict, the partial logic of money and its power and the sexual revolution. Within the individual there remains only the automatic and primitive moral imposed by the Super-ego; outside there is the penal justice of survival and convenience. There begin to disappear little by little self-domination, fidelity to one's word, decency and truthfulness in speech, mutual respect and, lastly, urbanity.

PROBLEMS FOR MORALS IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE

Psychotherapies and Ethics

The "ego" is an historical phenomenon due probably to the restructuring of the psyche produced by Christianity and later by post-Renaissance humanism. The original rationalist self-consciousness of philosophical thought reflected the aristocratic class of Athens. The strong spiritual force of Christianity provoked a notable psychic reordering that reflected the death of a series of obsolete structures in the social-cultural area and the probable repression of related psychic contents, leading to a series of forms of physical life -- some beautiful, others horrible -- related to socio-cultural absolutes.

The relatively lonely, self-sufficient and self-conscious "I" comes probably from a series of socio-cultural repressions. Over the "I" there was the "super-ego," a psychic control which Freud

described as "that" (the concept is actually in decadence), automatic, rigid, stupid and unconscious. From such a psychic situation with a similar correlation of unstable forces contemporary psychology and psychotherapy arose. They try to establish an equilibrium of the "ego" avoiding possible destruction by the unconscious from automatic moral regulations. Today psychotherapists leave completely aside ethical considerations, which at times they contradict. Though some hold the necessity of morals, they do not apply it. Psychotherapeutic techniques originated in the 18th century and made it possible to uncover the existence of an unconscious psychic zone charged with tension and deeply depressed by unconscious forces. Because such forces have moral connotations, which psychoanalysis had related to the cruel "super-ego," a serious ethics for the "ego" was placed under the automatic operation of the "super-ego," forgetting that the "ego" could have certain thoughts which were totally immoral, and even at times criminal.

Through psychotherapy the "ego" can be controlled and achieve an equilibrium. Psychotherapists help individuals deal with depression, cultural restrictions from the past, and the cultural alteration of love. They deal also with technological influences which for lack of love, provoke a rigid and tyrannical attitude in personal consciousness and intensify the law of the jungle in the unconscious. All this causes psychic changes and illness. Often instincts are perverted or weakened due to a lack of love resulting from moral confusion in the dedication of mothers and fathers to their function as educators.

However, psychotherapists believe that the equilibrium of the psychic system of the individual is enough for the balance and the behavior of the person. They speak not about duties, but about equilibrium or balance. Freud emphasizes as an example genital maturity as the automatic regulator; the highest point that one can achieve in love or work is the reduction of any cruel tendencies and self-direction. Though in his theory Freud discounted morals, in his life and practice he was a moralist, considering uncontrolled sexual liberty to be due to the presence of cruel instincts.

However, in these days there appear a series of psychotherapies built upon the notion that sexual impulses and tendencies to greed are irresistible. Psychotherapies generally allow persons to do almost anything to "satisfy themselves," except criminal acts which may be punished. These types of psychotherapies give great importance to the body. Other psychotherapies are not that permissive. Some are more exigent regarding self-control. This poses a very interesting ethical problem inasmuch as sacrifice and abnegation for each other often are defined as immature and cruel psychic games.

We are used to seeing morality used as an iron mask for compulsive goodness, masochism and sacrifices which keep the individual from interior peace and self-determination. Nevertheless, such things do not justify defining all abnegation, giving and sacrifice as neurotic. What is important is to see if there is a free will behind such conduct. Where the behavior of the individual is rigid we may say that it is neurotic; when such behavior is not accompanied in the individual by a clear consciousness of his or her capability and wishes there is a neurosis. Depression appears in defense of destructive impulses; when such reactions do not exist there is a free will.

Lately some psychotherapeutic theories take account of what are called "altered states of consciousness," proposing a psychotherapy "beyond the `ego'." Two months before dying Freud wrote this phrase: "Mysticism: that Kingdom located further than the I, and the that."

Moralism and Morality

For many people in the Western world any moral precept or invocation of moral duties has become extremely unpopular, especially when it touches upon their private conduct. In general morality is required of major officials in public affairs. In some countries people expect also a correct attitude in private sexual life. In general, in the public domain we expect a traditional ethical behavior, but in private we refuse any absolute morals, allowing for the co-existence of several opposite ethics according to the socio-cultural structures. There are crimes, but not sins; there is confusion about ethics relating to erotic behavior, but no doubt about the amorality in commercial transactions: both moralist and anti-moralist agree that no sin is possible in the economic field.

Let us attempt now to define moralism. It would seem that moralism is restrictive due to the fact that moralists attack sexually uncontrolled acts in relation to the family, while being less concerned for people who undergo economic hardship. In fact, the ethical bond which allows the moralist to criticize determined moral infractions in others condemns their not exercising this power over those committing economic infractions. Besides being restrictive and preferential, moralistic ethics is basically penitential. Sometimes the moralist is severe because he projects his own unconscious behavior. In conclusion it is very easy to become a moralist: first of all one frees from guilt the immoral part of one's own conduct and that of his class, then one focuses upon any immoral act or behavior by those he considers to be different.

Humanism and Moral

Morals as a specific area of the philosophical and anthropological thought seems to have appeared in the Christian West in the 18th century with such questions as: to be or not to be moral; which moral should one follow; is there a natural moral love? Certainly this has to do with the breakdown of the powerful religious environment. The same thing happened in classical Greece where the increasing power of humanism brought a need to strengthen ethical principles with the help of philosophy. Socrates was the first philosopher to see moral as something upon which one can and must reflect. Before that time rules for correct conduct were a direct consequence of the religious duties to the gods. Aristotle felt obliged to write two books about ethics as conceptual philosophical shields against the deteriorating conditions of human existence. It is very difficult to imagine a Greek citizen doubting whether there should be a moral or which ethic to choose. His doubts on this subject probably concerned whether or not to obey a moral precept, never the validity of norms opposed to his wishes.

Today, men find themselves in a totally different position. In human history we find a series of socio-cultural absolutes which confirm human existence. In the past these were based on myths of the tribe or clan, from which were derived the necessary minimal rules of survival and life with others. The Christian West also had socio-cultural absolutes whose weakening entailed theoretical and practical problems for morals. The reasons are similar to those of civilizations in the past. The weakening of monarchies, the appearance of classes, along with the development of technologies led to a gradual weakening of absolutes in favor of liberalism. With the breakdown of absolutes the alternatives have not been sufficient for secular humanism to ground an ethics. With the loss or in some cases, the weakening of their authority, religious, urban, philosophical and family principles have not been successful in withstanding opposition to all kinds of rigid ethical order. There is a tendency toward total moral relativism. With the lack in many people of

any religious inspiration, the only moral which survives is the penitential one which secures survival and the minimum of community indispensable for some functioning of social life.

People today are very worried concerning the great existential crises: How to reorganize the economy so as to cause the poor less suffering, how to diminish the cruel socio-economical differences between classes. What moral education will enable people to face today's problem and those of the future? Technology cannot give the answer to these questions. People will have to believe more in law and brotherhood; they must sacrifice their useless and expensive goods in order to share with the poor; they must experience something transcendent.

Pure humanism can attempt to solve some of these difficult problems; but it lacks completely the strength to help with the liberation of the people, for it has no ethic or moral to follow: confusion is the word of the day. People need a stronger ethic to defend themselves from those who abuse their power in the sexual, political and socio-economic areas. While people tend to regret the disappearance of socio-economical absolutes, they forget that that emptiness can be filled with the first important step towards transcendence.

In conclusion: people would consider a moral prohibition to be fake, silly, useless or irrational; especially in powerful countries where ethics and moralities have been replaced by the "system" structured so as to achieve their own narcissist goods.

The following are the characteristics of a contemporary ethics:

- External subjection to penal law due to the law being made more fair and to the growing process of depenalization achieved by democratic humanism.
- Accelerated processes of social and economic criminal organization creating a separate world with its own hierarchy, political, social and economic influence which competes with the world of law, moral and ethics.
- Excessive freedom in sexual matters.
- Disregard of moral codes.
- Exchange of moral for operational codes according to the requirements of the system.
- Failure of humanism to develop a moral of attraction.

All these can be found in the present moral situation which, being unsatisfactory, can make possible an opening for love, justice and peace between individuals.

Family and the Autonomous Youth Culture

There have been basic rules for interaction between the young and adults in the nuclear family. Perhaps the only exception is found in poor families which have been weakening for at least fifty years. Earlier rules for relations of authority and obedience between parents and children are transmitted by the family.

Some families, due to the high cost of living, must live in marginal areas but still retain an acceptable level of economic culture. In Venezuela the great problem of marginalization plus the lack of ethics among the higher classes could make one believe that the family is losing its function as a transmitter of culture. The middle classes, however, retain a certain level of stability and coherence.

Venezuelan society can be described by the following characteristics: social divisions, corruption, acceptance of economic crime, ethical contradictions, crime by white collar workers, lack of education, etc. It is worse still for the underclass lacking identity, order or education,

frustrated and angry, facing strong job competition and difficulty in entering schools which provide superior education.

Living in these conditions, youth usually have abnormal behavior characterized by visible and lasting anger. Children accustomed to a lack of love during their primary education, on the secondary level turn to violence and amorality, and end up becoming part of the marginal group. These are extremely narcissistic with a pervasive lack of moral or rational principles. Not believing in politics, they become anti-political or part of a gang. Their families are characterized by suffering, martyred mothers and a broken-down fathers. The educational plans of government institutions collapse.

After World War II there was a universal change in Western societies. Morals and ethics began to become confused for several reasons: a) criminal tendencies of youths in the U.S. and Europe, b) delinquency and crime by alienated rebels, c) earlier the hippie movement, and now d) drugs.

The youth revolution has taken over the industrial revolution: the big cities are there to be occupied and enjoyed by the young; cars and motorcycles are their symbols; and the products of technology (the electric sound, TV, and computers) abound. The women's and sexual revolutions contradicted the image of the father as an archetype. The principal problem is change at the political, social or economic levels and whether the young fight against it or in favor of it. This opens a question for the future: in what kind of society will we live when our children become parents? Will it be one with a strong sense of family and close relations, one of computerized pornography and sexual freedom, or will man's place be taken over by machines?

The characteristics of the present-day youth culture might be listed as follows:

(1) the tendency to draw closely together, to be satisfied with their achievements and uninterested in the history and politics of their society. The tendency of Venezuelan youth to be apolitical, as noted by Ramon Velasquez in the newspaper *El Nacional*, appears to be worldwide. After the 1968 riots in Paris and the political explosion of North American youth against the Vietnam war, political interest by the youth of the most developed countries has declined. In Venezuela college students abandon political ideals and the goal of changing the world and its socio-economical structures, which historically had been characteristic of students. Today they have a pragmatic preoccupation: they want to assure a more stable socio-economy which day by day becomes more difficult and competitive. Political interest is more local and concrete, limited to particular neighborhoods. It is difficult to make of youth, not a period of transition, but a goal in life. This is the first time in history when youth have had a consciousness of themselves and their values. It tries to interpret the world and life out of its own experience, without drawing upon the vital experience and concepts of older generations.

(2) Technology. There is a great fascination with machines, motorcycles, cars, music, stereos, computers, etc. Attacks against computer exhibitions did not last; many now want to own them and are very capable in running them; many more are attracted by their usefulness.

(3) A decay in language: the reduction in reading in favor of television decreases the critical power of the imagination and converts young people into passive receivers of information.

(4) The possession of extensive concrete practical information about sex, drugs, pornography and machine management.

(5) The change of fashion every five years.

(6) The wish to live adolescence as an end in itself, not as a transitory stage. However, there is an incongruity here. The criminologist, Professor Lopez Rey, holds that the communication

media generates a precocious intellectual and sexual maturity which causes economic and professional immaturity as youth become more economically dependent upon their parents.

(7) The influence of such oriental religions as Buddhism.

(8) The close relationship of youth culture and rock music, dancing and drugs.

(9) Sexual freedom and the frequency of transitory and erratic unions without love.

The youth "revolution" is not simple and one-sided; like every social event it is complex and multifaceted. For example, not all adolescents are affected to the same degree by the immorality mentioned above. Our theory is that if a youth grows in a stable family environment, then the possibilities of falling into immoral acts are more remote. If the family is not stable or strong enough to offer the youth security, then children go in search of something that might provide this.

The juvenile environment is fundamentally hedonistic; it requires space, parties, cars, clothes and education which not all families can afford. This causes conflict between the youth and his or her family when it cannot afford or keep up with their consumer demands. If the youth has become a dependent consumer, he may reject familiar ethical values as well as a strong environment, which later may lead to the use of drugs, crime or even suicide.

The contemporary youth atmosphere is a potent rival of traditional family life and its internal hierarchy. Egocentric or immoral parents sometimes are not strong enough to tell their children what to do, thus inducing great insecurity in adolescents. On the other hand, if the family is lovable, respectful and moral, without suggesting weakness, the education and protection of the children becomes easier, not only for the parents but also for school and society.

This can happen only through well-defined communication, for the goal is not to change the music or to make computers disappear, but to keep all within basic ethical principles.

Another important aspect of group formation in the new generation of families is its mental health. Where the children are protected we find three developing human phenomena: richness and variety of nuclear identification; diminution of primary impulses, and lastly sublimation through adequate stimuli and the vivid values.

The moment has come to decide whether the revolution in youth culture will be characterized by a dissolution of man or by the survival of the principles of life.

CHAPTER III

MORAL EDUCATION AND THE CHALLENGE OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: An Interdisciplinary Perspective

LUIS CASTRO LEYVA

INTRODUCTION

The subject of our study places the future of morality and science on the line, for the challenge of the 21st century threaten to be one of learning how to survive in a world without morality, in the midst of a developing relation of transitivity between the general and the social sciences. It may be convenient to qualify the treatment of this topic by considering the "common ground" on which we can currently agree.[1]

It is perfectly possible to ask ourselves if we do not already live in an amoral world. This question would have been strange two hundred years ago. Today it is possible, but not completely true, at least in Venezuela. It is more true to say that we live in an immoral world.

Amorality,[2] as understood here presupposes a series of conditions which may be summarized as follows: (1) human beings would conduct their lives in such wise as to render intentionality absolutely superfluous and, with it, the concepts of responsibility and guilt; (2) human beings would not be considered substantially different from animals except in their degrees of symbolic abstraction; (3) becoming increasingly irrelevant, the distinctions between the externality and internality of actions, passions, and feelings would disappear; and (4) human beings would understand themselves as causally responsible for themselves such that the question concerning our duties becomes worthless. In reality it is quite inconceivable to take amorality seriously as a *human* possibility.[3]

But lest we situate ourselves entirely within the vegetative and animal kingdoms, it is more realistic to speak of immorality, for there is much more immorality in the world than amorality. The problem of immorality is tied to the general problem of the intelligibility and the practicality of morality. In this respect morality is possible and real because it is realizable. However much immorality there may be in our world, its existence, at least intellectually, is a practical consequence tied to the idea that it is possible to act morally; indeed that it is possible to turn from immorality to a state of morality.

The question then is not whether there will be morality in the future, but, more properly, how will the morality of the future develop with respect to the 'immorality' that we have today? The scientific question considered from an interdisciplinary view does not appear any less complex.

If the predicate "scientific" is still associated, especially in the social sciences,[4] with the extension of causality and explanation so as to include areas once considered the proper domain of morality, one may dream with absolute disenchantment of the exercise of the will in relation to the possibilities of human actions and passions.[5] A world totally causal and explainable and, par excellence, describable, would be a world without cognitive mysteries. The public domain or the objectivity of the motives for our actions, and the causal structure of our anemic states, would make our behaviors "programmable." Our futures would be neither possible nor individual, but simply necessary.

On the other hand, the transitivity between one and the other kingdom of causality, which is what an interdisciplinary focus proposes, would lead one to recommend as heuristically and

methodologically efficient two conceptual possibilities for the future of morality: its suppression or restriction. Thus, one can imagine that the decisions pertinent to what should be done would come gradually to be substituted by answers referring to the change of what should be: one can only do what can be done. The idea of suppressing morality suggests the advent and consequent acceptance of a determinism or conversely the death of liberty.[6]

Perhaps, the acceptance or not of the possibility of continuing with the illusion that one is agent and not process might be the only thing left to call moral. But even such an acceptance -- of doubtful consolation -- would not have serious problems either of predictability and even less of practicality. Again, for now, the construction of a world where there is no history, but only necessity makes heuristically and realistically little sense. For this reason, as in the case of the possibility of amorality, it is more plausible to imagine a future world immorally living today's morality or morally living that same immorality and initiating with it a new system of values.

However, the future of morality and science depends on their past, which focuses on the issue concerning the conceptual and rational significance of both. In effect, what is debated is the process of moral evaluation in contrast with modernity. Today there is a 'traditional' backlash that in the name of history accuses and condemns -- without further consideration -- modernity and, especially, the Enlightenment. This phenomenon is quite extensive in the contemporary process of political philosophy and ethics.

The possibility of a lack of historical significance on this matter, means that we will live as now, deeply immersed in the profundity of our *akrasia*.[7] This is to say that we will continue obeying the force of lower passions that lead us to diverse ways of misjudging our relations with morality and consequently with practice and its reason.

Passions are not necessarily predictable. There is no reference to the obvious orientations that we share with all of the West (hedonism, mercantilism, sensualism, etc.). What is at issue here are those passions that, in relation to the emotions, have configured the morality of our immorality and hypocrisy, to the point that passions have without success tried to substitute for the Catholic moral education of our colonial tradition.

What I want to suggest is mediately historical. The future of morality as a problem and its relation with the future of the social sciences depend necessarily on an adequate understanding -- from our present -- of the moral past that we had.

In order to accomplish this aim, we will proceed as follows: (1) we will analyze the conception of morality as understood in terms of an empire of monarchy and fidelity, in other words, the analysis of moral-patriarchalism;[8] (2) we will examine the advent of civic education and its bankrupt attempt at "secularization"; and (3) we will formulate a number of reflections concerning the philosophical power of the present to face the questions for those futures that for now are only imaginable.

A MORAL CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Q: What is faith?
A: A light and supernatural knowledge by which without seeing we believe in what God tells us, what the Church proposes.
Q: Do you see that God is Trinity and one, how Christ is God and man?
A: No, but I believe it more than if I could see it.
Q: Why are you so sure?

A: Because God says it and the Church proposes it.

Geronimo Ripolda, S.J., Short Exposition of Christian Doctrine (Antonio Sanz, 1757).

Why return 100 years; why return to 1810? Are we such admirers of that national episode; is this the best way to respond to the challenge of the 21st century? These questions can be answered if we think about the strength of our prejudices over our beliefs. That moment, still alive in our official or public imagination is considered crucial for it is the starting point for the development of our moral imagination.

We have imagined that by blood and fire we become independent, that we first became independent of the superstition of God and of obedience as a proper category of political action; that we stopped being servants. Clearly, this is just an illusion, but still it is a fundamental one. At that time the language of the era or the idiom of serving considered these preoccupations as hallucinations. This is not trivial for hallucinations as critique, which are characteristic of a mentality of revolt (today we would called it "revolutionary"), indicates that the terrain in which a substantial part of the confrontation takes place is the dominion of *beliefs* rather than of the nature of things (ontology).

One who hallucinates sees what does not exist. That is the product of the imagination and, more specifically, of a type of activity that emanates from it with a creative and destructive power: fantasy. Now, in order for fantasy by means of the imagination to result in an hallucination, some things have to occur: first, the imagination has to be activated; secondly, this activation has to be caused by the "machine" stimulated by powerful passions; thirdly these passions have to be inclined to action rather than, for example, to a melancholic state; fourth, the excitability and elevation that they cause must be so powerful as to confuse, blind or impede the power of reason to control them. Such conditions are enough for fantasy to operate as an hallucination with its concomitant effects, namely, to negate the nature of what is and, hence, of what should be.

If we suppose a difference between belief and knowledge, and accept that the difference consists in the place that we give to the role of proofs and inference, we would be in position to assist the ambience of confrontation as it relates to the concept of trust and faith.

The believer in God of those times accepted as part of that belief *loyalty* as a condition of his moral existence, and therefore of his political and economic existence. Of course this brings about a series of concentric obligations and corresponding powers: the life of the faithful believer is God's, that of the faithful vassal the King's, that of the faithful son the father's; that of the faithful servant the Lord's, etc.

The scheme of all these obligations is properly termed patriarchalistic by Locke. Whatever that means in Venezuela, the truth is that it conceives and derives its social strength from the general power of faith, an intellectual and affective phenomenon proper to the concept of belief. This means that the administration of "ignorance" was an active part of the process of judging and believing: truth or falsehood may be said, but we believe in a truth that we ignore.

Ignorance and the ignorant should be raised for obedience and within obedience. Seduction for sin by means of the imagination represented the greatest danger against *belief* as a form of domination and conscious obligation. And since the imagination depends on the passions for the perpetuation of belief as the cohesive framework of the world, it should be guided by reason before the attack of the passions. It was the consciousness of the propriety of such dominion that gave meaning to that mode of belief that governed patriarchalism as a system of the world.

It is well-known that the first lessons of primary schooling were the catechism. It is also well-known that it had to be memorized. It is equally a fact that the age of (Christian) reason started at age seven. In this way memory emerged as crucial. What we need to know now is in which sense and with what objectives.

Memory is important for shaping the future of practical reason since it is attached to the development of the subject and his soul. The aim is to invert, among other things, the fundamental fear with the existence of two ideas of evil: the relative and the absolute. It also illustrates the need to love God within the abyss of puerile ignorance.

It is known that evil exists. One learns to fear evil indeterminately. That indetermination, united to the constitution of obedience as a form of moral conscience, provides the basis on which the practical interpretation of particular evils can be partially constructed. Therefore we feel certain that we know what should be done. And what is most important is a methodology established so that one may not err. What is doubtful is resolved by institutional certainty, i.e., by means of a process of moral acceptance of servitude, meekness and obedience[9] that the possibility of being a human person incites.

Memory then is very important for its implications for human behavior and the development of knowledge. Memory places practical reason at an early age in possession of the will and through this means possession of virtual and present knowledge. This is significant for many reasons.

First, the will is taught its function to control the passions at the service of truth. Memory requires that the obligation of obedience be observed by the will. The reason is obvious: a youthful spirit burning with passion soon becomes licentious.

Second, if the confrontation is successful and the agent well developed, he learns to guard the truth in the practical security of the future. When this brings new moral challenges, with the efficient help of memory, one can confidently confront the waves of fortune.

Third, reason in its triumphs acquires greater power to deploy itself didactically through human history. Reason will have no problem in making peace and order possible. Peace and tranquility in a world of obedience means the permanent vigilance of reason against the relative dream of the passions.

Fourth, reason becomes lord, dominating the passions and, above all, it conceives and perceives itself as *capable of being the principle of our actions*. As soon as one is trained to believe, one orders one's actions in terms of reason. One already knows what one has to do, and what one has to do is what should be done. Everything evil that we do is what we did not want to do, what we do not want. Our desiring is the source of goodness that is expressed through the consciousness of our obedience. If we reflect, our deliberation guides our behavior in the direction of right action or moral goodness. If one disobeys the dictates of practical reason, the conscience experiences guilt which, as an expression of a fundamental disobedience, arises as a possibility.

Therefore, it can be concluded that such a morality and its idea of education presupposes a series of propositions: (1) that a "science" of morality is possible;[10] (2) that the relations between economy and politics are not only conceivable, but that there has to be self regulation; (3) that ethics is conceived within a natural order that ontologically orders the possibilities of morality; (4) that ethics is understood as a function of the concept of dominance; (5) that ethics enjoys ontological priority or primacy with respect to economics and politics; (6) that ethics itself supposes as a possibility of morality in general the possibility of its existence as rational

education.

THE LEARNING OF LIBERTY: CIVIL EDUCATION

What is the morality of a citizen; in what does this consist? It is not enough to say that we are all citizens. The obvious inadequacy of this way of responding calls for development. An immediate reaction to these questions would consist in saying that there is no such thing as a citizen. Yet, specifically, what does not exist? The citizen, in the first place, does not seem to exist. Indeed, however much the government solicits it, there is a social awareness that is weakened by bureaucratic petition. The citizen is above all a *formality*. In the future (the challenge of the 21st century), we may see that citizens will exist but not as formalities.

Neither does the morality of the citizen exist. The morality of the citizen is not realized simply by the fact that we call ourselves by that name. As in the case of the existence of the citizen, the existence of the morality *of the* citizen is offered as possible, but not actual. Neither does there appear to be an existential aspiration to be a citizen.

Now these nonexistents threaten the future moral viability of the citizen. One may ask whether it might not be convenient to reject totally this future moral possibility? To answer this question, one must ask in what does the morality of the citizen consist? Two caveats before beginning: the first is that implicit in the need to consider the interpretative problem of the concept of `citizen' is the controversy between essence and existence. The second refers to the inseparable relation between reason and affectivity that develops the history of the concept of citizen.

Let us start the search of the citizen from the very beginning with the principle that is God. Two objectives are sought: first, what is the relation of the God of traditional Venezuelan colonial Catholicism with the possibility of citizenship and its morality; second, which were the routes of the citizenship in liberation theology?

Concerning the first point there exists a consensus. Religion and the citizen in Venezuela were not conceived as either morally or intellectually compatible: either one was a faithful believer, thereby a subordinate or servant, or one was free, and thereby impious or heretical. The problem -- or for that era the dilemma -- was to aspire to be a believer and a citizen. What started as a dilemma was resolved in practice. This signified two things: in the first place, that it was necessary to fabricate discursively an *ad hoc* theology for this purpose; and, secondly, actions and passions were set into motion that were not less concrete than the former.

On October 27, 1815, for example, Fr. Pedro José Hernández writes to Narciso Coll y Pray concerning the luck of one of the penitents in his parish:

> I hope divine grace will reduce many partisans of Independence for a Free America; and it is a constant that the principal fruits of this diabolical system has been heresy and blasphemy; for which, I ask, if it is possible, that you dispense me of the faculty of absolving the heretics for a year or for the time that you deem appropriate.[11]

In a similar way, years before and after the earthquake of 1812, Narciso Coll wrote a letter to his priest which clearly defined things said by Bolivar, Ribas, etc.:

> Are not these earthquakes natural effects that should not frighten us? You false philosophers! Certified physicians and naturalists shut up at least for this one time! . . .

Do you not ignore that your *ridiculous propositions* are *fatalistic* and*materialistic*: Similar errors have been a thousand times refuted and condemned. . . . The *evil man* hardly dares to defend you: a basic education is enough to be made aware of its infamy, and you will not triumph except among the *very immoral*and *ignorant*.[12]

In another passage the God of Narciso is very clear:

It is God who watches continuously and incessantly the same world that he brought forth out of nothing, governing all entities or beings in conformity to his highest and inscrutable dispositions, and punishing, even in this life, vice and rewarding virtue, while making public manifestation of his glory, power, justice and mercy.[13]

Narciso endeavors to change the attitudes of a society in which those with titles and education are considered moral, while faithful believers are looked upon as marginal agents without moral principles. He also intends to change the traditional theology which provides a ground for those seeking a theology of liberty. With this in mind the environment turns confusing. How is the God of the citizen's of Geneva? Where and how can he be found?

For our aims the best place to look is in education; specifically in Rousseau's *Emile*, Book IV and, especially the profession of faith of the well-known vicar. Emile arrives late to God, way beyond the age of Christian reason. Before his adolescence Emile has not heard any mention of God. Still he is sentimentally ready to find him in the very environment where he was educated; that is in nature, and, above all, in his heart. The encounter is very candid; God speaks to Emile without reservations, absolving him in the integrity of his own conscience:

In me there arises in my heart a feeling of recognition and for the author of my species, and from this sentiment my first tribute to the divine benefactor. I adore the supreme power, and I am moved before his benefactions. I have no need to be taught how to worship, for it is inscribed in my nature. Is it not a natural consequence of love to honor what protects us and to love what wishes us well?[14]

This statement brings God down to the level of humanity, he is inside everyone's heart, and he does not make distinctions between small or tall, ugly or beautiful. Every man naturally possesses God within his own depths, inscribed in his sentiment. Still God exists closely attached to the activity and structure of everyone's reason. All becomes just a matter of faith and passion, leaving obedience aside.

One can now descend from that profession of faith to rediscover the "confusion" that this way of establishing God philosophically sows in the process of conceiving an education for citizenship, that is, the education of Emile. Memory appears to be useless since it is not necessary for belief in something that one can not understand; this is catechism. An Emile-type of citizen in the course of time comes to know his own nature, and then he will move in the way of learning and understanding. With the destruction of materialism and fatalism, Emile becomes a God as his own natural measure against religion and in favor of philosophical enlightenment. This didactic change is summarized by Rousseau with a view toward emphasizing the end of faith: love for peace, equality and justice:

In my instruction I would not stick to the spirit of the Church but to the spirit of the Gospel, where dogma becomes simple and morality sublime, where there are more charitable actions than religious practices.[15]

Until these maxims are learned by his brothers, it is important to preserve public order:

In the meantime more lights arrive; let us preserve the public order; in all countries let us respect the laws and cults; let us not lead the citizens to disobedience; since we do not know for sure if replacing their opinions with others is good for them, but we do know for certain that to disobey laws is an evil."[16]

Here Rousseau makes noticeable the transition between the citizen of the republic, teaching putatively a future model of citizenry:

I come, my young friend, from reciting my profession of faith, and how God reads it in my heart: You are the first one to whom I have made such a recitation and perhaps the last.[17]

Since Emile was entering the critical age in which he chooses between good and evil, it is an appropriate time for receiving the "seal of truth."[18] If ethics was at the center of morality, it still continues to be so. It is the concept of character that still retains the attention of Rousseau. Virtue is the condition for the formation of character and what gives meaning to education. Notwithstanding, the sense of that character and those virtues, of practice itself, is dramatically different:

Very frequently reason tricks us; we have all become too adept in rejecting it; but our conscience never lies to us. It is the true guide of man. It is to the soul what instinct is to the body; whoever follows it obeys nature and is not afraid of getting lost.[19]

Politics becomes related to ethics as the force that together may rule the earth. It also gives politics religious connotations.[20]In Book IV of *Emile*, Rousseau initiates his consideration of the *social contract*:

The next step in man refers to that of the moral order. If this was the place for such a consideration, I would attempt to show how from the first moments there arise in the heart the first voices of conscience, and how from the feelings of love and hate there emerge the first notions of good and evil. [21]

The possibility of morality in general is founded in one's conscience and sentiment. If we remain within ourselves -- whether by way of natural disposition or education -- we will know no other surprises than those born of our own loneliness and limitations. It is when that *love-for-oneself* comes into contact with other selves that we find ourselves fascinated with the comparison and its effects, such that *love-for-oneself* becomes *self-love*. In opting for the value called *character*, the center of gravity consists now in the existential decision that opposes *these two loves*:

Here *love* becomes *self-love* from which all the passions are derived. To determine whether the passions are good or evil, it is necessary to know in what place man will situate himself with respect to other men, as well as what are the obstacles one has to overcome in order to attain his good.[22]

It is then from the experience of encountering others that conscience experiences the challenge to confront the possibilities of morality and politics. Two types of conflicts indicate two types of tensions that forcefully make the possibility of morality depend on politics. First, we have to recognize in the solitude of our affective conscience the *natural* "inequalities," before confronting the *civic* "inequalities," i.e., those of the social order.

From prudent conscience, i.e., from the natural and civil comparison of ourselves and others, there arises the tragedy of independence. In order to recover love and overcome the temptations to self-love we should follow the voice of sentimental conscience. In a similar way, it is suggested, that as a state, character is developed by resisting dehumanizing passions. Civil society should then be transformed into the kind of man that Emile wants to be. A methodological charge will civilly condition the possibility that Emile can bring to existence or not. The charge is this:

> It is necessary to study society by men and men by society: those who would treat politics and morality separately will never understand either of them. By first considering primitive relations, it can be seen how men should be naturally affected and which passions should emerge in them. Such a consideration yields that it is reciprocally by progress of the passions that these passions multiply and expand.[23]

What the anthropological datum reveals is equality. An equality that if not total is nonetheless one that implies that the differences that exist in a natural state are not sufficient so as to cause dependence. It is this natural equality that is seen to be destroyed by civil equality. It is presumed that the civil differences are even greater, that they are sufficient to cause dependency. This is for two reasons: one that refers to the very nature of the conception of civil equality and another that refers to the means employed by civil society in order to maintain the first.

In effect, civil equality is chimerical and vain. In such a condition, the second argument indicates, force is employed in order to assure its vanity and its chimerical character. And for this reason the equilibrium of nature and its acceptable equalities are broken. Civil society exercises a corrupting and violent influence and for this reason it absolutely and violently corrupts. Such a civil society is immoral:

> The multitude and the public interest will always be sacrificed at the expense of a small number and particular interests; always those specious names
> of *justice* and *subordination* will serve as instruments of violence and iniquity: from which it follows that the public orders that appear useful for the rest are rather useful for the few at the expense of others. It is according to this that one should judge the consideration that is due according to justice and reason.[24]

The moral challenge of the 19th century and for a good part of the 20th is how to keep civil society under control, how to make the Republic find in its history the general will.

Emile is only possible when civil society adopts politically his image and likeness. It is time to change society so that morality as politics will be absolutely possible. It is impossible to know with certainty if Emile will one day manage to be a citizen. Notwithstanding, whatever were the other sources from which our first liberals found inspiration, there is no doubt that the *scandalous confusion* of Rousseau provided them with a forceful motive for thinking of God in another way.

I have tried to treat the two types of morality with the hope of elucidating the conflict and crisis of modernity. In order to change society, we must understand our past. Philosophy and, in general, the viewpoints that do all in their power to forget history can serve as a bridge to enthrone -- with even greater force -- intemperate habits. The challenge of the possibility of a morality for the 21st century or simply for tomorrow, with or without foundations, requires paradoxically that we temper our will toward the past that has made possible our national life.

Instituto Internacional de Estudios Avanzados
Caracas, Venezuela

NOTES

1. This is a classical manner of proceeding; see *Nicomachean Ethics* VII, I, 1145b.

2. Concerning the difficulties and impracticality of considering as heuristically useful an ethical analysis of amorality, see B. Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (London, 1985), pp. 22ff. In fact I have sought to characterize amorality as bestiality, in line with Williams, rather than from the perspective of knowledge and its possibility in ethics. One may ask oneself then if bestiality does not make the discussion superfluous. Notwithstanding, I defend this description because of the historic value that it possesses for the ends no less historical that I am pursuing.

3. Following Aristotle the human is found between the divine and the beastly; see the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book VII, 1, 25-30.

4. Here there are two orders of questions. On the one hand, it is necessary to consider the general cognitive process that has made of natural science the model for the conception of the remaining sciences, especially the social sciences, which have been conceived among other things in function of the power and effect of secularization. The state of these questions today is philosophically and visibly in crisis; see R. Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Oxford, 1980); and J. Dunn,*Rethinking Modern Political Theory* (C.U.P., 1985), esp. ch. 8. In Latin America recently the social sciences (sociology and politics) attribute the crisis to postmodernity and, curiously, propose a re-encounter with philosophy and the idea of foundations. Notwithstanding, ethics does not appear thematized in this context. Its entry is from the perspective of the fissures of the social integration, narco-traffic, or in politics by intermediary of the effect of a liberal resurrection. For Latin America see E. Faletto, (Caracas: UNESCO, 1988); Lechner, (Caracas: UNESCO, 1988).

5. The contrast evoked here is a classical locus in the methodology of the social sciences. It concerns, at first sight, the confrontation between *causality and comprehension*. In Venezuela one must add the Creole dialectic. The point is that this touches decisively the conceptual future of the theorization of *practical reason*. Concerning this specific problem see J. Dunn, "Social Theory, Social Understanding, and Political Action," in *Rethinking Modern Political Theory*, p. 122.

6. The contrast between one and the other option -- determinism and liberty -- is less significant than the dehumanization that both postures apparently imply in virtue of their modern and Cartesian origin.

7. By *akrasia* I mean the intellectual intemperance or incontinence that weakens our will so as to excuse ourselves from thinking, that is from analyzing what generally is said and thought concerning these issues. For Aristotle *akrasia* is appropriately located between vice and bestiality. It refers to dispositions that favor rational and practical access to morality. See *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book VII, 1-10.

8. For heuristic purposes, I understand *patriarchalism* as developed in the work of one of the most decisive exponents of liberalism, J. Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, Second Treatise 75.

9. It is not my intention to paint a picture of a social world of servitude and oppression. I only want to illustrate the strength and methodology of certainty.

10. This does not mean necessarily that morality needs to be understood as apodictic; the term may be employed analogically.

11. A.A., Franciscan Fund, File 18, Personal.

12. A.A., Originals, General Captains, Audiences. Last documents 1813-1821, n. 3, Narcisco Coll y Prat, June 1, 1812, faces 7-9. Italics mine.

13. *Ibid*., face 10.

14. J. J. Rousseau, *Emile*, Book IV.

15. *Ibid*., Book IV.

16. *Ibid*.

17. *Ibid*.

18. *Ibid*.

19. *Ibid*.

20. Though economics is ambiguous in Rousseau, he still manages to give economics a religious connotation.

21. *Ibid*.

22. *Ibid*., p. 306.

23. *Emile*, Book IV, p. 306.

24. *Ibid*., Book IV, p. 307. Italics mine.

CHAPTER IV
EDUCATION AND MORAL EXCELLENCE: HUMAN FULFILLMENT AS THE FUNDAMENTAL CHALLENGE OFTHE XXIst CENTURY
JOSE MARIA SANCHEZ

Education and Human Plenitude

The following are brief reflections on developing the relation between moral education and human fulfillment. Below, M. Barros will write: "For us to decide in favor of education for the liberation of man and the humanization of the world is a decision . . . related to our cultural heritage." In a society without fathers, without role models, where new generations want to direct the course of history, a necessary decision must be adopted given that many of the parameters of personal and collective values have been altered. This is why education must be, after all else, a steady and constant process of acceptance of authentic values. As Ortega y Gasset indicates: "In nature there are no levels of reality. All that man does can be more or less authentic and hence more or less real. What we do and what happens to us is not more real than the meaning that it has for us in our life" (Ortega y Gasset, 1944). What is important to us, what has a value may be understood in terms of acquired knowledge. This will have more significance to the extent that it helps one not only intellectually and in dominating the external world, but also by impelling one towards a valuational understanding of what is human. To the extent that reason affirms and purifies its functions, it manages to lose interest in man and his values. Education today must provide a privileged place for values in a world loaded with scientific facts. This is the basis for the contradictions affecting certain teaching styles based upon a harmful axiological neutrality. Education is a moral problem because the student is an ethical being with values. Values is what man does with things and himself by reason of being a person; a world without persons would be a world without values (Alvarez Turienzo, 1983).

Intersubjectivity, Collectivism and Solitude

Man exists and acts together with other human beings, as Barros affirms, without losing sight of the personalist character of human action, whose foundations consist in liberty and responsibility. Joint or participative action makes manifest that the existence of man is coexistence, an encounter between an "I" and a "thou" (Buber, 1969). This encounter is basically defined as dialogue. But if the dialogue is missing, if the intentional referent, i.e. the other, is lacking, then it becomes a monologue, a self-expression (Frank, 1982). The encounter is minimized in this way; there is at best a togetherness but one without love. One is next to another, but each is in solitude, "the loneliness of two in company." If we extend the concept to a multitude, we can speak of the solitude of many in a collective. Collectivism already harms us; it already consumes us, leading us to the most absurd loneliness in the midst of monstrous agglomerations of strangers. We are threatened by a strange solitude born of a lack of communication, regardless of the magnificent information systems now available. We experience an unfertile loneliness in a world fashioned by science, which has thrown us into an alienated and unprotected society that engenders feelings of emptiness from which one escapes

with "machine work" or "reckless entertainment." This is why it is important to establish the metaphysical basis, and direct the praxis of intersubjectivity and the encounter-dialogue among men, so as to free one from falling into a collectivism whose necessary fruit is solitude.

Nevertheless, is there a place for authentic solitude; is there some room for the solitude of the wise man and of the monk? Man needs to be alone, to confront the solitude of recollection and reflection, to find and protect himself from the multiple forms of alienation that surround him. They say that man today is afraid to be alone with his spirit. If joint action, participatory community, and intersubjectivity fail to transcend personal dimensions and reach out to the others, it may remain victim to a noisy collectivism that promotes anguish and alienation. Or it renders inaccessible a sense of authentic and necessary solitude at the center of which what is specifically human is furnished.

Psychology, Education and Morality

One cannot entirely direct one's existence; in part one is predetermined by educational, cultural and historical circumstances. Yet one still is left with ample room for development and growth which should be realized with liberty and responsibility, that is, by means of moral options.

The many biological, social and psychological limitations that determine human existence provide the person precisely with the opportunity to permeate his being with meaning and achieve all his possibilities. This is accomplished in terms of the paradigm of joint liberty, transcending all of these limitations. Existence pertains to a world of multifarious possibilities where one is forced to choose. Man is a being who in every situation must decide his liberty. Liberty and responsibility are the two essential dimensions of the moral act, the explicit elements of morality. If morality is so closely connected to human existence, will we find there an equilibrium between the human act and the personality that produces it? Is moral obedience a basic ingredient in the harmonic development of personality? These questions are important because we are concerned with human fulfillment as the fundamental challenge of the 21st century, which challenge was launched precisely by moral education.

Barros has clearly demonstrated that self-determination is the ground for the development of the person. Self-government and self-possession, as its two principle manifestations, bespeak each person as a unique and unrepeatable subject. The two provide one with the conditions for the full realization of one's person to the extent that they guarantee one's personal liberty and responsibility, and establish the road for moral excellence in the educational process.

But, of what morality are we talking? It is not based on the reflexes of conscience (Eysenck, 1976) nor an irrational strength that opposes life and love and generates states of anguish. Neither are we talking about a morality linked to a religious doctrine and even less of a morality that needs to be sustained by the authority of an other-worldly presence. Rather, we are talking about a natural morality based on the virtue of justice. This exists when a community, guided by a sense of wisdom, lives in terms of an agreement of trust and mutual respect, and when each person as a particular individual is capable of accepting his obligations and defending his rights. Although the group is the natural environment for the well-being of the human person and for justice, human interaction, however necessary, does not abolish the primacy of the individual over the group. The subject of morality is the individual before the group.

But when this natural, spontaneous morality, based on the essence of man and the legitimate exigencies of community living, falls into the hands of authoritative elements -- whether

religious, political or cultural -- we encounter ethical systems whose principal virtue is obedience and principle sin is disobedience. Such ethical systems inflict scars of guilt and fear of punishment.

The situation would be worse if the ethics rooted in the heart of man degenerated into a morality of conformity, as Barros alludes, whether good or bad. A morality of this type can become insensitive before evil and before values that the majority does not profess. Today, before the impoverishment of human instincts and the waning of traditions that no longer prescribe for man what he must do, we are adopting a morality that paralyzes all initiatives of personal responsibility.

Finally, there is an ethics that, following the demands of the individual and the community and guided by the individual as value, takes root in the heart of man without conformist or authoritarian supports to inspire him to interpret and realize what is best in him. This is the best interpretation of the natural morality, which we will call a morality of aspiration (Deeken, 1984). It is a morality without guilt or fears, one directed, instead, toward personal realization. "Morality according to this conception consists in aspiring to what is best or the goal toward which we are oriented. This means growing as a human being and developing one's human capabilities to the fullest"(Deeken, 1984, p. 93). Indeed, the moral task consists in developing one's personality in harmony with what is most valuable in oneself. Morality as an ethical enterprise consists in a permanent, free and responsible decision about values, about what most relates man toward his spiritual enrichment and the consummation of his mission in this life.

The ethical and religious dimension of the human act frequently have been ignored by psychology and especially by psychotherapy. Many psychologists would definitely reject -- or accept with scruples -- the notion that the morality of the human act may constitute the ground for the dynamism of personality. What do unconscious motivations, mechanisms of repression, phenomena of transference, and self-realization, self-esteem and the desire for pleasure or power have to do with morality? Are we not speaking irreconcilable languages and confusing for example psychotherapeutic design of whatever sort with moralizing motives? Many psychologists ask these questions. But it is not a question of moralizing or of reducing psychological health to moral premises; it is rather a matter of not falling into the danger of psychologizing psychological acts which would be a devaluation of the spiritual and its personal and unique dimension. Psychologism sees, disguises and masks, hidden motives, defensive mechanisms, neurotic manifestations, absurd sublimations, etc., which distract from the real problem of the patient. The existence of the patient escapes psychologism. Jasper affirms that the human is a being who decides; one is not a being purely and simply but decides in each case "what is" (Frankl, 1983). The psychic states declared by a patient to a psychotherapist are acts of moral self-judgment, given that they presuppose an *ought to have been*, i.e., personal values professed by the patient. Regardless of how desperate and how depressed he may be, the patient confesses from the point of view of his spiritual world, the locus of his values, although they be accepted and lived in terms of a mitigated sense of liberty and responsibility. Psychology and especially psychotherapy have not had the courage to admit two fundamental theses: (1) that an ideal, a cause and even a whole life acquire greater excellence when covered by the mantle of morality; (2) that the human person, in the depths of one's being, feels the need to behave morally, whereas what is immoral makes one lose his harmony.

The following are essential to the morality of the human act and its connection to one's psychological fulfillment.

Ethical Conscience. In man there exists a moral instinct, a tendency to behave morally. We shall refer to this as his *ethical conscience*. The ontic conscience discovers a being *that is*; the ethical conscience discovers a being *that is not yet* but who should be. This being who is not yet stands before the possibilities of his self-realization as a person. We must not personify this ethical *what-ought-to-be* as an internalized authority, as this would have negative results for ethics. Instead, ethics as *what-ought-to-be*, as an aspiration, a goal, or the best option, is understood as the "voice of our total personality that expresses the exigencies of life and growth" (From, 1976, p. 54). It is an autonomous conscience, independent and personal, that executes the good and the valuable not by obeying the voice of authority but as a result of the pleasure and satisfaction that it experiences in so acting. This type of ethical conscience exists in all men; although mitigated, it is always present as the voice that orients the organism towards the end that is latent within one's being (From, 1985).

Liberty and Responsibility. The condition of being free and responsible unveils the core of human existence. In effect, the essence of man is to be "open to the world" (Sheller, 1976), i.e., always to be oriented towards something or someone: human acts are always intentional. Moreover, to be a person means to be oriented beyond oneself, to be self-transcendent. The multiplicity of possibilities that this offers for existence evokes the human person to realize in each case only one possibility, viz., the best one. Man cannot evade in every moment the necessity of *responding freely to his to-be-able-to-be*. We have referred to the various factors limiting liberty and responsibility, but the art of liberty consists in transcendenting them.

Life as Mission. Life understood as mission orients us towards values. The mission of each man is not unique; neither are his values which depend on him for their realization. Sheller talks about situational values in contrast to eternal values that are valid in every occasion and for all persons. Situations are linked to a specific situation and to each person in particular. This singularity of mission to realize values confers on human existence a character of moral obligation. Hence, there is little sense in talking in general terms of the mission of people in life, rather we should talk of *my* mission in each particular instance. The mission that each one has in life is something that no one can deny, although a party as function of self-interest may not recognize it. Goethe provides a wise reflection on knowing our mission in life: "How can one know himself? Never by reflection, but by means of action. Try to fulfill your duty and you will know yourself. What is your duty? Simply what the day requires (cited by Frankl, 1983, p. 78)?
If the ethical conscience is in our spirit as an intuitive vision of *what-ought-to-be*, if liberty and responsibility are constitutive characteristics of human existence and if the life's mission leads us toward the realization of specific values, would it be necessary to isolate the human act and to disengage it from its moral dimension on the suspicion that its ethical rank could deform it? Would we not deactivate the dynamic and harmonic development of personality if we deprive it of finding what is most valuable so that it can aspire to live in conformity to this value? "The *morality of aspiration* challenges man to develop his own human potential" (Deeken, 1983, p. 93). We should not be afraid to demand to look morally for what is best in us and live in conformity to this. It is time to end the *Epicurean era* in psychotherapy and substitute it with a *Stoic era* (Frankl, 1984). We can no longer delay the orientation of man towards moral values and the exigencies of a more disciplined and abnegated life.

REFERENCES

Buber, M. *Yo y Tú*. Buenos Aires: Nueva visió, 1969.

Alvarez, Turienzo. *El Hombre y su Soledad: Introducción a la Etica*. Salamanca: Síueme, 1983.

Deeken, A. *La Tarea Moral del Hombre Moderno*, in *Ser Humano*. Salamanca: Sígueme, 1985.

Eysenck, F. "Biology of Morality", in *Moral Development and Behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.

Frankl, V. *Pscioterapia y Humanismo, Tiene un Sentido la Vida?* Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982.

Frankl, V. *Psicoanálisis y Existencialismo. De la Psicoterapia a la Logoterapia.* Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1983.

Fromm, E. *Seréis Como Dioses*. Buenos Aires: Paidos, 1971.

Fromm, E. *Amor a la Vida*. Buenos Aires: Paidos, 1985.

THE NATURE AND ROLE OF EDUCATION IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT[1]
HENRY C. JOHNSON, JR.

Este es el mensaje de Pataruco:
al reunificarse el hombre en la
reconciliación con su origen y
la aceptación de su ser, brota
una nueva vitalidad creativa.

Rafael Tomás Caldera

The pages that follow are beginnings. Their purpose is to find some of the right questions as the necessary prolegomena to the construction of adequate answers. My procedure will be to examine what I take to be certain principles and "facts" (though one always fears using that latter term) and which when joined appear to raise some questions. These questions will be examined in turn for possible clues to more adequate, contextually generated educational answers. It is necessary to add the qualifier "contextually generated" because education and schooling are answers to questions which lie outside themselves: educational ideas and practices are neither self-interpreting nor self-justifying.

In substance, the argument is as follows. If a broad social goal is to achieve peace in an area long characterized by self-destructive conflict, this clearly does not mean simply the absence of conflict in its crude form, but the possibility of a certain quality of life to the achievement of which education is thought to be ancillary. In part, we are agreed, the problems arise from a fundamental conflict between "modern" developments and the remnants of indigenous social structures and their supporting cultural traditions. As traditional education is conceived to be inadequate to the process of "modernization," that process has brought its own new "education." But this imported "education," in turn, has eroded further the cultural base necessary for any coherent education. Consequently, the educational task is no longer the conventional one of constructing an educational regimen adequate to express and sustain the culture, but the radically more difficult one of reconstructing a culture adequate to an educational process -- all this *in medias rerum*, so to speak. The nature of the "new" education (already grown old in its host socio-cultural environment) makes its importation and application very questionable, since it manifests the same difficulties inherent in "modernization" itself. The roots of both lie in the hegemony of a techno-science which, for example in education, replaces the development of persons in community with the production of skilled functionaries defined by "manpower" models driven by abstract and ahistorical macro-economic principles. To begin the process of reconstruction, it is urged that we: (a) restore philosophical critique as the formal instrument necessary to unmask the difficulties and guide this reconstruction, and (b) re-examine the potential of art (especially literary art) to provide a fundamental element in the historically and existentially grounded substantive content needed for educational renewal.

EDUCATION AND MODERNIZATION: SOME HISTORICALLY CONDITIONED PRINCIPLES

To begin, then, let us consider certain basic facts and principles.

(1) "Modernizing" countries have without exception committed themselves to programs of education and schooling as instruments of social policy.[2] As Professor Paul Peachey has pointed out, the conventional definition of modernization includes "appropriate education" as an instrumental mechanism.[3] The inclusion of some educational regimen of both theory and practice is necessary to any coherent culture and society. Not surprisingly, then, as Professor, Roberto Hozven has pointed out, much of the long conflict between church and state that characterized Central and South America has been focused on the attempt to wrest from the church not only its vast and ambiguous wealth, but its control over the educational process.[4] Again, Hannah Arendt argues persuasively that when any society cannot make up its mind, so to speak, about education, that society is in the late stages of decline, if not of extinction.[5] Surely, the wages of educational confusion is death: a society/culture that cannot envision what to become through the deliberate formation of its young has lost its sense of its future, and hence of itself.

As I have suggested, this educational concern appears to be universal in modernizing countries. My experience, especially through the medium of international students and colleagues, is that whether one is looking at Latin America, Central Africa, or East Asia, educational questions and strategies are being sharply debated, usually in close and conscious connection with a political-economic agenda. In the United States, where education and schooling are omnipresent and enormously wealthy (and therefore often deemed successful), we have traditionally attempted to depoliticize education -- a thing impossible, of course. Consequently, "dialogue" about education and schooling in the United States, ignoring the fundamental levels of educational thought and practice, comprises only superficial spats, largely restricted to technical issues. In developing nations, however, the dialogue is generated by social and philosophical divisions and consequently reaches the level of fundamental issues and policies. Precisely because of its reality and vitality, this dialogue frequently erupts into academic chaos and even violence. The consequence is, one need not deny, often counter-productive; but at least it serves to keep the historical nature of education and schooling in clear view and to emphasize the real issues which are present at least some of the time.

Thus, when I see a Latin American university barricaded and struck, I often cannot suppress a sigh of regret. On the other hand, when I face a bland and falsely homogeneous class at my own University, I more frequently sigh for a radical or two to disrupt the issueless slumber of many of our students.

(2) Now, if education and schooling are both crucial processes in any culture/society and also very consciously problematical in modernizing or developing nations, how one thinks about education and schooling becomes a vital question. That is because there is, I repeat, no such thing as education in general, except for occasional (and usually dangerous) scholarly purposes. Education and schooling are, to use Professor Peachey's categories, "artificial" not "natural," although we are so thoroughly schooled that we feel the process to be almost second nature.[6]

There also are no modernizing countries in general. Each is a singular nation with its own history, to which its educational ideas and schooling mechanisms are indissolubly related as context. By historical, I mean not the past in general, nor any fixed point or object within it, but the ongoing socio-cultural context -- including, of course, the political and economic. This has roots in our common past experience, but consciously and unconsciously inheres in our present and participates in the determination of our future. The present is, I believe, an arbitrary moment

in our human experience seen developmentally. It is made by overlapping past and future: we are the conjunction of what we see ourselves to have been and done and what we see ourselves as doing and becoming. Thus time is neither the measure nor the problem; origin and destiny are. And these are always the fundamental educational categories. Educational content is what we take from the multiple potentialities and experiences we have had (the fields of our knowledge and activity), and then refocus in terms of that transitional moment between a valued origin and a valued destiny in order to illuminate our passage consciously and in terms of some ideal principle. The education process -- dangerously, but increasingly seen in terms only of schooling -- is the manner in which we contrive to effect that conscious passage, which by definition is never still.

(3) Given the truth of the previous proposition, it follows that each society/culture has its unique educational history. But there also may be, I am inclined to believe, some general features of "Latin American" educational history, though there is no Latin American history of education in general. Some of these characteristic features are as follows:

(a) There is a deeply rooted Ibero-American colonial "classical" tradition. This is linked closely to certain categories and ideals characteristic of an elite social group. Presently, it is manifest less obviously in the prevalence of its humane wisdom than in its socially bifurcating credentialism; too frequently, its practical mode is an autocratic didacticism. In a sense, it is a decadent tradition. By that I mean, not that either its content or its values are all materially evil, but that it has come to be formally in contradiction with much of its own traditional content and values. The consequent danger is that what is left of its humane substance will be rejected mindlessly because of its presently defective form. Perhaps some of the difficulty in its career can be attributed to its partial manifestation through particular movements -- e.g., the Germanic idealism of the sort exemplified by Krause, for frequently the inspiration of these schools of educational thought -- e.g., Italian neo-idealism -- were blatantly aristocratic or openly fascist.

Upon the anti-colonial revolution and "liberation" and as a reflection of that history, a secular "liberal" thrust was widely manifest in both culture and education. Though sometimes rhetorically "enlightened," this movement never realized its presuppositions in the liberation of the common people. It contradicted much in the popular culture, especially of course its religious base, without providing an alternative for the folk, let alone a common, indigenous substrate which could undergird and stabilize the conflicts inseparable from the process of change.[7]

(b) Whatever the merits of the previous account of the "classical" and "liberal" social and educational traditions, it is virtually indisputable that few if any contemporary social or cultural leaders view these root traditions as fully compatible with "modernization." Indeed, virtually entailed in the notion of modernization has been the notion that a new "matching" educational system must be provided. In most if not all cases, that has been understood to mean the educational system characteristic of the "advanced" North American and European countries, whence "modernized" industrial-technological society itself has taken its rise.

This "modern education" usually is evangelically proclaimed through a variety of means, one of which is the "multinational" corporations and commercial development agencies of whom it might be said, adapting John Wesley, "the world is their school district." Another is the "multinational universities" that now relish their role of spreading the gospel of modernization, even while they bewail the lack of power to make a "real impact" that they (blindly, I believe) take to be the cause of their limited success. Finally, there are the vast international social-political agencies whose presence is so conspicuous throughout the world: AID, the World Bank,

the Inter-American Development Bank, the Organization of American States, to name only a few major ones. The notion of education these instrumentalities largely share, while extended at great cost and with loud rhetorical flourish, has paid little attention to the historical relevance of their educational policies.

This "matching" educational system brings with it certain general characteristics. Conventionally joined to a "rational planning" approach to all public institutions, education is usually centralized, bureaucratized, and (for that reason, my experience suggests) usually unresponsive both to local differences and local needs. Again, this "matching" notion of schooling is almost always ideologically driven in terms of "manpower-planning policy" or some other variant of the "human capital" theory. Inevitably, this engine produces (quite literally) an "education" in which the person is defined and developed as an extension of the economic machine. But machines have no history, in whole or in part.

Evidence of such tendencies is, of course, everywhere, for "modernization" is not something that happens to some who are less fortunate; it is characteristic of us all without exception. Furthermore, it is not a goal in the sense of an end-state, on which "happy morning" all shall be "modernized." It is a continuous process that is gaining in inertia for us all. Look, for example, at the North American public and private schools and their "relevant" new programs of vocational testing, tracking, and socio-economic indoctrination, which many now propose for early elementary school. Under the guise of personal development and fulfillment, these mechanisms are dangerous instruments of class and role definition, the impact of which, however unnoticed, may well be catastrophic.

Nor does the "developed" pedagogical "West" appear to have much in the way of significant alternatives to provide either for itself or for "export." One set of purported alternatives is categorizable in general terms under the rubric of "romanticism." These are often styled as examples of "humanism" in education, as if they were the successors to the classical humanist tradition. They are, however, nothing of the sort. The romantic educational movement is psychologically defined and driven; it represents little more than an individualistic fugue -- a speciously attractive flight from reality that exists only epiphenomenally and is, by and large, only admired by, and open to, the wealthy. As alternatives, such movements usefully point up our educational discomfort, but, as even their father founder, Jean Jacques Rousseau, would probably admit, they show little promise as the foundation of fundamental educational change.

A contrary alternative, educational radicalism, is both a very complex phenomenon and little if any more sensitive to the singular historicity of the nations and peoples into which it is imported. Whether in its extreme Marxist-Leninist form or in its many softer and less doctrinaire varieties, radicalism also usually is not an indigenous development but an insertion from abroad. Whatever its rhetorical identification with "the people", it is no better than imperialistic technocratic educating, honoring the principle that the roots of educational development must grow from the soil in which they are expected to flourish.

Perhaps most puzzling of all is the fact that there appear to be no effective different and indigenous Christian alternatives. Why this is the case I am at a loss to say, except for the probably too simple explanation that on the part of the various religious bodies economic Erastianism -- now, thankfully, showing some signs of breaking up -- may have borne too well its poisonous fruit. The churches have also, on the one hand, too easily identified their potentially much richer educational tradition with a rather too static Hellenism, or allowed themselves (in a mirror image protest) to be lured down the garden path of individualistic psychologism on the other. In any case, religiously grounded education has surely more obviously manifested the

problem than become a clear source for its resolution. My argument, however, is not that these alternatives are unimportant, unsatisfactory though they may be. They are in fact very important in understanding the difficulties in "modern" educational theory and practice in the "developed" west. They are also important to establish the fact that "modern" education is by no means the universal and always successful social mechanism that its pretentious facade may suggest to the uncritical observer.

The Need for a Philosophical Critique of Education

The persistence of the alternatives just discussed suggests that our techno-scientific pedagogy needs a critique far more fundamental than one sketched merely in terms of its dubious origins and problematic effects. I cannot either fully accomplish such a critique here nor point to its having been done elsewhere. I believe, however, that it is now our first order of pedagogical business and that it may be on the horizon, brought into view by the increasing difficulty of patching or repainting our now old "modern" education. What perhaps can be said is that our educational difficulties arise from the peculiar conjunction of educational theory and practice (including the "research" now presumed to direct it) and the "science" that is now taken to found and to legitimize the whole enterprise. While "science" has driven out philosophy -- by reducing it to a species of ideology -- it is, I suggest, philosophy that must rescue us: not philosophy in the sense of a body of received doctrines, but philosophy as the source of the self-critique that neither science nor education can provide for themselves. In particular, philosophy must address such points as may be summarized in the following form:

- Point: "Modern" techno-pedagogy is largely pegged to a methodologically monistic theory of science that is both embarrassingly inadequate even to science itself and compels the reduction or elimination of too much of the traditional humane study central to genuine education.
- Point: "Modern" educational theory's positivistic bias renders problematic any serious concern for those values that both underlie and are part of the content for any socially or personally relevant education. This poverty of critical axiological development moves us not into an axiologically neutral position, but into an anti-social individualism and a self-contradictory ethical relativism. No educational system can fulfill its obligations either to persons or to societies on this ephemeral foundation. The reductionist move also produces a social-historical naivete that renders much of our human past (and hence our present and future) unintelligible.
- Point: The arts -- and here I mean the role they have traditionally fulfilled both as an important mode of the educational process and as content in the educational process -- are relegated to a merely recreational status or recast as personally satisfying or therapeutic.
- Point: The final consideration has to do with "rationality." We have noted briefly the meaning and role of rationality as a social and organizational principle in our present crisis.[8] One crucial aspect of this question has been pointed out by the hermeneutic philosophers and social critics. Underlying much of the new techno-science and (I would add) the new techno-pedagogy is what I prefer to call a "transfer of rationality" from the person to the techno-scientific system. In the long run, technology is not a thing or a particular machine, but a mode of thinking and working -- indeed, of living. Except for the few who create and control it, from genetic engineers to computer designers and master programmers, the role of most of us is to accept it, to fit in, to be determined by a system presumed to be more rational than any one of us taken singularly can

be. It may in fact be the case that the consequent educational goal for many no longer is the full development of critical intelligence at all! Both socially and educationally, this opens a chamber of horrors. It is the ultimate contradiction of the very possibility of those crucial normative principles that must shape any educational idea, practice, or act -- namely the achievement of fully humane, morally responsible intelligence, in a conscious community of believers and actors, who together control their corporate and personal lives. That this is particularly relevant to the question of peaceful socio-cultural development is not difficult to see.

It is important to lay a little more foundation for the points -- the accusations -- just made. Before that can be done, however, an important intervening question must be considered. What right and what authority do any of us have who are not in a situation to presume any competence or stake in these matters? Much of this essay itself suggests that adequate resolutions of problems in any of the spheres about which we have been talking can come only out of the socio-historical context in which they arise. While I fully assent to that general proposition, I would offer one or two important qualifications.

All have a right to ask to be included in the dialogue we are calling for and this for two reasons. First, our mutual world -- and there is a mutual world that surrounds our more limited ones -- is now so compressed and interdependent that a threat to peace for anyone is a problem for all. The very notion of "self-interest," upon which so much political and economic policy is still unfortunately based, is both archaic and dangerous. Second, the society and culture -- and therefore the education -- for which those of us in North America share responsibility represent major sources of the fundamental problem which confronts all of us. Insofar as we are able also to share in an open and critical self-examination, it may be possible to alleviate the problem from both ends. Legitimacy for this interaction lies in the principle that, although each community has its unique socio-historical matrix, it is not idiosyncratic. There are continuities in human nature and human experience as well as crucial differences, else we could neither understand nor talk at all.

The Scientific Construction of Educational Theory

To return to the basic argument, we must look further at the contemporary interrelations of science, education, and philosophy. For the most part, in its practical form, "research" means "science" or strictly "empirical" inquiry on the model of some sort of "scientific method." More specifically, educational "research" means some sort of educational science -- some sort of "techno-science" that functions chiefly by applying selected aspects of behavioral science (social and/or individual) to such educational problems as they can illuminate. There are exceptions, and the boundaries are not always perfectly clear, but the programs of our professional educational organizations furnish the evidence necessary to sustain that judgment.

In our understanding of professional research, philosophical activity -- especially that which is historically grounded -- is ignored for two reasons. The first, stemming from what has just been said, is that educational research has been crudely reduced to science or scientific research, while, more importantly, all other sorts of educational analysis or theorizing have been consigned to a limbo of "common sense," "intuition," or mere "speculation," or perhaps swept tidily under the very large rug labeled "ideology." The reason for the ease with which this redefinition of the domain of educational research has been accomplished is the assumption that science needs no critique of itself, because scientific propositions (or scientific "truths" as many like to call them) are implicitly universal and obviously self-justifying. Consequently, any

attempt to direct, let alone limit, "science" is both intellectually and morally unacceptable. By the same token, not to ground education virtually exclusively on techno-science would be equally reprehensible.

Now, to avoid the intellectual chauvinism implicit in such views, more discerning scientists (educational and otherwise) will sometimes distinguish between "pure" and "applied" science. "Pure" science is exactly that: "pure," unalloyed by base motives and uncontaminated by time, place and purpose. It is the application of science by those less pure folk who must accommodate its clean abstractions to a dirty world that results in compromise. Such persons, often crudely economic in their motives, do need watching.

Here, however, the argument needs to become historical and practical rather than pristinely deductive: In a world that cared little for science, science could be largely disinterested and thankfully amateur. Though few such individuals may still exist, no such world any longer exists. Given the contemporary nationalized and institutionalized forms of science, it is scientists (pure and otherwise) who first apply science. Science now is an application. If we consider the scientists who cheerfully participated and continue to participate in institutionalized and nationalized science indifferently in democracies or dictatorships, it is difficult if not impossible to distinguish their work qua science. As moral agents it is possible, of course, but their science says nothing about that. A recent example would be those scientists who did their work for John Manville and Union Carbide or those academic scientists who, neatly dividing the truths they will learn from the outcomes of their activity, have hastened to pocket attractive research contracts for "Star Wars." No, science (as Bacon told us it would) is now principally valued not for its truth but for its effect in "producing new works." Its mystical authority may derive from its presumed truth value, but its desirability issues from its promised effects.

Far from being "pure," then, science (including educational science) can easily become a socially and historically conditioned weapon, especially in Third World settings. But science itself does not consider that possibility -- philosophy can and must.The word "weapon" has the sound of a very unphilosophical accusation. But I believe that philosophers must, from time to time, say "J'accuse!" Whatever intellectual life was like in some scientific Eden, at present science is institutionalized in concrete socio-historical settings. These settings do not provide it with some ideal freedom, but in fact, even in academia, usually drive it into captivity to certain nationally and economically defined goals.

Again, as the previously mentioned "hermeneutic" philosophers and historians have pointed out, the power of science has been transmuted into a potential threat to liberty and democracy. We all argue that in the modern world knowledge is power. When that knowledge becomes available only to political and economic elites, and is used for their purposes, the consequences to human life can be catastrophic. Increasingly, we watch a succession of prestigious scientists "advise" our political leaders -- usually with what they want to hear; soon we are told that we cannot be told because we cannot understand, and therefore we cannot judge and choose. The presuppositions of liberty and democracy are, however, that the people can understand and can choose regarding those actions which affect their lives.

Science does not make this situation clear: As an establishment (which it has become), science does not want to; as a mode of inquiry, science does not have the tools to do so. In practice, present-day science is captive to certain aspects of its socio-historical context and therefore inimical to the process of liberating and democratizing human social life. This is possible because science, qua science, is not self-reflective unless accompanied by philosophical activity. Such philosophic activity is not contradictory to science, nor is the recommendation of

its inclusion a form of cultural antagonism. It is simply to assert that science does not represent a new absolute metaphysic. It is one form of human activity which, as part of the totality of human thought and action, must come under the comprehensive scrutiny for which the name philosophy stands.

The Visible Hand of the Dismal Science

In much of the Third World, then, techno-science is in fact the new intellectual colonialism, introduced as the handmaiden of the new form of political colonialism, economic colonialism. In the chaotic post-war period "reconstruction" was undertaken by the "victors" on the most benign of platforms: We needed to avoid destroying our enemies lest they again fall victim to fascist solutions. At the same time, Western nations were divesting themselves of their imperial colonies. For these struggling entities, in an admission of previous failure, the need was diagnosed to be something called "development." Other less directly colonized countries struggling for stability were seen to have similar needs. All needed aid for development -- a development that soon was determined by international economic structures, rather than by their own indigenous criteria. These structures and the development plans created in correspondence with them were, of course, created by applied economic science with the aid of social engineering. Thus, educational reform came to mean, not an indigenous activity, but a systematic revision of pedagogical practice, largely if not exclusively through the application of those pedagogical models and their supporting research paradigms which ostensibly had brought about the superior development being transferred to the struggling nations.[9]

The work of the World Bank is an instructive example. At first concerned exclusively with reconstruction, then with development, the Bank initially paid no attention to education until it discovered that without a population engineered to fit them its programs would not work. The educational interest that resulted, however, was tailored to its prior mission: development as measured by increased economic "productivity." Once having changed its posture, the Bank's impact quickly became massive. From 1963-1985 the Bank sponsored 304 educational projects in 90 countries, involving about five billion dollars. By 1985, the Bank's "educational" lending represented 6.4 percent of its activity. In five Latin American countries alone its current projects represent a total "investment" of some 454 million dollars.[10]

The form of educational "development" and "reform" fostered by this sort of educational "investment" is, then, determined in the first instance by economic policy and defined by the techno-scientific preoccupation we have been discussing. Thus, while programs may talk of "equity" and "access" for the "poor," the destiny of the disenfranchised is predetermined by the demands of a "modernization" essentially divorced from social-historical conditions and cultural content. At least two serious results follow: (1) The "target" populations are forced to choose between a colonialist traditional education which is patently supportive of traditional elites and structures and an imported techno-pedagogy and research which pays little or no attention to their unique history and culture. (2) This imported techno-pedagogy is superimposed upon a culture in which philosophy, literature, art and music have previously formed the warp and woof of personal identity and social meaning and value. Yet, these deeply rooted carriers of meaning and identity, of heritage and purpose, now have no function.

Impaled on the horns of this dilemma, no genuinely indigenous educational reform can be built up. The choice is now between two colonialisms, one dead and one very much alive. The net effect is not only that "educational reform" comes only with great difficulty and that

"research" seems to have little impact, but, far worse, that the necessary cultural base is seriously eroded in the process. This effect is aided, of course, by such other forms of cultural importation as the "media," advertising, and popular music. Only a socially and historically sensitive philosophical activity, I would insist, can bring us into a productive consciousness of this situation.

Artful Intelligence and the Creation of Educational Alternatives

I will conclude this section with one or two more specific proposals for what philosophy can usefully accomplish. First, philosophical activity can lead us in a return to a broader, less intellectually imperialistic notion of educational research itself. The beginning of this, it seems to me, is to see educational research generically as the critical application of human intelligence in all its modes to the problems of educational theory and practice, including schooling, in all their dimensions and contexts. This proposed definition raises rather than settles many questions, of course, but it raises the right questions. Second, philosophical activity can help us to comprehend and incorporate into our educational research and reform a consciousness of the limitations of science and of its interface with moral and ethical issues which it cannot single-handedly resolve. Third, philosophical activity can help us build educational theories which are not merely formal, as most have been in recent decades, but substantive, integrating the modes and contents of human experience (i.e., lived culture) into morally responsible and historically sensitive patterns for the mutual development of societies and persons.

My modest first-hand experience in developing countries persuades me also that their contribution to resolving these difficulties could have meaning in the so-called developed world as well. As noted from the conflicts they experience, there arises a sense of engagement with genuine educational issues and consequences which could produce the first new educational theory and policy in the West since the turn of the century. Inasmuch as the apparent success in developed countries, coupled with its commitment to techno-pedagogy and a very profitable business called educational research, has nevertheless produced not solutions to its own educational quandaries, but an inability to conceive of, let alone construct, alternatives, there may be need of the fruits of those who labor elsewhere.

In closing, I will turn finally to the fundamental questions which I initially suggested could be raised at this point. From a conventional perspective, the educational questions arising would be largely technical. But the fundamental question is, I think, not how we can educate, but whether we can educate at all. I have argued an obvious and intimate connection between culture and education. But, that surely is not news! The conventional move is then to ask, "Is our pedagogy adequate to our culture? Is it an effective means for bringing the young into the human community we share?" But, there may be no culture and little community at our disposal, only a "wasteland" left by generations of disintegration through exploitation. If that be the case, the question takes a very different turn: Is there any longer a pedagogically adequate culture? If there is not, can there be one? In other words, given the situation we have been exploring, educational theory must now begin, I think, with historically grounded sociocultural critique, and rebuild: it must, so to speak, make itself possible!

Questions about the possibility of education now are not merely technically difficult, but radically problematical because it is by no means clear that the very notion of educating makes any sense under present conditions. Education is perhaps a notion left over from the time of principled societies and cultures that could furnish norms -- i.e., stable meanings and values --

for guiding development both social and personal. Where are they in the wasteland? While, as we have noted Peter Berger to argue, "development" should entail governance by ethical principles, the "ethic" characteristic of both the "developed" and the "developing" now seems little more than a radically private and relativistic hedonism.

Our formal procedural principles, here in the wasteland, are reductionist. Our political and economic thought has become a set of bloodless abstractions. Thus, both in our thought and in our pursuit of goods, we have lost sight not only of others but of ourselves as well. Modernization, we have said, is the process in which we are all caught up. According to its canons, we are to consume ourselves into perfection: but we consume ourselves in the process. For some three thousand years, wise men in every culture have told us that appetite cannot be satisfied; but now we have tried to make it the legislative principle of our lives and institutions. In theological terms, a generation that laughs at the notion of original sin has managed to mass-produce it. We have -- some of us -- everything to live with, but nothing to live for.

Of course, this quite objective immorality cannot continue. The machine is not producing more and more for more and more; it is producing more and more for relatively fewer and fewer. The imbalance between the haves and the have-nots grows, rather than declines. When the images of becoming one's desires (of desiring as the only form of becoming), mediated through our "advanced" culture and its media, finally spark the Armageddon, what, who, will be left to desire? The refugee camps of Africa and Asia and the ranches of Latin America are, unfortunately, not curious accidents. Poverty with T.V., impotence and desire conjoined, are the potential nuclear elements of a future cataclysm.

What then of education? Can we repair the ruins and recreate education simultaneously under these conditions? Customarily we have regarded certain studies or disciplines as the fundamental building blocks of any educational regimen. These studies have had their educational role because they have represented fundamental forms of human experience and understanding. But we are in shambles ourselves. Much of our science (at least as it is taught in schools) is still crudely positivistic and reductionist, feeding us only abstractions. Our history, being thoroughly disemboweled, would have to be "thickened up," as William James put it, were it to function pedagogically with any effectiveness. Philosophy has repented of its flight into analysis, but where is it heading? Religion has been cast out and substituted by religious "thought" and psychologized spirituality. What is left?

It has been suggested in this volume that art -- particularly in the form of literature, poetry, and drama -- is not merely a reflection of culture but an instrument for building it, making it.[11] That is why, in fact, until recent generations it was the heart of the educational process. Real art is inescapably about human life. It works through myths and images, and perhaps it is the case that only myths and images can rebuild and populate the barren landscape. Perhaps through a restoration of art to its proper place we can return to an educationally adequate context, though it may be only in a sub-community and through the creation of a sub-culture -- a real counter-culture, a real leavening if you will.

Art has not been guiltless, of course, and has its own potential besetting sins. The aim here is not some mindless notion of expunging science or replacing it with art, but for art to provide once again a crucial integrative focus. Art ideally could function together with a more humane history, with a science educationally understood as a humane activity, and with other "subjects" similarly reconceived. So defined, art can make good myths, images and stories, in and through which we can live together rather than apart. If we can once again embody the truth rather than reduce and abstract it, perhaps there is still hope. If we cannot, hope will probably be

unnecessary.

The Pennsylvania State University U.S.A.

NOTES

1. Some portions of this chapter were explored in another paper, "The Utility of Traditional Philosophy in Educational Research and Reform," delivered in a symposium on "Educational Research in the Global Community," 1986 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco.)

2. I follow here Peter Berger's important distinction between "growth," "modernization," and "development," a distinction with both formal and substantive content. "Growth," he argues, is virtually universally defined in economic terms, as concerned with the wealth of goods. "Modernization" is conceived as describing the process by which we seek to stimulate growth and seek to increase the supply of goods without regard for the implications of that process. "Development," Berger argues, at least should mean placing growth and modernization under the authority of ethically conditioned political principles. See Peter L. Berger, *Pyramids of Sacrifice: Political Ethics and Social Change* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1976), pp. vii, 8-36, et passim. Clearly, I am indebted to Berger for far more than a definition or two, and anyone concerned with these problems must at least listen to what he has said, for example, in his *Facing Up To Modernity* (New York: Basic Books, 1977); or his and Michael Novak's more recent *Speaking to the Third World* (Washington, D.C., American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1985).

3. See Prof. Paul Peachey on "Appropriate Education" in George F. McLean and Henry Johnson, eds., *The Moral Imagination* (Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, in preparation).

4. See Prof. Roberto Hozven on "The Church and Educational Control" in *The Moral Imagination*.

5. Hannah Arendt, *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought* (New York: Penguin Books, 1977). See Chapter 5, pp. 173-96, esp. pp. 185-93.

6. See Prof. Peachey on education as "artificial," *The Moral Imagination*.

7. It is perhaps useful to keep in mind that the "state" as the actual "supplier" of services such as education is a relatively recent invention. The churches have always served as a transnational institutional means for providing both educational content and the necessary basis for support for the development and extension of schooling. When secularly oriented movements (understandably, from their socio-philosophical perspective) chose to remove education from the control of the churches, it was not immediately clear what other agency could take their place in an effective manner.

8. The literature reflecting the "hermeneutic" perspective is now vast and complex. However, I am particularly indebted here to Josef Bleicher's *The Hermeneutic Imagination: Outline of a Positive Critique of Scientism and Sociology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), Chapters 1 and 2.

9. Here again the relevant literature is very extensive. For another critique, see Denis Goulet and Michael Hudson, *The Myth of Aid: The Hidden Agenda of the Development Reports* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1971). The following are some of the sources that have particularly provoked my thinking and guided my observations.

See Robert G. Meyers, *Connecting Worlds: A Survey of Developments in Educational Research in Latin America* (Ottawa: Educational Research and Advisory Group, 1981). Meyers calls frequently for the growth of a "research mentality" (e.g., p. 18), although he admits that the universality (my term) of the enterprise can be questioned (e.g., p. 11). He regrets the fact that researchers do not keep in touch, but he fails to see that conflicting modes of thought may make that contact difficult. "Politics," he insists, provides "constraints" on research, which should (it appears) transcend all that sort of thing. His review also suggests that the impetus for research comes from "outsiders" and that it is regrettably lower in "education" than in agriculture and industry -- the latter differing, apparently, from the former largely in degree rather than kind. See also R. G. Davis and N. F. McGinn, "Education and Regional Development" in Lloyd Rodwin and Associates, *Planning Urban Growth and Regional Development* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969). *Educational Planning in the Context of Current Development Problems*: Proceedings of the 1983 I.I.E.P. Seminar, Paris (published by the Institute), esp., the articles by Reiffers and Silvestre, and by Ernesto Schiefelbien -- the latter fixing attention on the need for causal models for research.

The current state of affairs in Latin America is partly visible through *La Educación*, a review published by the Departamiento de Assuntos Educativos of the O.E.A., Washington, D.C. The Department also issues periodic reprints of particular articles as "Estados del Arte de la Investigación Educativa en America Latina." Regional publications differ considerably in mood and content. See, for example, the publications of the Centro de Reflexión y Planificación Educativa (CERPE), Caracas, Venezuela, esp. their *Investigaciones Educativas Venezuelanas*, which reflects much more politically and culturally oriented work. The "multinations" (if I may apply that term) are essentially neutralist, trying to avoid the political as dangerous and the cultural as unrigorous and unscientific. For another, but not incompatible view, see Joseph S. Tulchin, "Eversins Patterns of Research in the Study of Latin America," *Latin American Research Review* 18, (1983), 85-94.

10. Annual Report of the World Bank, 1985 (and other years), published in Washington, D.C. by the Bank. Also extremely important are the *Educational Sector Policy Papers*. In the third edition (Washington, D.C., 1980) for example, the argument given is that education "should be effectively related to work and environment," embracing the "knowledge and skills necessary for performing economic, social and other developmental functions" (p. 86). The chief need is for "capacities to design, analyze, manage, and evaluate programs for education and training" (p. 87). The foundation for this work are primarily economic formulae.

11. See Prof. Hozven regarding literature and building culture in *The Moral Imagination*.

THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL EFFECTS OF ADVERTISING
JEREMIAH O'SULLIVAN R.

THE HISTORY OF ADVERTISING

Advertising, in a broad sense, has been part of economies since at least the beginnings of trade. Merchants have always sorted out the advantages of their goods in the marketplace. The oldest known written advertisement is a 3000-year-old Babylonian tablet requesting the return of a slave. Shop signs and broadsides affixed to walls, posts or trees were common advertising devices in all civilizations prior to newspapers. The invention of printing by movable type ushered in a new age of commercial communication. The first printed advertisement in English appeared in 1477, the year after William Caxton set up his first press in England. By the middle of the seventeenth century, British newspapers had adopted advertising as an intrinsic part of their contents. The first daily newspaper in the American colonies devoted as many as ten of its sixteen newspaper columns to advertising. The styles and objectives of these ads stood as models -- in English-speaking countries, at least -- for the first period of the modern era of advertising.

Modern Advertising: An American Phenomenon

Industrial mass production began in England, but the assembly line and other innovations pushed the United States into the forefront of industrialized nations in the early nineteenth century. Similarly, consumer culture began in the court of the Sun King, Louis XIV, at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Later it spread to the general population of France and England in the expositions and department stores of the nineteenth century. But consumption, like production, found its most fertile ground in North America.

As America became more industrialized, especially from the 1880's to the 1920's, mass-appeal advertising paralleled the mass production of goods. Nationwide advertising directed the public's attention to the increasing variety and quantity of products distributed on a nationwide basis. Mass production gave urgency to the creation of a mass market, so that all that was made could be sold, rather than piling up in warehouses. Agencies appeared in France and the United States in the 1840's. By the 1870's, they were using relatively sophisticated marketing surveys and marketing strategies.

The Evolution of a Cultural Institution

Most advertising during this period focused on the product -- its construction, its performance, its uses, its price, and its advantages. Product-information advertising aimed both to familiarize the newspaper reader with the national brand and to introduce new products and educate the consumer as to their purposes. Many of the claims made for products were excessive and often mendacious, bringing advertising into disrepute well before the turn of the century.

After the 1920's, the product information model was replaced by a model of competitive mass advertising that stressed product imagery and product personality. This advertising placed commodities within natural or social settings -- a garden, a home, a party attended by

sophisticated people, etc. -- in order to project the meanings and values associated with those settings onto the commodities. Similarly, product-personality advertising equated the personal attributes of individuals with the qualities of the commodity: "The cigarette of discriminating smokers".

Influenced by the new forms of advertising, the meaning of the commercial exchange altered fundamentally: people paid money for product image and personality instead of product utility, as in earlier transactions. A combination of factors interacted to promote the mergence of product-image and product-personality advertising between the 1920's and the early 1950's. Among the most significant were technological innovations, especially photography and radio, the rise of parity products -- manufactured items so nearly identical that special efforts had to be exerted to discriminate one brand from the other -- and the beginnings of statistically-based audience demographics and market segmentation strategies.

The technological developments offered better opportunities for product presentation. Radio's sound transcended distance and time limitations in transmitting commercial messages. The realistic representations of photography conveyed images in ways that the older forms of illustrations could not. Advertisers used the possibilities of photography by intensifying the symbolic association between goods and the consumer's self-image. These possibilities in advertising stimulated the development of emotional, affective, or "mood" advertising. Under the influence of photography, facts about the product had to give way to product fictions, and utility became less important than fantasy. Likewise, marketers exploited the potential of radio by commercializing its content and revolutionizing advertising's form.

Products which were physically indistinguishable and were set apart only by their brand names still could differ in the image given to the product. A fictitious distinction, a belief, became a product attribute. Marketers began to differentiate goods less by describing the real or reputed character of the product itself and more by product imagery. Audience demographics and market segmentation strategies developed out of this urge to set the product apart. With data about prospective consumers -- including geography, social and psychological characteristics and buying behavior -- the advertiser could more easily reach distinct market segments with appropriate commercial messages.

All these factors distanced advertising from product information. Product identity and product identification became important, rather than the character and quality of the product itself. In the 1950's and 60's, notions of lifestyle also became increasingly important. Greater affluence and the popularity of television, among other things, made it easy for advertisers to promote the lifestyle ethic. Advertising told commercial stories that linked the individual to a social group or an economic class and associated products with the style of consumption of that group or class. The lifestyle format widened even more the gap between advertising, on one hand, and the utilitarian messages and their "reason-why" logic, on the other. Commercial television and refined demographic research strategies stimulated lifestyle advertising. Programs were delivered in a format suited for the sale of advertising blocks. Time became expensive when commercial television was the medium. The original one-minute commercial, replaced by the thirty-second one, became a fifteen-second flash because of rising costs. This had significant impact on the presentation: little time was left for a reasoned argumentation, comparative analysis, or meaningful product information.

Consumers are now divided into market-lifestyle-sectors characterized by "psychographical" features which describe all their buying preferences. The ultimate goal of this research approach is to develop a group's so-called psychographic portrait, consisting of generally applicable

personal values, attitudes and emotions. Using such a "portrait", advertisers could better identify and exploit the wishes and fantasies of potential consumers. Like earlier demographic research, psychographics identified blocs of people for advertisers, who then targeted them as buyers of their products. Psychographics continued the process by which lifestyle images were given priority over the presentation of facts about the product.

Advertising today uses all the many arrows in its quiver: information, image, personality, and lifestyle. How it mixes these for a particular campaign also depends on what factors are present: the kind of product or service being sold, the intended audience, the character of the actual audience, the product or service type, the context in which it will be used, the medium by which it will be used and the medium by which the message will be transmitted.

As a result of all this, changes have occurred in the way products are consumed. Today's advertising and consumer-culture have roots in the changing nature of the market in the late 19th century. Those changes paralleled changes in the modes of transportation and communication, urban growth and a cultural climate for social and geographical mobility. In the 1950's, people had more money and could afford to purchase more goods. Slowly the companies started to sell in a different way. From the selling concept, "Try to sell everything you produce without considering if there is any need for it", manufacturers came to use the marketing concept, "Discover and appeal to the existing needs and wants". But, only a small range of needs were appealed to. Many of the needs satisfied were environmentally wasteful, materialistic and short-term. Other needs were and still are unsatisfied.

THE BENIGN CHARACTER OF "AMERICAN-STYLE" ADVERTISING

Advertising can be approached by two main research paths.

One deals with ways to devise more effective advertising. Its point of view is that of business which is responsible for the bulk of the material published on advertising: books on consumer behavior, how-to-advertise, marketing guides, and even semiological approaches that explain the complex world of the consumer's preferences.

Many of the research methods used in the study of advertising's effectiveness just after World War II have been called into question by the methodologists of the various academic disciplines involved. One big stumbling block was the large number of factors, apart from advertising, which affected sales. As computers came into widespread use in the 1960's, sophisticated computerized models were increasingly used to refine theories and procedures.

The other path is a critique of advertising more from the consumer's point of view. Advertisements are analyzed and their influences on the public are measured, not in terms of buying behavior and sales as would the business-oriented researcher, but in terms of psychological, social and cultural changes attributable to advertising.

With few exceptions, the critical scholars are negative toward advertising. The business point of view often claims that advertising only mirrors the society in which it exists and is unable to create wants and needs other than those which consumers already experience. Studies from the critical viewpoint nearly all deny this, and a positive or neutral stance seems almost impossible to achieve if one assumes an initially critical perspective.

The Nature of Advertising

"Advertising", as we usually understand it in contemporary society, is a process of persuading a mass audience through the mass media to buy commercial products. It is distinguished from direct selling-the hawker of merchandise in a public market, on the other hand, and from "public service announcements" such as the times of church services, health warnings sponsored by non-profit organizations, etc., on the other.

Such local advertising as announcements of food prices in supermarkets or of sales in department stores is ethically less problematic than the expensive, wide ranging advertising campaigns of national or multinational corporations. The main criticisms leveled against advertising deal with ethics in the narrow sense of conscious distortion and manipulation, or in the broader sense of what forms of advertising are doing to human discourse in general. By its nature, advertising changes and directs human behaviour and culture, although its only intention is to sell. The critics, even those who do not doubt the general morality of that effect, call into question the ethics of many of the means employed and the appropriateness of particular campaigns.

Large-scale commercial advertising is characteristically Western. Moreover, even if it is carried on by local advertising agencies in Tokyo, Singapore or Nairobi, its pattern is overwhelmingly American in origin. Furthermore, the driving engines of much contemporary advertising are those large American corporations that perceive advertising as an indispensable element in their companies' profitability. Their dependence on advertising has set a precedent which others feel they must follow in order to remain competitive. The kind of advertising being discussed therefore can be appropriately called "American", even if it is used to sell the products of Sony, Toyota, Hyundai, Nestle, Shell, Volkswagen, or Volvo.

Both the manufacturer and the advertising agency share in advertising. The manufacturer devises the marketing strategy, and the agency develops ways to carry it out. The ultimate responsibility for advertising, however, lies with the manufacturer, who purchases it. An agency only devises a format which the manufacturer can accept or reject. If dissatisfied with one agency's approach, the manufacturer can go another until satisfied, or can devise its own campaign. Since the manufacturer's role is so great, ethics in advertising is essentially tied to ethics in marketing.

The Defence of Advertising

Industry has laid itself open to criticism in the past by not assigning a high enough priority to ethical considerations. Such criticisms are mainly:

"*Show Window*": This highlights one of advertisings' most important functions as making the products of industry visible to the public. It is the most visible activity of business, its show window. By showing people their products, producers are making claims for them, but also they are inviting public criticism and attack if their products do not live up to their promised benefits. For this reason, proponents say it is safer to buy advertised products than unadvertised competing products. The makers of the advertised product put their brand names and reputations on the line. They will try harder than others to fulfill their claims and maintain their good reputations.

"*Materialism*": In response to the charge that advertising makes people too materialistic, the authors admit that advertising affects our value system by suggesting that the means to a happier life lie in the acquisition of goods, more materials things. But they point out that different consumers have different needs and desires. Advertising presents the possibilities, it is up to the

consumers to determine which are among their more urgent needs. Some enjoy a simple lifestyle: others want to indulge in the material pleasures of a modern technological society. There are advertising sponsors making appeals at both poles of this continuum. A whole industry exists -- and advertises -- to sell products designed for those who want to live "more simply"! Material satisfaction may even serve as a means to create a wider range of opportunities to achieve higher cultural and spiritual values. For example, advertising informs the public about upcoming cultural events like opera and drama, thereby making them more accessible. In the Spring of 1994 Gregorian chant, promoted by advertising, was near the top of the pop music charts in some countries!

"*Manipulation*": According to the critics, "Advertising manipulates us to buy things we don't need by playing on our emotions. The persuasive techniques are so powerful that consumers are helpless to defend themselves". The defense says that advertising cannot make us buy things we do not need; that people who say the opposite have little respect for consumers' common sense and their ability to make decisions; that many advertised products fail; that subliminal advertising, which has inspired many fears among critics, has never been proven effective; and that some products are successful even without advertising. In short, advertising's influence has been exaggerated. People are skeptical and do not pay that much attention to advertising.

"*Artificial Needs*": To the complaint that, "Advertising creates artificial needs", the defense says that if there is no need for a product then people will not buy it. Advertising does not create needs; it helps the consumer decide which among the various brands to purchase. Marketers have found that the way to advertise and sell products is to satisfy genuine needs and wants, rather than to invent needs.

"*Too Much*": Many complain that there is too much advertising, but the defense says we will just have to put up with it, because the dominant economic system demands a high level of mass distribution of products. Advertising volume will stay high because mass distribution supports our free enterprise system. It is the price we have to pay for free television, freedom of the press and our high standard of living.

"*Offensive*": It must be acknowledged that many find advertising to be ineffective and in bad taste. What is "offensive" is often subjective, determined by time and culture. Many things hat used to be offensive in the past are no longer so. Liquor ads can be offensive for some, while others take them for granted. Often the products themselves are not offensive, but the advertising offends in order to gain attention. Benetton, a clothing manufacturer, in 1991 literally plastered Europe with billboards showing nothing but a blood-soaked newborn baby, with no further comment and no evident relation to the product. The same company simultaneously staged a similar, "distraction marketing" magazine ad campaign in the United States -- arguing that it wanted to stir up discussion of controversial issues. One of the ads featured a nun kissing a priest; another portrayed a dying AIDS victim, a corpse in a pool of blood on a street, etc. However, if a campaign does not in some way attract people, it is the standard opinion of advertising experts that it will fail. The audience has the veto and can ignore the offending advertisements. But advertisers are aware of what the general public finds distasteful and, for the most part, try to avoid it, the Benetton example apparently notwithstanding.

"*Stereotypes*": It must be admitted that advertising does perpetuate stereotypes, as many critics claim. However, great changes have occurred in this regard in recent years. Advertisers have become sensitive to stereotyping population groups, because these groups constitute business for them, just as much as other groups. Minority advertising has become niche-making, instead of the use of stereotypes. The image of women in ads also has changed significantly so

that men and women are portrayed equally. This is due not to feminist pressures, according to the defense, but more to changes in the marketplace which make the exploitative representation of women counterproductive.

"*Deceptive*": To the complaint that "Advertising is deceptive", it must be said that continued deception would be self-defeating because it causes consumers to turn against a product. `Puffery' -- "the best", "greatest", "premier" -- if sometimes believed is therefore deceptive, but there is little evidence that deceptive advertising helps sales. It is in the interest of the advertiser to stay honest.

"*Adds to the Cost*": In Spain, it was said that a car of the Seat Audi Volkswagen Company would cost, theoretically, 100,000 pesetas less if the cost of advertising were omitted. Consumers might cry, "We are paying to have something sold to us.!" But the defense says this is not true because advertising makes possible mass production, which in turn reduces prices through the economy of scale. There are many other factors in the cost of an automobile which are equally intangible, but of acknowledged importance: aesthetics, psychological satisfaction, etc.

Social Benefits and Social Responsibility

Advertising also stimulates the development of new and better products, gives us a wider choice, holds prices down, encourages competition, subsidizes the media, supports freedom of the press, and provides means of dissemination of information for health and social issues as well as for products. Although advertising sometimes is misused, the Federal Trade Commission has reported that 97 percent is satisfactory. It is up to both advertisers and consumers to ensure that advertising is used intelligently and responsibly.

Advertising is bound by laws, but it also is tempered by ethical responsibility and the canons of good taste. You can act unethically without breaking any laws, but the community may impose its own informal sanctions for such violations. Most advertisers claim today to maintain high ethical standards and socially responsible advertising practices, but the sins of the past haunt them. Still, the pressures to make a strong and innovative impression are so intense that the temptation to strain limits of good taste and even morality often becomes too strong to resist. Ethical considerations tend to be an afterthought in the planning of most advertising campaigns.

Previously free of formal restrictions, advertising is now a heavily regulated profession, due to earlier excesses and shortcomings. Consumer groups, specially interest groups and government, can review, check, control and change advertising. In the United States, federal regulation of advertising imposes strict controls on advertisers through law. There are a number of institutional bodies which look after the rules.

THE NEGATIVE CRITIQUE OF "AMERICAN-STYLE" ADVERTISING

The Mirror Theory

According to the "mirror theory" put forth by some defenders of advertising, the industry simply takes its contents from the culture, transforms them and throws them back. But a metamorphosis occurs when culture's symbols are associated with goods. The meanings of images and ideas are infused into products and services, just as the meanings of products and services are infused into images and ideas. Advertising then releases the altered meanings back into a commercialized world ready to deliver products and services. This process is somewhat

parasitic, feeding on the products of noncommercial culture -- ideology, myth, art, sexual attraction, even religion -- for commercial ends.

Others describe it similarly. The selling function of the advertising message limits what is mirrored. Promotion is always positive; commodities are presented as the road to happiness. In short, advertising uses existing values and symbols rather than reflecting them. It typifies what is diverse, filters out what is antagonistic and depressing, and naturalizes the role of consumption. The picture presented is flat, one-dimensional and habituates the audience to its interpretation of what is "normal".

It can go even further. Commodity imaging constructs the precise ideological focus most appropriate for a certain market situation. It builds dense semiological systems out of a selection of cultural items. In this way commodity imaging can, to a degree, be ideologically creative, and it may bring about a real change in the culture's symbols.

Advertising does contribute something by reconstituting meaning, rather than merely reflecting it. The devoured cultural contents retain their affectivity, but are stripped of their context and are "sold back" to the consumer as a new cultural system -- with new, commercial values replacing the original noncommercial values. For example, women are commodified to sell almost everything: cars, perfumes, etc. Their bodies, sexuality and mystique are traded. Today's mass advertising has less to do with products than with lifestyle and image, not reason but romance. Therefore, it is a cultural system instead of an informational system. But it is an incomplete cultural system, since the real values of its noncommercial contents have been drained out, leaving only their affects attached to commodities. Furthermore, only the pleasant side of life is shown, not the unpleasant and painful experiences with which a complete sociocultural system must cope.

The distorted image reflected by advertising is conservative, an effect of appealing to the lowest common cultural denominators, with which all will agree and which can offend as few as possible. In the constructed world, the safe compromise but false unity of perspectives which advertising shows is represented as our deepest and natural desire. The middle-of-the-road approach, the fear to offend any group, has been politically institutionalized. Therefore, as an ideological vehicle, advertising is not just constrained by the logic of hugging the middle of the road, but also becomes subject to the pushes and pulls of cultural politics, and is punished when it blunders too far off the track.

Ramifications of Commercialized Communication

According to certain authors, there are seven cultural ramifications of the commodification of discourse-consequences which follow when the values of communication are fused to the market:

- The logic of discourse changes and becomes distorted.
- The recontextualization of images and ideas debases their former normative values. Logical relationships are destroyed when there is no longer any real connection between the product and the images and emotions used to sell it. The use of images from religion, art, patriotism and similar noncommercial dimensions of culture trivializes and debases not only the images, but also the noncommercial institutions themselves.
- The identity of the consumer is reshaped as a relationship to goods and services, which themselves are turned into "fetishes" with unrealistic symbolisms of power. People become

regarded as "economic animals" when the real relationships of life are distorted, as human nature is devalued and defined only in relation to the goods and services humans consume. Values far beyond what they really possess are attributed to the commodities being sold.

- The reliance of mass media on advertising revenues gives advertisers direct influence on media contents, so that they can reshape almost the entire spectrum of the media to meet their needs. Consciously or unconsciously, those who pay for advertising come to control the media. The financial "bottom line" becomes the only criterion of "worthwhile" programming or publishing, and both the artistic and moral values of the media are inevitably degraded. The waste of resources becomes a virtue under this influence, as product "turnover" to inflate the "bottom line" overshadows even the most urgent demands of environmental conservation.

- The constant urging to change products and services contributes to waste.

- When messages are disseminated largely because of their market value, the ideals of citizen-democracy succumb to those of consumer-democracy.

- Finally, politicians' imitation of mass marketing strategies makes political discourse undistinguishable from advertising. If people are only "economic animals", it follows that they have no rights except as contributors to the economy, and the central principles of democracy become gravely threatened. This threat would be made greater by the assumption, gained from the advertising-dominated culture, that the selection of political leaders should be guided by the same mindless process by which advertisers now sell their commodities.

This is a disturbing vision of an advertising-dominated world.

MEDIA RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ADVOCACY

Research for Education

An important concern of those involved in the growing movement for media-awareness education (sometimes called "media literacy" education) is with advertising and how people can "defend themselves against it". There is need to determine the adequacy of the usual methods used to study advertising and to make and test a research model of beliefs and attitudes towards advertising and to study the factors in belief structures about advertising and their importance. Among the many strands which have to be sorted out before media education can be properly carried on, however, is the need to find out just why and how people object to and distrust, advertising. A partial answer has been given by the empirical study of the ways people perceive the social and economic effects of advertising.

The results reported some positive and some negative impressions of advertising. It was regarded as communicating product information, thereby promoting market efficiency and improving the economy. On the other hand, it was seen as misleading, as promoting materialism and corrupting values. While shaping the kind of person who will buy goods and therefore contribute to the economy, advertising also was thought to undermine children's education and to promote sinful inclinations.

An earlier, two-dimensional model of advertising's perceived effects was found to be deficient, since it gave inadequate place to personal uses of advertising, such as for product information and amusement. The new research also delineated three kinds of cultural effects more sharply than had been done earlier: materialism, value corruption and falsity. Public

attitudes towards advertising were found to be increasingly critical and distrustful. The proliferation and intrusiveness of advertising were especially annoying to many.

One survey studied the work of some of the most significant scholars in the humanities and social sciences who have written on advertising's social and cultural consequences. Their views were classified by discipline:

- psychologists think advertising is a source of learning or conditioning;
- sociologists see it as establishing role models and as impacting social behavior;
- anthropologists view it as ritual and symbols, giving meaning to artifacts and other objects;
- educators are concerned with its influence on child development, and
- communication scholars often equate it with propaganda and analyze its role within the mass media and its influence on the media.

Advertising is subtly seductive, causing a preoccupation with material concerns and the assumption that these lead to happiness. There are a number of reasons for advertising's effectiveness. It is pervasive, it is repeated over and over, it systematically uses research designed to improve attention, comprehension, retention and behavioral impact. Finally, its impact is heightened by the fact that its audience is increasingly living in a cultural vacuum, away from traditional sources of cultural influence such as family, church and school.

Mainstreaming

In view of the relative cultural vacuum in which it operates, advertising has a strong "mainstreaming" effect, especially for more greedy and materialistic consumers. To the many effects of advertising voiced, must be added that it raises expectations -- showing the "grass to be greener" elsewhere. It also romanticizes the past. It uses only moderate sexual stimuli, because excessive sexual provocation would not be controllable for the advertiser's purposes. Advertising promotes passiveness. It changes the norms of public decency by showing all kinds of social phenomena and expressing indifference to them. Consequently, collective political priorities decline. As long as consumer demand and GNP are up, we do not need social and economic justice, according to the political value system advertising encourages. The distorted emphasis in the language taught by advertising reduces the credibility of language and also advertising's own credibility.

Whether from a Biblical perspective or from that of secular humanism, advertising appears to be a social force opposed to religion. Some of what it sells is, by the standards of many people, sinful. It promotes a morality of materialism and a gospel of goods. It must be acknowledged that materialism preceded advertising, but the appearance of the latter coincided with the rise of other influences, such as urbanization, industrial expansion, increasing literacy, and widespread education, all of which worked with advertising to promote materialistic values.

All these influences -- together with the influence of the nonadvertising contents of the mass media -- work together in complex ways to cultivate the social meanings by which we organize our lives. The relative share of advertising in carrying out this process remains ambiguous and impossible to measure with any certainty. Nevertheless, its tendency to focus on certain values to the neglect of others must have some impact on those heavily exposed to advertising. There still is hope that advertising agencies may recognize the fact of this selection process and take steps toward a good, rather than bad, influence on the moral climate.

Gender

The origin of the use of pictures of women as sex symbols in advertising is lost in the early history of the industry. The motives are obvious, but they represent an assumption on the part of the advertiser that the majority of potential buyers of that particular product are men. Changes have occurred in the use of gender references in advertising in recent years which are owed more to the advertiser's perception of their audience than to any considerations of morality, decency or good taste, or even to the influence of the feminist movement. Most advertisers now realize that women have at least as much buying power as men, and consequently take pains to avoid offending them. This does not mean that there is less sex in contemporary advertising, just that it is used more subtly.

Gender stereotypes and myths are interwoven in beer commercials and their contexts. Drawing on research on the relationship between alcohol advertising and drunken driving, we can discuss the ways in which the myth of masculinity is expressed in beer commercials. The advertising works both as a mirror and as a reinforcement for the myth. Beer commercials are only one form in which the myth appears, since it is found in ordinary non-mediated communication as well as in all sorts of mass media contents. The ads both reflect and reinforce the culture's conception of "the man's man". Also, myths take different forms each time they are related; so beer ads "reshape the myth of masculinity, and in this sense, take part in its continuity construction".

Myths in any culture tell the boys and men of that society what it means to be a man, what kinds of things men do, how boys become men, what environments are to be preferred by men, how men relate to each other and to women, etc. Each of these concerns is defined in beer commercials. Challenge, risk, mastery over nature, technology, others, self, dominate the image of masculine activity portrayed by the commercials. Beer is a reward for challenges met and overcome. Beer-drinking itself is never portrayed as a challenge, even though it poses many challenges. Alcohol affects judgment, slows reaction time and threatens self-control. Therefore, beer-drinking is a challenge in itself, but it would be self-destructive for the beer industry to advertise it as such.

In the world of beer commercials, masculinity revolves around the theme of challenge, an association that is particularly alarming, given the social problems which stem from alcohol abuse. For the most part, beer commercials present traditional, stereotypical images of men, and uphold the prevailing myths of masculinity and femininity. Thus, in promoting beer, advertisers also promote and perpetuate these images and myths. Furthermore, the commercials are highly accessible and attractive to children and offer answers to their questions about gender and adulthood. They have real impact on social learning and attitude formation.

The myth of masculinity has a number of redeeming features, but the beer commercials present only one dimension of masculinity, which is clearly antagonistic, possibly laughable, but without doubt sobering.

Brand Building

Some authors have studied how advertising contributes to building "strong" brands, i.e., favorable audience responses to brand names and the logos and other imagery associated with a particular company or product.

Two of the most interesting cases are those of the advertising of Marlboro Cigarettes and Absolut Vodka. The construction of product charisma is not about functional or instrumental utility; it is about manipulating emotional meaning, which is different from rational function. It also avoids questions of "truth in advertising" because there can be no literal way to taste Marlboro Country or verify that Coke adds life.

Marlboro Country is "metaphysical" in the negative" sense of the term as used by positivists. It is a social construction of reality which exists only if people participate in its construction and maintenance. But if such an image is firmly related to the product it can radically change its value and lend charisma.

"Imagepower" study shows us that brands are very important in the marketing process. In the beginning there is only a company, which creates, manufactures and sells a product. Next comes the product, with certain physical features, and certain functions and attributes which characterize what the company is selling. After that comes a long-term communication process which establishes brand identity through creating and positioning symbols which will define the product in the minds of the audience. Finally come individual advertising campaigns and other promotional measures cumulatively to build up the brand's presence to, and desirability for, the public. Careful and consistent brand building can result in greater sales. In different cultures, brands are built up differently. Brand building in Europe needs individual attention for each country, and "branding" in Japan is different from most Western practices. Branding is a vital stage. Whether the product is good or not, if people do not believe in the brand they will not buy it again. This sums up the ultimate aim of all "image" and "lifestyle" advertising. It also suggests why advertising is so essential to free enterprise marketing, and why that kind of advertising is unlikely to disappear as long as that economic system lasts.

Strangely, just as some followers are willing to die for a charismatic leader who is associated with a glorious cause, some consumers exhibit extreme behaviors towards artifacts imbued with compelling meaning. An example of this is the case of a young teenager being killed for his Nikes.

"Charismatic" brands develop an ethical problem. Strong brand identity is, at the same time, one of the most important objectives of advertising and one of its most troublesome attributes.

Children and Advertising

At the age of five or six, children have trouble distinguishing fantasy from reality and make-believe from lying. They do not distinguish programs from ads, and may even prefer the ads. Between seven and ten years-old, children are most vulnerable to "televised manipulation". At age seven, the child can usually distinguish reality from fantasy, and at nine, he or she might suspect deception in ads -- based on personal experience of products which turned out not to be as advertised -- but they cannot articulate this and still have "high hopes". By ten, this has begun to turn into the cynical view that "ads always lie". Around eleven or twelve, the child begins to accept and tolerate adults lying in ads. This is the real birth of the adolescent's enculturation into a system of social hypocrisy.

Due to their lack of experience, young children have less resistance to advertising, and it may be especially harmful because of their inability to distinguish it from other programming. But the frame of reference for judgements of "reality" or "fantasy" can shift. Children asked whether a "realistic" drama about a school was "real", replied that it was not, "because it was not

like their school". The considerable similarity of the television portrayal to their own experience, but with discrepancies, had actually increased the children's perception of it as "unreal".

Another problematic area is advertising's tendency to view only positive aspects, avoiding ugliness, pain, and other negative dimensions of real life. In this it differs from education, other contents of mass media, and similar, more balanced modes of presentation.

The content of advertising has long been subjected to much criticism. This was discussed earlier, and is accentuated in its impact on children. Stereotyping and raising children's expectations higher than can be fulfilled might be stressed. So might the way advertising plays on existing fears and constructs irrational fears. These visions of advertising see it as a malignant, rather than a benign influence, as pervasive and often as immoral.

Television, in general, has also changed the image of the child in modern society, and advertising may amplify that change. In earlier times, children were regarded as "sweet" and "different", incapable of adult responses. Now there is a tendency to portray them as "kids", streetwise, amusing, interested in excitement and fast action. Kids really know more than we give them credit for and should not be talked down to. If that stereotype comes to affect adult-child interactions, little leeway would seem to be allowed for either discipline or education. From another perspective, children are seen as living in an "age of innocence" -- trusting, naive, uncritical. Adults who act upon this stereotype are likely to regard television as unmitigated evil, seducing and taking advantage of the innocent and defenseless.

The Global Perspective

One more negative scholarly view of advertising is that there may be no use in studying the social and cultural effects of advertising alone. They are part of a larger system in which large conglomerates control our culture. One of their tools is advertising. This view certainly is correct in insisting that advertising must be studied in its proper context and as one influence interacting with many others.

Advertising is a product of industrialized society. Since a coherent and viable economy, today, is largely dependent on mass industrialization, advertising will continue to be a factor in our lives.

Effects as "By-products": But advertising is what we see and hear all day long. All conceivable media are filled with it. The study of the social and cultural effects of commercial advertising is in itself a negative one. Social and cultural effects are not the intended effects of advertising, because it is not designed to change social behavior or cultures.

Advertising functions only to sell products or ideas. Therefore, it is not surprising that this topic is not dealt with much in advertising textbooks, which stress "how-to-advertise". Social and cultural effects are by-products of advertising, but they are central to the interest of those who are fearful that advertising has too much influence on our view of the world. And it does. Exactly how advertising works on consumer's minds is still a matter for continuing research, but that it works cannot be denied.

America, the Laboratory: The critical study of advertising in the United States is especially welcome, because that country is the Valhalla of advertising, or as others argue, the country most "littered" or "polluted" by advertising. At least the effects are more obvious there than in most

places. The U.S. is the laboratory of advertising research, and what has been happening there may soon be happening elsewhere.

The Distorting Mirror: Defenders of advertising say that advertising only mirrors culture in order to create sales appeal. But the mirror is distorted. Every critic on the subject describes the way in which the mirror selectively uses only parts of culture, linking values and symbols to commercial products. Advertising is so all-encompassing that this clearly faulty mirror has become an authority on what the culture "should" be. The mirror tells us about an ideal life, toward which we all should strive using the products recommended. Advertising functions as did the story teller in ancient times; by telling us its stories, it transforms culture into a consumer culture. The commodification of culture is the result of linking the culture's symbols, norms and values to good.

The rationale for dealing separately with American or Western advertising and advertising in the rest of the world is that advertising has become such and integral part of Western culture. Also, American society has become the model for that way to advertise all over the world. When operating globally companies advertise in non-western parts of the world using the same Western mirror for their advertising, though they will sometimes use indigenous models as well.

Global Frustration: This makes the mirror even more biased. By showing Western advertising in non-Western countries, the ideal Western lifestyle and culture are proclaimed. The critics of "cultural imperialism" say that this leads to cultural alienation. Others see it as a tendency to globalization, for companies operating and advertising globally represent a tendency toward a global culture. Advertisers say that it does not make sense not to target indigenous culture because in that way they will lose sales, whereas sales are their ultimate goal.

But Western advertising can and does lead to frustration. Many cannot afford the goods of the ideal life. And, whether using local symbols or not, the distorted mirror of advertising will still be linking culture to products and therefore stimulating consumer culture wherever it is shown. Criticisms of advertising are less criticisms of capitalism than of its result: consumerism. People do not need all the products shown in order to be happy. We can do without the "materialism" which is used so often to stereotypically describe American society, but which in fact describes most of the Western industrialized world.

A Survey of the Literature on Advertising

Some parts of the world are not represented in the works discussed below. But the overall conclusions of scholars dealing with advertising and culture are amazingly consistent. Advertising all over the world is operating in much the same way, and all over the world, it is increasing in volume and probably in influence. The tendency to globalization, first in economy, and gradually also in culture, gives advertising free rein.

More Active Critics: A few general comments can be made about developments in the literature on advertising. Over the past decade the amount of advertising has increased. As a result, the criticisms have changed, becoming even more severe. Organizations like The Centre for the Study of Commercialism (CSC), The Foundation for Media Education (FME) and its magazine, *Adbusters*, and the Cultural Environmental Movement (CEM), stand up to advertising "pollution" by creating awareness among teachers, communicators and others who disseminate information. They have developed an active role, which can be considered as new, distinguished from the more general consumer protection of the past.

Also there are those who hold moderate views which consider advertising not to be as bad as other critics make it seem. But they, too, warn of its harmful effects. This tendency describes the information environment in which people live as crucial for social and cultural effects. The more access one has to information, the less influence advertising is likely to have. Conversely, the less information one has, the more influence advertising will tend to have.

More Dialogue: Law is not an issue here, because there can be no law against showing only the "good life" while leaving out its deficiencies. There is no way to escape advertising, but at least we can strive for advertising that is more responsible in restoring the true reflective power of the mirror, whose distortions have been the source of much of the evil.

The business point of view has changed little. In consulting typical textbooks to see how they deal with criticisms of advertising, we find that they use most of their space to respond to the easier-to-answer difficulties and pay scarce attention to the more central and critical issue of the "faulty mirror theory". Some complaints are easy to rebut, but the distortion of reality seems to be an essential trait of most contemporary advertising and needs to be faced squarely.

A serious dialogue between advertising and its critics is important. Advertising has a responsibility. It must be possible to sell goods without devaluing cultural symbols or the values held by a culture. That advertising is leading to consumerism is largely a result of mass-production by industries which have to sell large quantities of their manufactured products to show a profit. Still, there is no need to present that as the highest goal attainable. Responsible advertising should try to achieve its economic goals while keeping them in proportion with greater human values.

More of the Same: Despite the vast technological and political changes sweeping the world, it seems that nothing really new has happened in advertising over the past decade except, according to critics, that the situation has deteriorated. The world has become Westernized. Global corporations have expanded to different regions of the world where they cause more of the same complaints heard so often in the past. Advertising is still growing, and therefore growing in importance. The critics of advertising have grown with it.

Some relatively small organizations make an active effort to attack advertising by education, and consumer groups have gained in power. But it seems also that governments are not cooperating with the critics. There is a worldwide tendency toward liberalization, deregulation, and privatization favoring the advertising industry, which results in the critics sharpening their views.

In the meantime, there have been more nuanced reactions as well, from scholars who see the benefits of advertising, along with its bad aspects, and who are somewhat less critical. The arguments in defense of advertising remained, overall, the same. This is somewhat unfortunate since they so frequently miss the main points raised by the critics, on which then little dialogue takes place. But it does seem that the advertising business is listening more attentively to critical views and takes suggestions from them in order to produce better advertising. There is room for the presentation of critical papers in meetings of advertising specialists, giving hope that broader dialogue will develop.

The Commodification of Culture: Whereas earlier critics concentrated on advertising's creation and use of unwanted persuasion, in 1994 the critics are attacking the commodification of culture, the all-encompassing presence of advertising, and the cultural changes for which advertising is held partly responsible. Advertising has changed people into consumers. Some ads are clearly an insult to people's intelligence. Fear at these tendencies and indignation about then still run high, and are even growing in some circles.

The development of advertising is a "success" story whose end is not in sight. New media have been invented which will create new possibilities for advertising. It is doubtful that the "information superhighway" will be free of advertising for it is the perfect vehicle to reach millions of people. And good marketing sense demands the use of culture and cultural values for efficiency in targeting audiences. The often-heard complaint that the mirror of advertising is a distorted one remains serious, but a true reflection of reality would not sell many products; so some distortion seems inevitable. Most criticism is directed against this faulty mirror.

In the end, even if it is hard to admit, were it not for advertising we might not have the marvelous opportunity to see the Olympics, or many other unforgettable moments in our lives and in our country.

REFERENCES

Adbusters. A quarterly publication of The Media Foundation, 1243 West 7th Avenue, Vancouver, British Columbia V6H 1B7, Canada.

Bendinger, Bruce. *The Copy Work Shop Workbook*. Chicago: Copy Work Shop, 1988.

Bovee, Courtland L. and William F. Arens. *Contemporary Advertising*. Fourth Edition. Boston: Irwin, 1992.

Clark, Eddie M., Timothy C. Brock and David W. Stewart (eds.). *Attention, Attitude, and Effect in Response to Advertising*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Eribaum Associates, 1994.

Collins, Ronald K.L. and David M. Skover. "Commerce and Communication," *Texas Law Review*. Vol. 71, No. 4 (March 1993), pp. 697-743.

Communication Research Trends. A quarterly Information Service from the Center for the Study of Communication and Culture. Vol. 14, Nos. 1 and 2, 1994.

Himmelstein, Hal. *Television Myth and the American Mind*. New York: Praeger, 1984.

Maloney, John C. "The First 90 Years of Advertising," Chapter 2, in Clark, Brock and Stewards (eds.), pp. 13-54.

Martínez Terrero, José, S.J. "The Economic and Value-Centered Approach to Advertising Research in Latin America." Privately-distributed paper, February 17, 1994.

Mattelart, Armand. *Advertising International: The Privatization of Public-Space*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Piñuel, J.L. "La Publicidad," Chapter 9 in *La Dirección de Comunicación* by M.H. Westphalen and J.L. Piñuel. Madrid: Ediciones del Prado, pp. 433-561.

Wernick, Andrew. *Promotional Culture: Advertising, Ideology and Symbolic Expression*. London: Sage, 1992.

THE CHRISTIAN COMMANDMENT OF LOVE
The Realization of the Person and the Common Good
ALBERTO MUNERA D.

Education in the university is constituted not only by joint daily activities, but, under certain circumstances, it is itself an area for study and research. The education of the human being comprises such abundant and complex dimensions that its research approximation is necessarily limited. However, due to their importance some areas of education evoke particular interest, resulting from the profound repercussions they have upon individuals and societies. Without a doubt, one of these areas is moral education.

The university rightly engages in reflection and debate with regard to the public and explicit import of moral education, whose effect on the configuration of our future as persons and as human groups is evident. In effect, if the future is built on the foundations that are being laid today, and if the designs for tomorrow become a reality in the measure that we have carried out the blueprints and structural design, then moral education may be understood as a series of structural plans that will facilitate the careful construction of our future society. Obviously, it is the job of the university to design the plans for building the future and moral education is central to this essential task. Yet, it is difficult for the university to take a responsible part in building society without a prior and in-depth understanding of the structural forms which will support the future edifice. If the university does not as "universitas scientiarum" contribute the elements for carrying out the design, society will emerge with possible defects and deficiencies which could have been avoided.

We shall approach the topic of moral education in terms of its foundations and place it in an interdisciplinary context. This is because the design of human conduct that will serve as the basis for a future society necessarily depends on all kinds of human competencies -- and the sciences from which they spring -- that facilitate its design and development. Once an adequate interdisciplinary blueprint has been agreed upon, we turn to the subject itself. As a human activity moral education requires an adequate understanding of the principal actor in the educational process. On the other hand, as human behavior susceptible of development in the educational process comes from conscious experience, an interdisciplinary approach and moral experience are the two fundamental elements of moral education.

Toward this end, however, the university cannot ignore a dimension which pertains historically, culturally and anthropologically to our context, namely that of religion and Christianity. In any case, due to its universality the university engages all available resources, but in our milieu the fundamental contextual characteristics of the moral subject are tied to the socio-religious Christian phenomenon. Therefore, it is appropriate that the university utilizes the concepts of religious Christianity in its reflections.[1] Indeed, it may be argued that without compromising its proper limits philosophy historically has reflected passionately on religious phenomena in all its dimensions and very specifically in its relation to human moral behavior.

In order to characterize Christian moral identity reference frequently has been made to an evangelical precept: the commandment of love. From the early days of Christianity until now, this commandment has been understood as the key to Christian moral conduct. In order to reflect on the foundations of moral education within a Christian context, inevitably we consider the Christian commandment of love. However, many other aspects are to be considered separately in

the analysis of this evangelical precept. First of all, a retrospective look is necessary to capture the historic dimension of Christian moral identity. Then it will be necessary to establish epistemological and hermeneutical criteria which permit a critical judgment of the past. From there it will be possible to formulate in terms of contemporary thought the Christian commandment of love as the groundwork for structural designs which can support the future edifice.

THE COMMANDMENT OF LOVE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PAST

Approaching Current Moral Reality

Due to the great advances of modern technology and the broad capabilities of the mass media, it is possible to identify major problems that affect simultaneously large sectors of humanity. Important regions of the planet have been destroyed permanently by fratricidal war. There is evidence of commercial exploitation and economic dominance. The demographic growth of immense populations accentuates situations of extreme poverty in people already suffering from an endemic lack of resources which threatens their subsistence and development. The tireless struggle of economic powers for the exploration and domination of nations and continents has solidified structures of institutional injustice which are more and more resistant to all attempts at liberation.

In every kind of society a polarization or stratification is present between human beings with unequal possibilities; small groups control proportionately the majority of resources of whatever type, while the masses barely obtain minimal goods for their subsistence. Violence, in the form of political, military, economic, commercial and social pressures, is deployed against entire societies. The most elemental human rights are trampled upon flagrantly by the uncontested forces in power. The unchecked forces of capital exploit millions of workers in situations of unequal competition, thereby accentuating the distance between the social classes and establishing competitive pressures which lead to their mutual destruction. Science, technology and human creativity develop their inexhaustible potential while at the same time impotently contemplating the ecological deterioration resulting from their own inventions.[2]

If we descend from a global focus and concentrate instead on the units such as countries it is equally possible to detect a multitude of problems which on a daily basis violate individual and social existence. In such regions as Latin America, it is especially frightening to contemplate the impotence of masses of people in view of the daily situations they must endure:

- the merciless death of innocent children from hunger, malnutrition and sickness of every kind due to lack of the resources needed for survival;
- the permanent educational deficiency that subjects entire populations to an economic and social strata which becomes ever more difficult to overcome;
- the exhaustion of peoples resulting from inadequate public health services and the resources indispensable for maintaining a hygienic and healthy life;
- the weakened family structure torn by circumstantial economic pressures that impede a peaceful and stable common life;
- the violence affecting the family, as well as the political, economic and cultural life of small, unprotected societies; and

- the oppression of social and ethnic minorities and the mistreatment of the great majority of women in our society due to backward cultural traditions.[3]

This is but a sampling of the myriad of deplorable conditions to which for centuries our Latin American brothers have been subjected.

These factors and others are analyzed from many different scientific perspectives: sociology, political science, anthropology, economics, demography, history, law, etc. But from a philosophical and theological viewpoint, these matters require urgent ethical and moral attention. For regardless of the philosophical current to which one ascribes, one fact stands out clearly from the many problems listed above: the deterioration and breakdown of that which, although undefined, we call "the common good." By distinguishing between ethics as a philosophical discipline whose object is human conduct, and morality as a theological discipline whose object is human conduct from the viewpoint of religious phenomena, I take this problematic as an object of moral reflection.

Certainly, each of the issues mentioned has always been an object of study and definition from the moral theological viewpoint. Concretely, the Catholic Church has presented abundant documents dedicated to this issue and there abounds a lengthy theological bibliography in reference thereto. But it is of particular interest that in Latin America the above problems appear to spring from the actions of professed Christians, while the great majority of those affected by such actions also are Christian.[4] Given that the global situations described are contrary to the common good but products of human action, we must label their authors immoral.[5]

If one accepts the hypothesis of an intrinsic morality in every religion, especially in Christianity, the paradox is clear, viz., the immorality of Christians in a Christian society. If such a simple presentation of an hypothesis be accepted, an important question follows: What has happened to Christian morality if, in spite of its supposed excellence, it does not cause Christians to act morally?[6] By means of its documents it is possible to demonstrate that Christianity has always proposed a moral doctrine that condemns as openly immoral and against Christian principles human behavior responsible for problems such as those mentioned.

Yet historical events show that Christianity has lived a kind of theoretical-practical schizophrenia wherein one finds, on the one hand, a supreme moral doctrine and, on the other, an openly contrary behavior.[7] This undeniable reality has given way to a justified criticism of Christianity as not living up to its own moral doctrine. This does not deny the marvelous contributions of this religion to the progress of humanity, both in the field of moral doctrine and in the practice of love and service to society. But the magnitude of Christian virtue practiced in the history of our religion does not hide the obvious scandal of a moral deficiency in part of the ecclesial community. This is especially apparent at the present time when the appreciation of the phenomena focuses on the social and fixes its attention on its structural, ideological and institutional aspects.[8] With regard to contemporary moral theology, the treatment of such an aberration becomes inevitable and constitutes a challenge for justified self-criticism in an attitude of honesty before a world that inquires into the reason for this situation.

In considering the issue, we can reaffirm that Christian morality is synthesized in the Christian commandment of love. In the past, this commandment has remained largely unfulfilled by Christianity even to the point of producing present realities of obvious immorality. Where does one lay the blame: in the liberty of Christians who have simply disregarded the commandment of love; in the painful historical circumstances that have brought us to the present situation against our will; in the minority of followers of Christ who have been overthrown by

superior forces in number and in power; in the lack of coercion by the ecclesial authorities; or in what theology calls "the force of sin" which has prevailed over the heroic goodness of our religion?

Without rejecting the relative value of such answers, contemporary moral theology has sought to articulate other possible causes for the moral inefficacy of Christianity. While contemplating the commandment of love and its treatment in the past, moral theology has dared to reflect on an aspect of unquestionable repercussion in the life of the ecclesiastical community.

Christian Moral Education until the Present

Moral theology considers Christian moral education as a hypothetical answer to the painful paradox of the moral inconsistency of Christianity. The suspicion that Christians in past centuries, as in our own time, have been morally educated in such a way that their behavior is nonetheless deficient or barely adequate is not inconceivable. Modern moralists have entered into a critical analysis of moral education in terms of its content, structure and key elements.[9] They have detected some aspects which betray faults and inconsistencies in relation to the original postulates of the Christian faith and have also discovered elements foreign to the religion established by the person of Jesus Christ.[10]

A review of the works of moral theology used in clergy formation demonstrates the great preeminence of the ethical over the moral. Even worse, it presents the historical development of philosophy and its horizon in a manner which excludes pluralism of thought.[11] The primary postulates used in moral reflection became more the propositions born of pagan philosophy than actual experiences of the faith supported by Christian practice.[12] The almost total disregard for the scientific advances in all disciplines related to man and his relationship to the world produced a moral code that is extremely abstract and disconnected from vital human reality.[13] The orientation of the moral formation for the sacrament of reconciliation schematizes great moral issues in very negative legal terms,[14] while scriptural resources tend to operate mechanically as authoritative testimony oriented to demonstrate preestablished theses.[15] Moreover, the preponderant methods employed in clerical formation are casuistic and a legal hermeneutics founded upon schools with relative authority.

This philosophy and theology have quite questionable characteristics. The philosophy in moral education is Aristotelian-Thomistic.[16] With due respect to this valuable area of thought, various of its positions have produced characteristics in the moral scheme of Christians which have resulted in deficient moral behavior. Among such characteristics one can include a static understanding of the reality of the human being, the universality of principles in contrast to the accelerated evolution and variation of history, the immutability and inflexibility in abstract terms of basic principles distant from the stressful problems of everyday life, the essential abstractness of existential phenomena, the rigidity and fixation of moral norms in need of adjustment and adaptation to historical man, and the inexorable and extreme objectivism which lacks a systematic comprehension of the dynamic of unique subjective historicity.[17]

It is impossible not to find in all of this the influence of a metaphysics centered on universal concepts and on the individual existent as a participant in the world of essences.[18] The rigid hylomorphism of Aristotelian philosophy results in similar anthropological perceptions and establishes fixed moral qualities of participants in the infinite goodness of pure act, while their corresponding intrinsic wickedness is in proportion to their potency; such elements color the perception of human spiritual and material dimensions.[19] This hylomorphic anthropology is

decisive for the interpretation of the human subject, but Platonic principles also play a role in relation to questions concerning origin and destiny, stressing a determinism which is far from the eschatological Biblical version.[20] The epistemological postulates of this philosophy inevitably served to mold the concepts of revelation and of faith with a cognitive emphasis and an objectivism arising from theories concerning the noetic identification of truth.[21]

Aristotelian ethics provided the basic structure for Christian moral knowledge as well as binding normative foundations of immutably innate primary principles, as well as outlines of freedom, conscience and law which constituted unchanging molds for Christian moral perception.[22] Given that generations of Christians have been educated according to such rigid ethical-philosophical schemes and lack a specifically Christian experience of faith, the deficiencies of the Christian moral sense appear unavoidable. With a certain sense of relief, contemporary moral theology can justly place the blame for these and other not specifically Christian elements on those who forged traditional morality, including elements of Stoicism and Maniceism which, from early times, have affected Christian moral understanding.[23]

For its part, theology, of course, has shaped Christian moral education. The above philosophical background came partly from a Christian educational patrimony whose theology had assimilated Aristotelianism in its methodology, epistemology and hermeneutics. Other theological characteristics upon which moral education is based are Judaism, spiritualism, historical maladaptation, interpretive literalism and impersonal rigorism.[24] In reality, in traditional Christian moral education, theology has been based on a written hermeneutics tied to historical literalism and fundamentalism.[25]

In the same way, the teaching authorities frequently decreed in absolute terms to the detriment of the evolution of dogma; they mythified the tradition, stressing its value by means of pronouncements and postulates.[26] Thematically, fundamental theology projected a perspective of revelation and of faith oriented to strengthening the cognitive transmission of eternal truths and the immutable foundations of moral principles.[27] The concept of God frequently approached the philosophical propositions of an infinite and perfect Being brilliantly delineated in each of his unique attributes and capable of being assimilated, almost without any changes, to the theory of a First Cause or of a Cause of Causes.

A disencarnate Christology removed the concepts of nature and person from the historical Jesus of Nazareth in order that experts might atomize him in abstract conceptual references.[28] A theological anthropology was construed saturated with subtle scholastic distinctions and abstract realities that, prior to the conjugation of grace with liberty, dissected the moral human subject into separate compartments as many pieces of a jigsaw puzzle which in the daily flow of existence were very difficult to put together.[29]

The above theological panorama has emphasized the negative aspects of Christian moral formation in order to underscore the weaknesses of past education responsible for the paradoxical deficiencies of Christian moral conduct. But this does not in any way mean that all has been deficient in the past, nor does it indicate ignorance of the marvelous theological work developed over the centuries in the Church. It is precisely to such work in theology and to the unquestionable support of Christian philosophical thought that the positive developments of Christian moral doctrine can be attributed, including the moral goodness realized by Christians throughout history. Neither would it be just to place the blame for the moral inefficacy of Christianity on the education of past epochs, obviously conditioned by their own temporal and cultural circumstances. One cannot expect the theology of that day to be in a position to analyze

scriptures in accord with the critical tools now available with the advent of recently developed instruments.

Thus the relative culpability of a moral education structured along the lines of a certain philosophical and theological mentality cannot be charged as the sole and exclusive cause of the actual inconsistency in current Christian moral conduct. Yet, significant blame could be articulated against the moral inoperancy of Christianity if theological thought and philosophical pluralism underwent notable development while the educational scheme remained static and unaffected.[30] In any case, from an historical perspective Christian morality, synthesized in the commandment of love, was notoriously affected in its comprehension, development and execution by a limited moral education that delimited its characteristics. Additionally, it may very well be the case that in the area of education, although the Christian commandment of love, interpreted as an evangelical precept of great importance, derived its normative character from God via direct revelation, its application by the Christian was mediated by moral principles anchored within a philosophical-theological structure.[31] In other words, the Christian commandment of love was absorbed within the strictures of a moral academy perfectly stratified and mediated to Christians in the form of catechesis, preaching, reception of the sacraments, magisterial documents and formal university instruction.[32]

If contemporary moral theology has risked an honest self-criticism of its possible structural flaws and of its moral education, it has done so with the intention of recuperating lost ground in relation with the accelerated advance of the sciences in our current world.

EVENTS GENERATIVE OF CHANGE

The self-criticism effected by contemporary moral theology did not arise spontaneously but sprang gradually from two events taking place within the Church: Vatican II and liberation theology. These have brought about an enthusiastic process of reflection and rethinking of a multitude of theological questions. Although they may be situated within a specific historic moment, their antecedents represent the toil of many years and the sporadic initiatives of past epochs.

In particular, Vatican II was a response to the pressures of Christians and theologians who for years had been insisting on making their faith experience an occasion to return to the gospel and to a fundamentally Christian identity. The theology of liberation, on the other hand, emerged as a living process of the faith of an oppressed people who, in the midst of their struggle for survival, finally made their voice and thought heard in the Church.

These two events can be considered in parallel fashion. Their realization seems to spring from a common font, i.e., a Christian experience of faith committed to the historic necessities and exigencies of our world today. These two events have not only signified a radical revision of moral theology, its content, method and questions, but, above all, has generated a decisive change in the perception of the Christian identity that fully justifies our critical judgment and makes possible a future perspective grounded on the Christian commandment of love.

Vatican Council II

The Church as a total community came to consciousness of the moral inefficacy of Christianity in the Council, where it recognized that the moral education elaborated and realized for centuries had failed to bring about an effective morality in Christian societies. The

fundamental direction of the conciliar documents invited the Church to restore Christian life and to formulate Christian doctrine in a manner similar to its origins. The way to deal with the problematic of the modern world plainly indicates that the prior focus of moral education had not achieved its objectives; indeed there is no shortage of instances of errors committed in the past.

From an analysis of the conciliar documents, a consideration of the Christian movements that gave way to the Council, and our previous theological reflection, it is possible to deduce that Christian morality possesses a specificity that in previous periods had not surfaced sufficiently. This was due to a symbiosis with a multitude of historical-cultural and philosophical elements of non-Christian origin, which not infrequently were contrary to the very dispositions of the gospel. Post-conciliar moral theology has boldly determined to purify Christian morality from spurious elements so as to render the identity of evangelical practice ever more in conformity with the most pristine and legitimate experiences of the primitive Christian communities. In this way moral theology has endeavored to assimilate with fidelity the call to "return to the original sources" promulgated by the Council. But not only did the Council attend to this historic communion with the genuine experience of Christian faith, it incited a resolute acceptance of the sciences and their autonomy and the adequate incorporation of their advances in the reflection and life of Christianity.[33]

All this involves a profound rethinking of morality in epistemological and hermeneutic terms which makes possible a new perception of Christian identity and its conduct. This novelty should coincide with the original perception of the primitive community and the moral education that follows should embrace this new perception.

Some elementary epistemological and hermeneutic principles proposed by the Council provided criteria to confront the preconciliar moral perspective and the moral education it sustained. It assured the design of a different version of Christian practice and education for future generations. The acceptance of Biblical exegesis as an essential tool for interpreting sacred scriptures deserves special mention since it is responsible for a definitive rethinking of ecclesial doctrine that has revolutionized theological thought in all its divisions.[34]

In the area of moral perception, it has made possible a grasp of Christian morality as a function of precepts revealed by God that obliges the Christian to construct moral criteriology from the vital faith experiences generative of specific moral behaviors during the time of the writing of scriptures, which later were formulated as precepts.[35] To recognize pluralism of thought as valid in the Church for the understanding of faith decidedly affects the epistemological foundations of ecclesial doctrine. Another dimension is the sphere of experience as a privileged place of faith and revelation. Here the structural notion of Christian truth receives a very different focus, given that the new foundation situates experiential orthopraxies first rather than noetic orthodoxy.[36]

Liberation Theology

Before its explicit formulation this focus was present in moments and situations of the Latin American Church. From the earliest of times committed Christians have raised their voices and engaged in struggles of liberation that were in some way thematized.[37] Eventually, there emerged painfully a theological view within the corpus of Christian theology that contributed fundamental elements for a reconsideration of Christian identity, especially in our times. This suggested a possible moral education that could lead to moral efficacy in Christianity today.[38]

If in the moral structure of the precounciliar era the protypical methodolgy consisted in a descent *from* a perfectly structured philosophy and theology *to* possible moral practice, the first and most fundamental contribution of liberation theology is a move from Christian praxis to a structured and thematic formulation of thought.[39] The Christian experience of praxis-faith becomes the determinating element of moral postulates in a manner similar to that in which the formulation of Christian principles took place in the primitive Church according to exegesis.[40] The interpretation of the history, social events, political phenomena, and cultural, ethnic and environmental circumstances of early Christians living their faith provided the resources constitutive of an intrinsic moment of moral thought. Without this permanent hermeneutic of situated existence, the formal thematization of moral thought becomes impossible.[41]

In this sense, the contributions of Vatican II and liberation theology have been responsible for the rise of a theological anthropology of a very different type than that present in precounciliar morality. In this anthropology the Christian identity is more adequately configured in terms of current reality; in other words, the Christian commandment of love as the synthesis of Christian morality begins to be viewed from an optic markedly different from that characterizing former times. The moral education which follows from this reflection is in conformity with this new perspective.

The challenge which the future presents to Christianity as regards morality should be addressed in the light of these new existential and doctrinal foundations. The fidelity of such foundations to the primitive experience of the gospel guarantees the moral effectiveness for Christianity which we have perceived as absent due to a former inadequate perspective of the Christian commandment of love.

THE COMMANDMENT OF LOVE IN FUTURE PERSPECTIVE

Keeping in mind the insights of Vatican II and liberation theology, the passionate work of postconciliar theology has been concerned with approximating the configuration of a fundamental Christian identity. The commandment of love is taken, necessarily, not as one more precept of New Testament writing, however transcendental it may seem, but as a symbolic formulation for a much more profound reality than a simple utterance of Jesus Christ. The moral task of the Christian does not proceed merely from following precepts or norms of conduct, but from the theological realities constitutive of Christian life as deduced from New Testament exegesis and other testimonies of the primitive community.[42]

The Historical Existential Process of the Christian

Two postulates, one theological and the other taken from modern philosophy, contribute toward the establishment of a first element of the Christian identity. In contradistinction to the static essentialism of the Aristotelian anthropological vision, the human subject in modern philosophical versions is always conceived within an historic dimension and in continuous and permanent evolution. As a dynamic actor in one's own self-construction, each individual is situated in permanent relation to the historic past, his surrounding social environment and his continuous and creative projection into the future.

All these aspects which hitherto were considered accidentally or in a secondary sense are now considered as constitutive of one's existential being. Thus, one's social condition and the

character of one's unfinished process in the existential passage of time are markedly accentuated. In perfect consonance with this image -- springing from modern thought with support from such sciences as psychology and sociology, as well as cultural anthropology -- theology apprehends the human person from Biblical data in a state of perpetual unfinished transition. Emerging as a replica of an infinite God, one's historic existence is proposed as a project of reproducing the divine features. This involves recognizing that a projective character, susceptible of growth and transformation, is expected to move in an ever more adequate assimilation of the divine image and its features. The human being, then, is in definitive tension, oriented toward a replication of the divinity in a metahistorical state.[43]

In this view of man as a project in continuous development toward a greater likeness of his Creator and eschatological end one perceives constitutive human sinfulness. Tradition calls this original sin, as negation of the teleological similitude with God, or as the lack of the dynamic image of the divine features. Inherent to the subject by reason of one's state as creature and accented by one's freedom exercised in terms of a human-social prejudice, human sinfulness affects all existence. In a dialectics of less to more, it coexists with the positive likeness received from the Author of one's existence, which is further accented by the human social goodness proper to those who love.[44]

In Pauline theology, the ontological justification of the subject is understood as a continuous Paschal passage from death to life, from evil to goodness, from darkness to light. This is to occur with an experience of faith in one who does not always achieve what he or she wants because of the strength of sin of the world. Vivified by the divine life of grace, the Christian subsists as a growing child until conformed to Christ, so that he no longer lives but Christ lives in him, i.e., until the features and sentiments of Christ are fully reproduced. In this Paschal dynamic of theological tension the Christian subject is projected eschatologically toward an entitative transformation that culminates in manifesting the likeness of God, whom we will see as He is because we shall be like Him.[45]

The experience of Christian faith, from which one receives the specific identity of a follower of Christ, does not occur in a noetic acceptance of abstract truths, but in the religious experience of one's incorporation into the life of the Trinitarian God. Because of the free acceptance of Jesus as incarnate Son of the Father in dynamic mystical reproduction of his features, the very same love of the Father and the Son is poured into the heart of the Christian. This works mysteriously an interior transformation that St. Paul calls a *metamorphosis* of all his reality until the new man appears. Possessed by the love of God, he is similar to Christ, the only begotten of the Father. This changes his manner of looking at the world until he thinks with the same thought as God. The sentiments, thoughts, attitudes, perceptions and reactions of the new man -- which the New Testament presents as ongoing and in a permanent process of transformation -- are the same as those of Christ.[46] The Christian is, therefore, a subject who realizes daily his vital experience of faith in this continuous passage from a sinful constitution to an existential state of grace in a perpetual dynamic of justification.

How can one be Christian without experiencing this profound and marvelous process of transformation? The aforementioned paradox of the co-existence of Christianity with an immoral society is not so strange given the possibility that Christian life has not always reached its true plenitude, especially as it is merely mediated culturally in a manner which does not represent a deliberate existential acceptance of the Son of God, as took place in the first Christian epochs. The Christian who has experienced a transformation in the Son of God, can no longer be the same; all one's reality is affected in a continuous and permanent way by the personal presence of

the infinite love of God which resides in one's interior and moves one into action that is decidedly Christian.

Conscience and Freedom

When from the perspective of moral theology one attempts to penetrate the interior events that result from the active presence of the Holy Spirit in each Christian, it is possible to so describe the Christian conscience and freedom, that the peculiar identity of the follower of Christ is made specific.

Following the testimony of St. Paul and the first Christian writers, the cognitive level of the Christian subject undergoes a profound modification. One's perception of reality occurs within a religious dimension in which the subject grasps the world and history inseparably in one's context as a creature and in terms of one's eschatological end. The critical process of conscience refers to the valuation of all being which occurs in proportion to the possession or lack of possession of divine reality. In matters of practical judgment, the Christian conscience proceeds in function of criteria and values originating in the infinite love of God present within. Love is the definitive parameter for conscience and its judgments. The conscience's work of discernment, given its constitutive reference to the love of God, proceeds by selecting that which is in conformity to this love.[47] Thus, the Christian commandment of love, understood in ontological terms as the operative presence of the Holy Spirit in the conscience of the subject transformed as child of God, constitutes the most intimate ground of the Christian identity.

The Christian subject does not deliberate in his or her conscience in terms of extrinsic norms, inherited cultural values, or philosophical postulates, nor in the face of elementary values present in the social environment. Rather, the Christian deliberates in the face of the absolute value of the love of God which is the reality of the Holy Spirit present within. This is the state of prayer of one who is attentive to his symbiosis with God himself and impels him to conform his behavior thereto.

For this reason the word 'liberty' in a specifically Christian context does not correspond to the simple designation of a human capacity to decide between possible options. On the contrary, the liberty proper of a child of God involves a voluntary adhesion to the infinite and personal love present within. It consists in the faithful and resolute following of love that impels one to a total offering of self for the benefit of others. Here a specifically Christian sense of liberty involves the complete transformation of human conscience in Christ, together with the inevitable communitary and societal connotations. Constitutively, it is a gift of oneself in total offering for the benefit of neighbor.[48] The Christian paradox is that one is freer to the extent that one places oneself in the service of neighbor, the more one gives to others. This commandment of love is summarized in the words of Christ: "there is no greater love than one who gives up one's life for others." This is the supreme Christian liberty evident in the same Christ "who loved me and offered himself for me," so that he is freest who best serves the Christ present in his neighbor in a state of total oblation.[49]

Evidently, these features of Christian conscience and liberty are absolutely constitutive of the identity of a son of God. The moral inoperancy of Christianity is unthinkable when such fundamental elements are rooted in the deepest structures of the human person and sustained by the experience of a personal love of God. The Holy Spirit has been sent to each child precisely to fashion moral conduct until God himself is constituted as the definitive reference of the Christian's understanding of the world and moral life. In this respect, New Testament theology

stands in notable difference from Judaic morality essentially in reference to law. Even recognizing the historic revelation of the God of Israel, St. Paul takes pains to contrast the old law with the new law of the Holy Spirit, viz., the commandment of love.[50] If the Christian functions morally in actions or attitudes exacted by the law, this results from the origin of such conduct and of the law itself, that is to say, the love of God. Occasionally, as exemplified by Christ himself in the gospel, the work of a child of God, in conformity to the impulse of the Holy Spirit, surpasses and even contradicts the precepts of the law.[51] Indeed primitive Christianity did not take the Decalogue or the juridical corpus of Israel as its fundamental referent, but concentrated on God's law of love inscribed in the heart of the Christian. The law of love led to moral behavior vastly superior to that foreseeable in the normative formulation of the Old Testament. The love of God present in the Christian leads to plenitude and thus surpasses the law. Accordingly, for St. Paul the Christian is not subject to the law because, liberated from its yoke, he is called to live in the liberty of the children of God.[52] This is to say that the constitutive feature of Christian identity coincides with the faithful observance of God's impulses of personal love in the interior of the believer.

Realization of the Person and the Common Good

This said, it is understandable why the primitive community did not view sin as a proper constituent of the Christian. The presence of constitutive sinfulness of all Christians undergoing a process toward permanent justification or conversion was never forgotten. But sin as a behavior contrary to love and justice could not be present in a subject occupied interiorly with the infinite love of God.[53] This made it possible for the moral efficacy of Christianity to become manifest: love was lived experientially. Given that this involves a complete offering of self to others, the Christian community was born as an ecclesial confluence of persons totally dedicated to neighbor. Love was plainly visible to the point that others exclaimed, "See how they love one another." This love not only generated a community, but completely regulated the social relation of the Christian with its surrounding world.[54]

The common good, the good of the community, the good of society and the good of all fostered an understanding in which the realization of the person resided in being a self-gift. Justice was understood as that which promotes the benefit of all beyond particular interests, and this in contrast to the elemental juridical or legal criteria of civil society. Mutual concern, unanimous growth, harmonious development, equitable participation, and communal sharing of all kinds of goods are the fruits of love born of the Holy Spirit who configures the structure of the Church and the empire of Christian justice.[55]

When one contemplates a reality so marvelous and then compares it with the actual state of Christianity, the hope is generated of a return to its constitutive identity as a child of God which in the future may render Christian morality efficacious. Certainly one cannot hope for a radical change of the present situation -- a liberation from the actual slavery of our peoples is unthinkable -- without a return to the specific identity of Christianity. The realization of the person in relation to the common good of society does not seem possible except as the result of a personal transformation as children of God and temples of the Holy Spirit. The commandment of love, understood as the experience of a genuine *metanoia* and *metamorphosis* of our being by the active presence of the Holy Spirit, presents itself as the plenitude of the human subject and as the guarantor of a morality whose end is the common good of society.

If the commandment of love is lived in its true ontological dimension and not merely as a matter of precepts, Christian moral education differs markedly from instruction based on codes of conduct where by social or religious pressures are imposed in order to derive the desired behavior. The transmission of values and the justification of the same by rational means falls short of Christian moral education, which cannot be situated solely within the conceptual field given that Christianity is realized in much deeper dimensions of being. Without the explicit presence of a profound religious experience in which the process of conversion is realized and a participation in the divine life is achieved, one can only talk of a peripheral and hereditary Christianity transmitted via cultural conduits that does not attain a genuine Christian identity. The moral operation and social efficacy of Christianity depends on living a life of love which can occur only in the depth of religious experience, not as the result of mere compliance with legal dispositions; theological love can occur only in the profundity of religious experience.[56]

Education and the moral education of the Christian come together in the religious experience we call faith. As a living event, faith involves a self-conscious and personal encounter with the humanized Son of God, Jesus Christ, in union with the Spirit of love and the Father.[57] This eminently communitary and social event, by reason of the relationality from which it originates makes impossible an experientially living love that is not in relation to others.[58] Christian moral education participates then in the characteristics of a truly educational process, which necessarily implies a community which participates in the same characteristics and converts itself into a natural environment wherein prayer, reflection and the formation of attitudes can take place.[59] Here Christian moral values, that come from the loving presence of God the Holy Spirit, are communicated not simply by instruction, but by a participation in the life of the community.

It is possible to detect throughout history some common characteristics of these Christian values that render them unmistakably Christian. Such values engender, for instance, a critical attitude toward social reality born of love experienced in community life. In effect, the transformed Christian is compelled in his conscience by the love of God and thus cannot be insensitive to the situations of injustice and suffering of the human person perceived in one's historic context. This sensitivity leads the individual in union with the community to a prophetic and courageous denunciation in resolute commitment to foster the liberation of the oppressed and mistreated persons or societies.[60] Love leads the Christian individual and community to a special option for the poor and marginalized, the oppressed and fragile, the weak and dispossessed minorities in favor of their continued permanence and development in history.[61]

Hence moral education is not a question of providing abstract instruction about the human being, it values and rights. Neither is the goal of moral education the mechanical performance of certain behaviors qualified as good. Rather, a living Christian moral education is realized when the subject in community develops one's potentialities to love in a manner that manifests itself in an unavoidable commitment to the process of human and social perfection.

CONCLUSION

It is difficult to establish in theory something as complex and immense in its dimensions as the "common good," which is also difficult to discern within a framework limited to the achievements of individuals or small groups. Notwithstanding, for Christianity both are possible not because it has a greater amount of data or mechanisms, but as a result of the realization of the

Christian in love which stands as the final referent of moral action. Thus, the Christian commandment of love leads the Christian to personal plenitude in service to others, the common good. The commandment of love in its projection restores the hope of an efficacious Christianity in benefit of a society that lives in the paradox of a grave social immorality.

Pontificia Universidad Javeriana

NOTES

1. See Puebla, especially nos. 1054 and 1060.
2. Vatican II, *Guadium et Spes*, nos. 4 to 10.
3. Puebla, nos. 27 to 70.
4. Puebla, *Message to the Peoples of Latin America*, n. 2.
5. *Ibid*.
6. *Ibid*., n. 8.
7. The texts of Vatican II, and in the case of Latin America, the documents of Medellin and Puebla recognize the reality of the moral inoperancy of our Christianity.
8. Puebla, *Message*, n. 2.
9. See Marciano Vidal, *Moral de la Persona* (Madrid: PS Editorial, 1985), pp. 811ff.
10. *Ibid*., pp. 539ff. For the Stoic and neo-Platonic influences, *ibid*., pp. 509ff.
11. Consult the typological schemes of moral theology prior to Vatican II in Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*(Rauch, Oeniponte, 1962).
12. For centuries the moral theology taught in the Catholic Church followed the outline of St. Thomas, who, in turn, is indebted for a great number of his postulates to Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*.
13. The insistence of Vatican II to take seriously the sciences and their progress as an indispensable element for the understanding of man and the world can be understood only in terms of their notable absence until recently.
14. See, for example, Arregui-Zalba, *Compendio de Teología Moral* (Bilbao: Eléxpuru Hermanos, 1951).
15. Either in Noldin or Arregui one may confirm the use of Sacred Scriptures as a simple reference to substantiate the assertions of the authors.
16. As indicated in n. 12.
17. See Charles E. Curran, *Principios Absolutos en Teología Moral?* (Santander: Ed. Sal Terrae, 1970) from which the qualifications enumerated here can easily be derived.
18. For examples of references to essences with which a great deal of earlier moral theology is concerned, see Noldin-Schmitt, vol. 1, *De principiis*, n. 67.
19. The application of the hylomorphic theory to morality tended to understand matter as evil.The liturgy included prayers in which God was petitioned to teach us to abhor matter in order to love the spiritual. For its application in the area of sexuality, see Arregui-Zalba, *op. cit*., p. 224, n. 270.
20. See Vidal, n. 10. The concept of the origin of life by infusion of a precreated soul into a body "elaborated" by the progenitors and the concept of death as the separation of the soul from the body are classical formulations of traditional Catholic theology.

21. The concept of revelation as it appears in Vatican I manifests a clear Aristotelian-Thomistic epistemological influence. All this is in the context of a Biblical interpretation that supposed the direct transmission of noetic truths by a revelatory route.

22. See the definitions of law, conscience, or freedom in texts on moral theology prior to the Council.

23. For the Stoic influence in Christianity see Vidal, *op. cit*., p. 515. For the Manichean influence, especially in Augustinian thought, it is possible to derive an idea in the anthology of texts titled *La Moral de San Agustín*, a publication of Gregorio Armas de la Purísima Concepción (Madrid: Asilo de Huérfanos del S.C. de Jesús, 1955).

24. The famous treatises of neo-scholastic theology before Vatican II are a testament to this affirmation.

25. Recall the huge debates about the first chapters of Genesis generated in the 1940s as a result of the development of paleo-anthropology, prompting the encyclical *Humani Generis* of Pius XII. Biblical exegesis received legitimate citizenship only in Vatican II.

26. Carlos Bravo, S.J., in his article "Ciencia Teológica y Magisterio" presents interesting examples of this phenomena.*Theologica Xaveriana*, n. 64 (July-September 1982), pp. 209ff.

27. Brunsmann, cited by H. Fries in his *Leherbuch der Apologetik*, I (Vienna, 1930), 147, states, "Revelation consists in the verbal communication to men of some truths that serve so that they may know and attain their supernatural end."

28. The classical "treatises" of neo-scholastic theology abound in theses on nature and person in full philosophical debate.

29. Recall the celebrated dispute "De auxiliis" between the Dominicans and Jesuits.

30. The thesis of the International Theological Commission concerning theological pluralism (1976) made this evident in contemporary theology. Abundant bibliography can be found on this topic in *Estudios Eclesiásticos*, n. 222 (July-September 1982), pp. 337ff.

31. See P. Häring, *La Ley de Cristo* (Herder, 1968), pp. 302ff. Note Häring's evolution in his post-conciliar works.

32. For an example of this see M. Vidal's *Moral de Actitudes* I (Madrid: P.S. Editorial, 1981), pp. 105ff.

33. Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 36.

34. Vatican II, *Dei Verbum*, n. 12.

35. This is clearly deduced from the context of the *Dei Verbum*.

36. Compare the definition cited in Vatican I with the text of *Dei Verbum*, n. 2 and 6.

37. From the great theologians of the patristic age to the valiant defenders of the human rights of the oppressed ethnic groups during the era of the conquest of Latin American, such as De las Casas.

38. In Moser-Leers, *Teología Moral* (Madrid: Paulinas, 1987) there is a recapitulation of the Moreno Rejon's bibliography of Latin American moral theology.

39. See Clodovis Boff, *Teología e prática* [*Teología do politico e suas mediações*] (Vozes: Petropolis, 1978).

40. See Karl Rumm, *Cristianesimo como novità di vita* (Morcelliana: Brescia, 1955).

41. A model of this is the famous "Discurso a Diogneto: moving document during the patristic period. See the text of Ruiz Bueno, *Padres Apostólicos* (Madrid: BAC, 1965), pp. 845ff.

42. Immensely illustrative of this is the work by Bernard Rey, *Creados en Cristo Jesú*s: *La nueva creación según San Pablo*(Madrid: Fax, 1968).

43. The studies of neo-testamentary anthropology give support to these affirmations. See especially C. Spicq, *Dieu et l'homme selon le Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Du Cerf, 1961), pp. 194-95.

44. See my study on this topic, *Pecado original desde el pecado personal* (Bogota: Universidad Javeriana, 1983).

45. For a treatment of this aspect, I recommend the study by Lyonnet-Sabourin, *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice* (Rome: BIP, 1970).

46. Illustrative articles may be found in P. Lyonnnet's *Apóstol de Jesucristo* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1966).

47. An extremely profound exegetical-theological treatment of the specifically Christian conscience is found in C. Spicq,*Théologie morale du Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Babalda, 1970).

48. The liberty of the children of God is admirably treated by Lyonnet in his book, *Libertad y Ley Nueva* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1964).

49. See L. Cerfaux's book's, *Le chrétien dans la théologie paulinienne* (Paris: Du Cerf, 1962), especially chapter X, "Le don de la justice," pp. 343ff.

50. In the same chapter, on p. 395, the author treats "L'abrogation de la loi ancìenne."

51. See P. Lyonnet, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-08.

52. Lyonnet in the book cited in n. 47 states, "We repeat one more time that the Christian is not a man without a law. He has an internal law that is the very life of God in him, and, by means of this internal strength, he can fulfill all that God expects of him" (p. 172)

53. "Have no other debt other than love for one another, because he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law" (Romans 13:8). "We know that all who have been born of God do not sin" (1 John 5:18).

54. In this consists the unity among Christians: "And I have given them the glory which you have given to me, so that they may be one as we are one." In this consists the sign before the world of the divinity of Christ, of his divine mission: "So that the world may know that you have sent me." The unity consists in *esse ad alium*, totally *ad alium*. (Lyoneet, *Apóstol de Jesucristo*, p. 207).

55. C. Spicq, *op. cit.*, T. II., pp. 165 ff: "La justice de la foi est la justice que vient de Dieu."

56. *Ibid.*, "Formation de la conscience et christianisation du sens moral," p. 592

57. *Ibid.*, Appendix I, "Vie morale: Christ et charité," vol 1, pp. 381ff.

58. Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, n. 7.

59. See Jean Mouroux, *L'experience chrétienne* (Paris: Aubier, 1954).

60. Recall Puebla: "What does the commandment of love impose? Christian love surpasses all the categories of all the regiments and systems because it brings the unsurpassable strength of the Paschal Mystery, the value of suffering on the cross and the signs of victory and resurrection. Love produces communal happiness and inspires the criteria of participation" (Message, n. 8).

61. See Puebla, 1134.

LOVE AND THE CHRISTIAN DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY
JOSE AYESTARAN, S.J.

The following, in a series of steps, attempts to summarize and then comment upon the chapter of Alberto Múnera in order to join his search for the deeper meaning of the theme of this volume. The presentation here follows the same order as his report.

INTRODUCTION

The context of this discussion is the university's task to investigate from various angles the complex and important theme of moral education with a view to developing an architectonic design and plan for the foundations of tomorrow's society. A cultural heritage is subject to critical social changes that radically question traditional moral education. Latin American culture is in many ways a mixture, resulting so from the fusion of three previous cultures: Amerindian, African and Iberian. The maturation of the resulting culture of the new world is not yet finished; it is young and still seeking its own identity. Similar to North American culture, the cultural inheritance of Latin America is not closed.

Every culture develops and changes in a rhythm which is asynchronous to its strata or levels. The most superficial strata change more easily and quickly. The most profound part of a culture is its fundamental distinctive and distinguishing character, its soul or ethos. This grows and changes only slowly over centuries and millennia.

The succession of ever deeper changes in a cultural inheritance frequently accompany social changes which, in turn, derive from scientific-technological developments. In the Inter-American context the pace of change deepens and accelerates, for the impact of these social changes is magnified when their source is exogenous and effects a weak culture in search of its own identity. In this situation our inheritance and ethos is profoundly attacked.

As one's moral authenticity is linked with one's cultural ethos, the social changes create moral confusion. Hence, the search for designs for moral education in the midst of social changes will have to correspond to the ethos of our cultural inheritance. Founding the new moral education must relate to this problematic of the history of our culture.

A global approximation of the present moral reality can be verified through the contributions of the diverse sciences which are then interpreted in moral terms. Although the resulting concepts are not precise, they reflect, in terms of the Christian Commandment of Love, the realization of the human being and of the common welfare.

The resulting sketch is very negative, almost apocalyptic: wars, fratricide, institutional injustice, inequalities of all kinds, violence, exploitation, powerless popular masses, hunger, sicknesses, insufficient education, deficient health services, family weaknesses and ethnic oppression: the picture is desolating. From whatever science, the judgment arrived at is very negative.

While agreeing with this globally negative apocalyptic vision, should one consider only the negative aspects; is such historic pessimism justified; are there live moral forces acting in our society?

Further, as the social changes seem to affect profoundly the cultural inheritance, perhaps the cultural ethos is being affected, and with this the most profound moral elements.

CHRISTIAN MORAL EDUCATION

It is deplorable that the above moral situation is found in societies with a Christian and Catholic inheritance, and that it is produced by people who consider themselves Christians. In view of this situation moral theology suggests some causes of the moral insufficiency on the part of Christians and proposes a Christian moral education. Critical analysis of traditional moral education manifests these characteristics: a) a total predominance of ethics over morals, that is to say, of philosophy over theology, b) almost total abstraction from scientific advances, projecting an eminently abstract moral disconnected from history, and c) juridicism.

The philosophy found in traditional moral education has been of an Aristotelian-Thomistic nature marked by universal principles, immutable and inflexible postulates, essentialist withdrawal from existential phenomena, fixed and deterministic moral rules and an inexorable objectivism.

The Christian moral is influenced also by Platonism, Stoicism and Manichaeism. Its epistemological postulates have affected the fundamental concepts of revelation and faith with an emphasis upon knowledge and objectivity. Hence, moral education has been above all ethical, without clarifying the specifically Christian faith experience. The influence of this philosophy has been pervasive: literalism in the interpretation of earlier texts, absolutization of magisterial authority, mythification of tradition, a perception of revelation as an immutable eternal transmission, a philosophic concept of God, a Christianity derived from the history of Jesus of Nazareth, an anthropology saturated with ecclesiastical distinctions, etc.

This description of the theological panorama caricaturizes the negative aspects of Christian moral formation with the evident intention of pointing out these weak points in past education to which the paradoxical deficiencies in Christian moral behavior might be traced. This is not to deny the "marvelous theological thought developed during centuries in the Church" and its great positive results. But the conclusion which imposes itself is that the synthesis of Christian moral thought based upon the Christian commandment of love was dissolved by an academic moral perfectly elaborated in all its levels through a moral education transmitted especially through the notional instruction in catechetics and preaching, rather than through authentic education. This auto-criticism of the traditional moral is made with a view to its purification and to recuperating lost ground.

This is an honest and courageous auto-criticism of moral theology, recognized as the major cause of the moral inefficiency of Christianity. But is this critical judgment appropriate if the tradition was efficient in a rural traditional society? Thus, the moral tradition seems not always to have been inefficient, but only in view of the actual changes in society.

The philosophical approach to Christianity has claimed continuous validity applicable to all history; this has marginalized history. Originally, the Christian faith enlarged past philosophical vision, which was then able to serve in the elaboration of theology. This inculturation was frozen, however, and has not been opened sufficiently to the new morality arising from science and modern philosophy.

The traditional philosophical-theological vision of moral theology seems almost totally responsible for the moral ineffectiveness of Christianity, to which should be added the traditional separation of moral from spiritual theology which orients the development of an authentic

Christian life. As the great spiritualities gather and promote the ascetic strength and mysticism of authentic Christian life, the separation of moral from spiritual theology has done damage to both; the ineffectiveness of Christianity seems due to the weakness of its spiritual theology. Religious and lay spiritual theology are in need of the same auto-criticism as has been made on the moral theology. This is in keeping with the recommendation below to develop the Christian experience of faith as a source for the renovation of modern moral education.

PRESENT SOURCES OF CHANGE

Two sources, namely, the Second Vatican Council and liberation theology, derive from the same source, namely, the Christian experience of committed faith in the face of the historic demands of today's world. This must assist in the discernment of Christian identity and in the development of the moral theology to be transmitted through a new moral education.

Vatican II

The Council made it possible to appreciate the ineffectiveness of traditional moral education for the modern world. As a result there developed a new awareness of Christian moral identity and of the need for a new moral education.

The basic issues were the principal epistemological and hermeneutic principles, namely, the new scientific developments, the contributions of new biblical exegesis, the new concept of revelation and its influence in the moral theology, theological pluralism in contrast to the fixism of the traditional patrimony and experience as a privileged source (a *locus theologicus*) for faith and Christian revelation.

This global vision of Vatican II suggests the following as important for present changes:

- Interdisciplinarity: This reflects both the opening of the Church and the development of modern sciences. This interdisciplinarity of the positive sciences between themselves and with philosophy and theology is still in its beginning and requires the development of a new epistemology. At present, though the sciences and philosophy and theology make their contributions, these are not articulated methodologically. This is a challenge in the elaboration of a new moral.

- Theological pluralism: within theology there exists today a new pluralism which raises a series of problems which still remain unsolved. Though theological univocity exists no longer, theological pluralism creates contributions which are so varied as to cause confusion, especially in the moral field. A subterranean moral theology is being proposed, but has not been accepted; there is notable distance between the official moral and what is being developed on the investigative level.

- Return to the sources: this is a return not to the archaic life or to the simplicity of the pre-modern world, but to the foundations of all Christian life. Instead of traditionalism, there is now a turn to the tradition, including in the first place, biblical exegesis. This itself has constituted a better relation of teachers and tradition. Return to the Scriptures has brought also a new understanding of Judeo-Christian Revelation, as the auto-communicating of God to man in history. With this one passes from the metaphysics of "eternal and immutable truths" to the historic: from the notional to the experiential, etc.

- Religious experience: the center of all Christian life and of moral experience is faith, rather than reasoning in abstract philosophic or scientific concepts. Moral education will have to deal more with the spiritual religious experience than with such concepts.

Theology of Liberation

The theology of the liberation is a Latin American phenomenon, although it has broader antecedents. It makes a fundamental contribution to the reconsideration of Christian identity and moral action, as well as to theological method. It begins from the Christian praxis of faith in history which it reflects upon and systematizes as in primitive Christianity.

The analysis of reality which is central to its epistemology of reflection in moral theology is interdisciplinary, above all with the social sciences and technology. This makes new contributions to theological anthropology and gives new expression to the Christian commandment of love as the synthesis of Christian morals.

The theology of liberation, on one hand, insists on the historical praxis of the faith, but, on the other hand, has not yet elaborated a systematic moral theology, especially a fundamental moral theology. It provides some solid hints on conceiving the fundamental moral as a following of the historic Jesus under the influence of the Spirit. To follow Jesus is not to imitate him at 20 centuries' distance, but to continue in history his life and works in constructing the kingdom.

On the other hand, North-American theologians have made distinguished contributions to moral theology, though not precisely in fundamental moral. Their contributions could be be useful, above all as North-South inter-american relations leave leave much to be desired in the moral field.

THE COMMANDMENT LOVE ONE ANOTHER AND THE FUTURE

Recent theology, combining the thrusts of Vatican II and the theology of liberation, has delineated a fundamental Christian identity, locating the command to love one another at the center of all theological reality, whence flows the dynamic of the entire Christian world. Alberto Munera, in this volume, elaborates this proposal in four stages.

The Christian Historic-Existential Process

From two postulates, one philosophical and the other theological, a new concept of Christian anthropology can be elaborated. Modern philosophy perceives man as historical and in continuous and permanent evolution; he constructs himself through permanent relations with past history, with the present social atmosphere and in creative projection towards the future. In this way the static and essentialist vision of Aristotelian philosophy is overcome.

On the one hand, theology in keeping with the contributions of the human sciences, and based upon biblical data, develops a revealed anthropology: created in the "image and likeness" of God: in the project of his historic existence man is expected to reproduce the divine qualities. On the other hand, the existence of man has a component of sinfulness which disfigures his similarity to God. Following Pauline theology, the ontological justification of the man is a continuous Pascal passage from death to life until man reproduces completely the qualities of Christ and feels, with him, as a new man.

This transforming experience of the Christian faith does not happen through a noetic or notional acceptance of abstract truths, but in the religious experience of one's vital incorporation into the Life of the Holy Trinity. No one can be constituted as a Christian without experiencing this marvelous process of total transformation. No one can pretend to have a Christian moral capability without having lived this experience. Christian identity cannot be lived only as a culture if it does not include a deliberate existential acceptance of transforming grace.

Overcoming the essentialist and unchanging mold of the Aristotelian anthropology, philosophy and technology together enter the process constitutive of man. The perspective shifts from metaphysics to the historicity of this process. There is a modern vision of a new man; its great discovery is subjectivity. The central proposition is then that there is no Christian moral without the constitutive experience of the new man. This constitutes a theological process of grace accepted in freedom. Without a Christian subject, there can be no Christian moral, for the moral of extrinsic precepts is not Christian.

Conscience and Liberty

The Christian experience of the transformation of the subject as a child of God effects continuously all human reality by the personal presence of the infinite love of God in one's heart and its resulting impulses to Christian action. Moral theology is centered especially in two specific elements of Christian identity: conscience and liberty. Conscience, as the cognitive limits of the subject, is deeply affected by Christian love which gives it a particular manner of grasping all from a Christian angle. The Christian conscience discerns everything in terms of the Spirit, that is, of love embedded in one's heart.

The Christian freedom of the child of God is not just a simple human capacity to decide, but a voluntary stance in terms of the infinite and personal love of God within the Christian. Under this impulse, freedom consists in the capacity of self-giving for others. Christian liberty has inevitable communitary and social implications for overcoming moral inertia and serving the common welfare.

Though there are occasional coincidences, the primitive Christian did not take as reference the Decalogue or the Jewish law, but the law of love inscribed in the heart. This impulse of Christian moral theology can overcome and even contradict the precepts of the Jewish moral law. Modernity has discovered and deepened subjectivity, and thus conscience and the liberty. The affirmation of a fall of subjectivity into subjectivism should be questioned, but guarded against.

Munera's legitimate central preoccupation has been the inefficiency of traditional moral education. The solution proposed is the experience of faith as constitutive of the new man who consciously and freely acts under the impulse of love. The problem, of both traditional and modern moral, however, is not only inefficiency but the falsification of conscience and freedom. What is a true and correct conscience?

The founding theological experience of the Christian moral is necessary, but not sufficient, for it lacks reflection on the eventual necessity of an objective of morality which should not be able to be manipulated and falsified. Without the objectivity of a moral rule the subject can fall into subjectivism. Is it sufficient to say that the Spirit of love illumines the Christian conscience and drives it toward the Good? Does not the capacity of discernment given by the Spirit include objective and lasting rules? Without some objective rule morals can fall into "situationism."

Traditional morality holds a natural law written in man's ontic-existential nature. This foundation of the objective rule for traditional morality assumes the ethical philosophy of pagan origin, whereas the modern conscience and sense of freedom reject obedience to this rule. If natural law is well understood, does "natural" mean non-Christian? If that be rejected, is there no other Christian rule to serve as the last criterion for morality?

Latin American Christology proposes as a Christian rule of morality the following of the historic Jesus. This implies the constitution of an historic rule to assist in rearticulating in historical terms certain basic values of Christianity (Cfr. Jon Sobrino, *Christology from Latin America* [Mexico: Edition CER, 1976] pp. 94-111) Without entering further into the problem, we can say that fundamental morality implies, apart from the constitution of the Christian subject by the gifts of the Spirit, an objective Christian rule founded in the subject and obligatory for his personal realization and the common welfare. Fundamental moral theology must study the historization of the generic value of Christian love. What shapes the principle or fundamental rules for the historization of the Christian commandment of love is not metaphysics or an essentialist anthropology, but the historic situatedness of the life of Jesus of Nazareth.

The Theology of Liberation suggests the following principles: 1) the conversion of the subject, which implies a passage from egoism as the soul and motor of the false realization of the person to a love for each other and for the common welfare; 2) a preferential option for the poor in order to build from their historic situation towards the common welfare, which implies the good for the majority of the poor; and 3) acceptance of the conflict implied in realizing the commandment of love as leading to the construction of the kingdom.

Final application of these principles consists not only in an intellectual deduction, but in a charismatic exercise of the Spirit of Love.

Realization of the Person and the Common Welfare

As in primitive Christianity, the living experience of God urges one towards an operative and effective moral. It embraces also the realization of both the person and the common welfare. Moreover, it proposes that the realization of the human being in the common welfare is possible only by means of the transformation of man into a child of God who lives the commandment of Christian love.

In the modern mind, unfortunately, the realization of the person frequently has been conceived in opposition to the common welfare. Individualism considers the realization of the person to be distant from or even contrary to the common welfare. On the other hand, collectivism's affirmation of the common welfare weakens the realization of the human being.

Between these two contrary "isms," the renewed Christian moral affirms that personal well-being and the common welfare grow in direct proportion one to the other: there is no authentic personal realization without giving of oneself to the common welfare.

This bipolar realization, person-common welfare, is possible only within the Christian experience of faith. Modern atheist or other secularist propositions which cut out the experience of God affirm a false realization of one of the poles at the expense of the other.

Future Christian Moral Education

Christian moral education is not principally instruction or transmission of values for rational and cultural motives. The experience of Christian faith is necessary as a foundation for the moral

strength growing out of theological love. This experience is living and self-conscious (not only religious and cultural); it reflects a personal encounter with God in Christ, which embraces the community and society.

This education by means of experience considers the subject to be in charge of his own education, for his life is a permanent, practical training process. Such education has some common characteristics: a critical attitude toward the social reality which grows out of love, appreciation for the sciences and their progress, and the preferential option for the poor.

In the Christian moral field, education as instruction or transmission of knowledge is insufficient; the importance of experience is rightly underlined. Christian identity has been weakened by a traditional moral education which was satisfied with instruction regarding "eternal or permanent truths" or moral behavior. It is necessary to recognize, on the other hand, that traditional moral education has not been limited to intellectualist instruction, especially if one takes into account all that has been contributed by spiritual theology.

In any case, experience must not fall into an intimist personalism, typical of anti-Christian individualism, for which personalism has been rightly criticized. Authentic personal experience is situated historically and committed to the common welfare. In proposing its understanding of the commandment of love, Christianity does not propose a magical and spiritualist solution in the place of efforts coming from the other sciences. Christian experience is not all, but it is fundamental and the foundation of Christian morality.

MORAL EDUCATION AS HUMAN FULFILLMENT:
The Fundamental Challenge of the XXIst Century
NICOLAS BARROS M.

MAN, CULTURE AND EDUCATION

Education is a phenomenon which concerns man and, as a process of human praxis, takes place in its own world: the world of culture. Accordingly, it bears the historicity inherent in objective realizations of culture. Therefore, it can be understood and interpreted only within the temporal framework of an epoch in dynamic relationship with the system of values, beliefs, ways of life, ideas, and views of reality which shape our tradition, set up our cultural heritage and support our identity. For this reason, any analysis of education as a phenomenon, either in its individual or social dimensions, or in its cognitive, affective or moral aspects, requires situating the reflective attempt in the framework of the philosophy of the human person nurtured by the contributions of the human sciences.

To theorize and philosophize on moral education supposes a systematic reflection on problems brought about by educational praxis in the whole context of present day culture and society. It is based on an idea of man as a premise of any further inquiry. In this sense the axis of the reflection should be placed on the interaction between humans and culture, which shapes humans as "creators" and as "created" by culture.

In order to accomplish this critical and liberating (or emancipating -- Habermas's term)[1] function implicit in innovative and creative tasks, one needs to be incorporated in his or her cultural heritage. It is exactly here that the educational phenomenon is inserted. Its proper function essentially is to guide the process by which new generations *understand*, *interpret* and *apply* their cultural heritage.[2]

To decide on education as a means to liberate or emancipate man is a value decision grounded in our cultural heritage. Actually, it is being accomplished in a culture and a society in crisis. This crisis affects the character development and the conditions under which our younger generation must strengthen its moral judgment, define its personality, and assume the fundamental task of making its own life and constructing its own world. Hence, the challenge brought about by the questions raised by the end of an age and the advent of a new century become disturbing and promote the boldest speculations. In our classrooms today we have a generation anxious to accomplish in the shortest time in the course of history the task of protagonist in every sector of human praxis. The only prediction we can make concerns the radical character and the high speed of change; these seem to be the essential features of the 21st century. On which basis should we set up the educational process in order to guide young people in the complex task of freely defining their moral behavior, and thereby realizing the highest values of our cultural heritage? How can we offer them proper assistance in understanding, interpreting and applying these values at present and in the near future? Here, we face two essential questions which beset us at the beginning of our reflections.

Freedom and responsibility are attributes of the human person which, as values, are founded in our cultural heritage. As such, they point a way for the educational process and set up a reliable starting point which encourages moral growth in accord with cognitive development and the unfolding of intelligence and rationality. However, they do not exhaust the inherent

complexity of human action (praxis). Human fulfillment, which supposes the development of the dynamism of action of the whole person is achieved only in "acting together" with other human beings. It is here that the relevance of the commandment of love is attained, i.e., in the genuine sense of "caritas" as the guiding principle of being and acting and, therefore, as a criterion of moral excellence and of the realization of the whole person. This appears as the ultimate end of moral education which faces the challenges of a new century. Consequently, it is on this that we shall focus in what follows.

PERSON, ACTION, MORALITY

The experience one has of one's fundamental cognitive process is the starting point for the knowledge of man as a person. In this sense, it is the richest and most complex experience. In Karol Wojtyla's words:

> Man's experience of anything outside of himself is always associated with the experience of himself, and he never experiences anything external without having at the same time the experience of himself.[3]

Thus, this epistemological approach proceeds from one's experience, as an experience of oneself, to the elucidation of anthropological questions in the framework of the concrete person's existing and acting.

From the human being's viewpoint, the term 'experience' denotes "experience lived through." It corresponds to the meaning of the German term `erlebnis' which comes from `erleben' and means "to live" -- a happening, for example. In this regard, H.G. Gadamer says:

> Insofar as it is a secondary formation on the word *erleben* . . . the motivation of this linguistic formation should be sought in the meaning of *erleben*. To start, *erleben* means "to be still living when something happens." Henceforth, the word *erleben* gains a tone of immediate understanding of something real, in opposition to that which one believes to know, but without the certainty of his own experience, either because it is something drawn upon, supposed or imagined. What is lived (*das erlebte*) is always lived by oneself.[4]

Consequently, man's immediate experience, that is to say "*erlebnis*," is the most direct way to know the human person. This experience, as an experience of myself, implies a cognitive relationship in which I am, at the same time, the subject and the object. As such, it extends to other people as objects of my experience. Thus, according to Wojtyla's view:

> The experience of man is composed of his experience of himself and all other men whose position, relative to the subject, is that of the object of experience, that is to say, who are in a direct cognitive relation to the subject.[5]

Therefore, experience becomes the primary source of the knowledge of man. Be it the knowledge of the man that I am or the knowledge of other men. Insofar as it is human experience, it is integrated by the experience of oneself and that of other human beings.

This perspective should not be viewed mistakenly either as a positivist empiricist or phenomenalist approach. What is given in experience is not the "surface" aspect of the human being as sensorially perceived, but man as such. At this point, it should be kept in mind that:

> It does not seem reasonable to believe that we are given only some more or less undefined set of qualities in, or rather of, man, but man himself. Moreover, it seems most improbable that man with his conscious acting is not given as the object of experience.[6]

In other words, what is immediately given in experience is man's acting. The immediate human experience (*erlebnis*) leads us directly to human acting which is manifest in the dynamic totality "person-action." Accordingly, human experience always is the experience of "I act." Therefore, inasmuch as one's conscious acting is what is immediately given by experience, it is fundamental to disclose the inherent essence of the fact "man acts" in any attempt to know and understand the human being as a person. It is in the experience so interpreted that we can discover the whole evidence of man's acting. Because, if action is a manifestation of conscious acting, it can be ascribed only to man as a person. In brief, action presupposes man as a person. We experience man as a person and we are convinced of it because he acts. Action, then, yields the deepest insight into the essence of the human being as a concrete person.

But actions have a moral value: they may be good or bad. This intrinsic feature of human acting cannot be found in the acting of an agent who is not him or herself a person. Consequently, the person's acting is the only expression of human dynamism that might be called "action" with the sense we ascribe to it. Actions then have an intrinsic moral dimension.

On this basis, the fundamental reason of the encounter between anthropology and ethics in the history of human thought becomes evident. Given the unity of human moral experience, it is an encounter that may well be extended to the relationship of philosophical anthropology to ethics, on the one hand, and to the philosophy of education, on the other. As has been stressed elsewhere:

> . . . it is in connection with his acting (that is action) that man experiences as his own the moral value of good and bad (or as is sometimes wrongly said, of the moral and immoral). He experiences them in the attitude he assumes toward them, an attitude that is at once emotional and appreciative. At any rate, he is not only conscious of the morality of his actions, but actually experiences it, often very deeply. . . .
>
>   Simultaneously, both the action and its corresponding moral value -- goodness or badness -- function, if we may say so, in a thoroughly subjective manner in experience, which consciousness conditions by its reflexive function.[7]

Summing up, human experience is the experience of an acting person; that is to say, the experience implicit in the "I act". As such and to the extent that it is free, this is conscious and responsible and hence essentially ethical. Education, as a way of acting inherent to the person, holds an identical ethical modality:

> When we search deep into the integral structure of moral conduct and becoming, into the integral structure of man's becoming morally good or morally bad, we find it in the proper moment of freedom. It is in the structure of man's becoming, through his actions, morally good or bad, that freedom manifests itself most appropriately. Here, however,

freedom is not only a moment; it also forms a real inherent component of the structure, indeed, a component that is decisive for the entire structure of moral becoming: freedom constitutes the root factor of man's becoming good or bad by his actions; it is the root factor of the becoming as such of human morality.[8]

Education inserts itself in the becoming of the human person, as is manifest by the moral value of his actions. Consequently, moral acting is one form of human praxis. In itself it constitutes a process by whose means the subject's potentialities are actualized in the human person, that is to say, in the concrete man-person. Or, as Jacques Maritain put it, it is a "moral act", praxis, or "practical wisdom in the Aristotelian sense."[9]

In what follows, we shall attempt to examine the nature of the person's own dynamism and, afterwards, spell out its implications for "acting together with others." On these bases some pedagogical conclusions will be drawn concerning the role of education in the person's realization from the general viewpoint of the search for moral excellence and human fulfillment.

HUMAN PERSON AND HUMAN DYNAMISM

Karol Wojtyla's *existential personalism* is a philosophy of subjectivity and consciousness, which attempts "to enrich the realist view of the person," as it appears in the Lublin school of thought. From this phenomenological perspective we shall draw a series of inferences which can provide intellectual enlightenment for the interpretation of the person's moral behavior.[10]

- Phenomenological experience is the fundamental source for a deep understanding of the person through his or her acts.
- The human act is the clearest expression of the person in the framework of his or her own dynamism.
- Given the intrinsic moral nature of human acting, there is a phenomenological identity between one's self-experience and the experience of morality.

The person's understanding is achieved on the basis of his acts, which are the main source for experiencing values, for only by acting does the person experience the moral value of good and bad. Hence, we shall analyze the structure of human dynamism in order to grasp its essence and work out a clearer understanding of moral behavior. As we have already pointed out, the experience of "I act" represents the main source. The experience of acting, as a means of personal realization, has a subjective character; it is the acting of an ego which in itself has a conscience in function of its acting consciously. Insofar as the agent has an experience of self, the actor discovers that he or she is the source of his or her own action.

Here we reach the grounds of the person's efficacy and transcendence in action. What is given in human acting as a whole is the experience implicit in "I act." In this sense, every experience is an experience of oneself, that is essentially, of the efficacy of the act which at the same time transcends the agent's subjectivity.

In the perspective of an existential-personalist view, I exist inasmuch as I am an acting person. I am conscious of the fact that I cause and perform my own acts, and I transcend them because I know that I cause them and am not completely expressed by them, for I can substitute them by other acts. In other words, the efficacy and transcendence of the ego over the content of what is mine is shown in an immediate self-evident and original experience.

However, the human dynamism involves two manifestations that should appropriately be distinguished in favor of our main argument: (l) on the one hand, human acting or doing is itself conscious and carries along with it the responsibility implicit in the "I act"; and (2) the mere "something happens in man" is the result of a passive activation from the consciousness viewpoint. In other words, this is the difference between "man's acting" and that which "merely happens" to him. But being manifestations of that dynamism by means of which the human being's potentialities are actualized and realized, they are integrated in the "ontic support" -- or "suppositum" in St. Thomas' words,[11] considered as the concrete man-person. This represents the unity and synthesis of the person's acting (activeness) and the implicit dynamism of that which merely happens in him or to him without himself being the agent of his own action (passiveness).

In brief, human dynamism entails, on the one hand, the efficacy and transcendence of the person's acting and, on the other, the implicit activation of that which happens to man as a result of an inner dynamism in which he is not "active" as a concrete ego. In that sense, the term 'activation' involves the passiveness and activeness that are supposed in every actualization of man's potentialities.

Being a "dynamic unity" his "acting", as well as that which "happens to him", have a common root, which is not other than the human being as a dynamic subject who is the main source of his acting. Accordingly, actuation and activation denote two manifestations of human dynamism that, in their origin are integrated in the unity of the ontic support (suppositum). Here we reach the ultimate foundations of action. The subjectivity present in both requires an ontologically subsequent factor as its necessary condition. In this sense the "suppositum" is a being inasmuch as it is the subject of existing and acting. Its coming into existence is the first act by which it sets up its own dynamism. Therefore, initially, it becomes identified with the person:

> In the first fundamental approach the man-person has to be identified with its basic structure. The person is a concrete man, the individual *substantia* of the classical Boethian definition. The concrete is tantamount to the unique or, at any rate, to the individualized. The concept of the "person" is broader and more comprehensive than the concept of "individual," just as the person is more individualized than nature. The person would be an individual whose nature is rational -- according to Boethius' full definition: *persona est rationalis naturae substantia*.[12]

However, neither "rational nature" nor its "individualization" fully denote the implicit meaning of the term `person.' The person is not only "something"; it also is "somebody." This is an important distinction whenever it is identified with its ontic support or ontic structure. As a person, the human being is an acting subject, a subject of existence and action. His existence is personal and not only individual. As we have already said, that existence integrates the efficacy of acting and the subjectiveness of activation. The individual who acts is *somebody*: the man-person as the subject of his or her actions. The "ontic support," as the source of potentialities and the ultimate foundation of the person's dynamic cohesion, synthesizes and unifies the two expressions of human dynamism: acting and activation. In this perspective the human being is disclosed as a being which is, exists and acts, and which by acting realizes its own potentialities and creates himself in action. This distinctive feature is evidenced particularly by morality:

> Morality and acting differ essentially, but at the same time they are so strictly united with each other that morality has no real existence apart from human acting, apart from

actions. Their essential separateness does not obscure their existential relationship.[13]

The man-person, as a suppositum, realizes himself in the efficacy and transcendence of his or her actions which, as such, represent authentic expressions of his or her self-determination. For this reason, the ultimate *constitutivum personae* essentially is self-determination. The main question concerning its structure becomes the fundamental issue in any attempt to know and understand the person through his or her acts. Self-determination is an ontic property implicit in the person's freedom which in itself is inalienable. Consequently, it is a necessary condition for his or her whole realization. To that extent it brings forth an essential aspect of moral excellence as an ultimate end of education.

SELF-DETERMINATION, MORAL EXCELLENCE, AND THE REALIZATION OF THE PERSON

In the person's self-realization through action, the will shows itself as a property of the person; the person which is realized in its own dynamism, which is an expression of the will. Exactly here, the role of self-determination, the dynamic foundation of the person's realization, becomes clear.

The structure of self-determination supposes self-governance and self-possession. Human action reveals an ego who possesses and governs him or herself. Anyone may assume or carry out this property. It is grounded the person's inalienability which, to the extent that it is something specific to the person, unites and integrates every manifestation of the person's dynamism. Therefore, only in experience and, to be more strict, in self-experience, is man given as a person. By acting he, at the same time, determines (that is, is subject) and is determined (that is, is object).[14]

Considered as an instrument for the person's realization, self-determination has a transcendental and dynamic character. It sets forth the person's transcendence, because experiencing oneself as a source and agent (efficient cause) of action one goes beyond the limitations of one's own nature in order to reach the highest level of self-realization. This shows its dynamism insofar as it makes possible the person's actualization and realization according to the highest value that his actions may achieve from the moral point of view. In such a sense, self-determination becomes the ultimate foundation of moral excellence; it is one of the goals pursued by education in every age.

Self-governance and self-possession are responsible for the person's freedom and define the way to moral excellence in the educational process. They set up the essential elements of practical wisdom, or ethical "know how," in the Aristotelian sense. They are learned inasmuch as they shape our own lives. For that reason they assume the role of principal means for the personal fulfillment and assume the freedom of every act. Undoubtedly they are the grounds of every education that attempts to achieve the moral excellence inherent in full development of the human being.

The human act, as an expression of the will in the person's dynamism, has a value by itself. This is the personal or "personalist" value of action, according to Wojtyla.[15] It points to one's self-realization in the dynamic interrelation between person and action. Consequently, it becomes the main source in apprehending the person's value and the hierarchy of his valuations.

However, self-realization is achieved finally in man's "acting together with others." Hence, if in the person's knowledge what is immediately given is action, and this bears the distinctive

character of "acting together with others," it could not be possible to conclude an analysis of the person-action dynamics without considering the questions raised by intersubjectivity. This is a matter of extending this analysis to "acting together with others." The consequences of such an attempt is the crucial question which leads us to the domain of *intersubjectivity and participation*[16] as the last parameter for personal fulfillment in action. As we shall see in what follows, this sets the conditions for achieving moral excellence and human fulfillment in a time of accelerated and unpredictable changes.

INTERSUBJECTIVITY, PARTICIPATIVE COMMUNITY AND HUMAN FULFILLMENT

Human acts are accomplished in the context of different social and inter-human relations. For this reason, in order to understand and interpret the personal nature of human acts it is absolutely necessary to consider the consequences derived from the fact that they may be performed with other human beings. "Acting together with others" not only is frequent and usual, but universal. The questions raised by this universal dimension of human action may be answered on the basis of an analysis of the concept of intersubjectivity by participation.

According to Wojtyla,"participation" offers the basic channel for the dynamic correlation person-action, inasmuch as it is a way of "acting together with others."[17]

The "Personalistic" Value of Action

We shall start from what has been called the "personalistic" value of action. For the person, the performance of action is in itself a value. Here, efficacy, transcendence and self-determination are integrated in the unity of the person. Consequently, the "personalistic" value of human action is the clearest and most fundamental manifestation of the person's worth.

Even though being is prior to action, insofar as the person and his value are prior to the value of action it is in action that the person actualizes himself through the structure of self-governance and self-possession. This fact has been stressed since the beginning of our argument: the "personalistic" value of action is drawn from the personal performance of the act. In this sense, the "correlation of the action with the person" attains an ontological as well as axiological validity.

On this basis we reach the conclusion that the personalistic value of action is prior to, and conditions, the other values. Every moral value supposes an action grounded on the person's self-determination. Therefore, any judgment on the merit or demerit of a person's acts must begin by determining whether he is or is not the true author of the said acts. Hence, the action's performance cannot be perceived only in ontological terms but, on the contrary, should be viewed in an axiological context.[18]

The action's value is "personalistic" because by performing the action the person thereby fulfills himself or herself, or in other words becomes a person or attains the ontological status of a person. Inversely, anything opposed to this "fulfillment," that is to say, anything which may limit or deny action should be considered morally bad, insofar as it would be opposed to the person's fulfillment. Whenever the person is self-fulfilled in action, the structure of self-determination is wholly consummated. It is exactly in this self-realization -- which itself means to perform or accomplish acts -- that its ethical value is found. It emerges and develops as a

substructure of the personalistic values which it itself supposes.

Participative Community and "Common Good": The Idea of "Neighbor"

The *personalistic* perspective in the analysis of human dynamism offers enough evidence of the authenticity of the "action's value" from the person's viewpoint. Although this is not an ethical value thus far, it comes forth from the depth of human dynamism and, to this extent, it reveals and confirms the ethical values. This provides a better understanding of such values in strict correspondence with the person and the "world of persons", rather than as ideal entities detached from human existence.

We may now raise the questions leading to the core of our main argument. What meaning does the phrase "acting together with others" have for the "personalistic value of action"? Can we keep, in this context, the person's transcendence and inalienability; can the person's acts uphold the value hierarchy which derives from this transcendence? In the perspective of Wojtyla's existential personalism, an affirmative answer to these questions emerges from the idea of a "participative community." It is the very idea of "participation" which can lead us to the clarification of human dynamism in the context of an "acting together with others." At this point, the argument requires more precision regarding the definition of the concept of "participation;" this will be the focus of what follows.

Currently, the term `to participate' means "to have a part in something." However, from the philosophical viewpoint, its meaning concerns directly the intrinsic nature of the human being. It is nothing other than the person's transcendence in action whenever it is accomplished "together with others." This transcendence itself reveals that the person is not engaged or conditioned by social interaction, but holds up his or her own freedom and dignity which, as such, are the ultimate grounds of "participation." In that sense the personal value of action is retained and fully realized, without any limitation or entanglement arising from the "acting together." To be able to participate means that "acting together with others" one retains the "personal value of action" and, at the same time, shares the realization as well as the results of that action Thus, participation becomes the essential feature of "acting together with others."[19]

This idea of participation leads us to the foundations of the dynamism of the person. The whole structure of the value of action -- the person's fulfillment, transcendence and integration -- is clearly manifested as a consequence of an action accomplished in conjunction with other human beings. Therefore, participation assumes the entire burden of the fact that by "acting together with others" the person achieves his full realization. To that extent, participation becomes the determining factor of the "personal value" of any possible mode of cooperation.

According to the main lines of our argument, individualism, as well as totalitarianism -- or anti-individualism -- represent clear limitations of "participation." On the one hand, individualism denies participation because it assumes that the individual's good is in contradiction with that of the other individual's. In such a case, there is no possibility for the person's realization by "acting together with others." On the other hand, this denial is also implicit in totalitarianism -- or anti-individualism -- which, in a way, might well be called "reverse individualism" It presupposes that in the individual there is only an inclination to achieve his own good; consequently, the common good can only be achieved by restraining that of the individual. As may clearly be seen, both alternatives deny and contradict the personalist perspective which is grounded in the conviction that the person's distinctive feature is his

capacity to participate. Obviously, this capacity needs to be cultivated and developed and it is at this point that education plays a role of transcendental importance.[20]

It is not human nature which compels man to exist and act "together with others." Rather, it is the existing and acting together with other human beings which enables one to achieve one's own fulfillment; that is to say, one's intrinsic development as a person. For this reason, every person is entitled to act in order to fulfill himself in action. Hence individualism and totalitarianism must be rejected together with all their mistaken implications.

To achieve greater precision regarding the concept of participation, we need to define it from the viewpoint of the concept of community. Participation is the constitutive factor of community understood as the concrete reality of existing and acting "together with others." In this sense, participation is directly related to the person's experience.

However, community itself is not the subject of action. On this matter, Wojtyla says:

> The term "community," like "society" or "social group" indicates an order derived from the first one. Being and acting "together with others" does not constitute a new subject of acting but only introduces new relations among the persons who are the real and actual subjects of acting.[21]

But, in its substantial and abstract sense, the concept of community is nearer to the reality of the person and participation -- nearer, perhaps, than such notions as "society" or "social group." This is because of the role played here by the idea of the common good as a cohesive factor. In Wojtyla's words:

> the solution to the problem of the community and participation does not lie in the reality itself of acting and existing "together with others"; it is to be looked for in the common good, or, more precisely, in the meaning we give to the notion of the "common good."[22]

In an "axiological sense," the common good becomes the community's good, for it promotes or brings forth the conditions for communitary existence. Therefore, it is the foundation of any authentic human community. As a principle of right participation, it places the person in a position to accomplish authentic actions and fulfill oneself in acting "together with others":

> In groups established on the principle of a temporary community of acting, participation is neither manifested as clearly, nor realized to the same extent, as in communities where their stability is grounded in the fact of being together -- for instance, a family, a national group, a religious-community, or the citizens of a state. The axiology of these latter communities, which is expressed in the common good, is much deeper.[23]

But, in the "acting together with others," we should distinguish between two types of attitudes: "authentic" and "nonauthentic." Among the first should be mentioned solidarity as a person's constant disposition to assume his or her responsibility in the community; opposition, indisposition to act or work for the common good; and dialogue, which shapes and strengthens human solidarity by means of opposition. Among the "nonauthentic" attitudes it is enough to mention, first, conformism, which sets aside human solidarity and turns itself into a negative disintegrating attitude. It is a form of passivity in which the man-person becomes the subject of what happens instead of the responsible actor or agent building his or her own commitment in

the community. Evasion is a second nonauthentic attitude characterized by the lack of engagement and interest for the common good. In this way, our analysis reaches the basis of the concept of participation in the context of the human dynamism: the person's being and acting as a member of a community.

We find here two reference systems of essential importance which derive from two implicit meanings of the concept of participation in the context of human dynamism: the idea of "neighbor" and that of "member of a community". Although, in a way, these two ideas seem to coincide, inasmuch as a member of a community is also another man's neighbor, some differences should be stressed. On the one hand, the notion of neighbor requires not only an acknowledgment of the human as such, but of the person's value, regardless of his or her membership in a given community or in society at large. Therefore, the notion is related intrinsically to man and to the value of the person, beyond any consideration of one's relations to this or that community or to society in the broad sense of the term. In other words, the notion takes into consideration only one's humanness, which is a possession of every man as well as of myself. On the other hand, although being a member of a community is presupposed by the reality denoted by the notion of neighbor, it removes to a more distant plane and in a sense overshadows the broader notion of neighbor.

The notion of neighbor is the most direct way to understand "participation" as "sharing the humaneness of every man." In this sense, it refers to the widest reality one may come to share. Consequently, it leads us to the ultimate foundations of inter-human relations; the capacity to participate acquires all its depth in the notion of neighbor. The man-person is not only able "to share" in the community's life, but is able to participate in the very humaneness of others.[24] It is exactly on these grounds that stand the meaning and the "personalist value" of the concept of community. Something implicit in the deep content of the concept of neighbor reveals the meaning denoted by the term `participation.' To share the humanity of every man is the essence of participation; it is the necessary condition for any personal value of existing and of acting together with others.'

Therefore, to lay the groundwork for an authentically human community in a future world -- of which we can predict only the depth and speed of changes regarding inter-human relations -- the systems of reference implicit in the notions of neighbor and community membership should overlap and permeate each other, instead of becoming radically distant. The radicalization of this distance brings forth the always present danger of "alienation." Let us listen to Wojtyla's words:

> Man's alienation from other men stems from a disregard for, or a neglect of, that depth of participation which is indicated in the term "neighbor" and by the neglect of the interrelations and inter-subordinations of men in their humaneness expressed by this term, which indicates the most fundamental principle of any real community.[25]

The "dehumanization" of our present-day society, besieged by every kind of alienation of which we are direct witnesses and protagonists, does not lie in the system of things: as nature, civilization or system of production and distribution of material goods. It should not be forgotten that even though humans did not create nature, they are its master. Furthermore, man develops the systems of production. Therefore, it is in his hands to overcome alienation and dehumanization in today's civilization: only man is responsible for alienation. It is precisely the "commandment of love" which reveals the essence of man's alienation, which has no other source than the neglect of the depth implied by the meaning of the word "neighbor."

It is the commandment, "Thou shalt love," in its authentic sense of "caritas," that clearly discloses the highest ideal of "human fulfillment." This is an ideal that, given the critical circumstances of today's culture and society, becomes an enlightening criterion to meet the demands every human being must confront in order fully to realize the Good in existing and acting together with others. Accordingly, it represents the ultimate end of an education that, by means of moral excellence, attempts to realize the whole man-person, facing the disturbing questions raised by the advent of the 21st century.

Universidad Simón Rodríguez

NOTES

1. Cf. Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971); see also *Ciencia y Técnica como Ideología*, (Madrid: Tecnos, 1984), p. 173; and *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. I (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), pp. 366-99.
2. Cf. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Verdad y Método* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1977), pp. 378-314. Regarding the meaning and implications of a "critical hermeneutics", see Habermas's "On Hermeneutics' Claim to Universality" in K. Mueller-Vollmer,*The Hermeneutics Reader*, (New York: Continuum, 1985); P. Ricoeur, "Hermeneutics and the Critique of Ideology," in*Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 63-100; and J. B. Thompson,*Critical Hermeneutics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 36-111.
3. Karol Wojtyla, *The Acting Person* (Holland: D. Reidel, Dordrech, 1979), p. 3.
4. Gadamer, pp. 96-97.
5. Wojtyla, p. 4.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
9. Jacques Maritain, *La Educación en este Momento Crucial* (Buenos Aires: Club de Lectores, 1977), p. 13.
10. K. Wojtyla, "The Task of Christian Philosophy Today," in *The Human Person*, Proceedings of The American Catholic Philosophical Association, vol. LIII, (Washington, D.C. The Catholic University of America, 1979), pp. 3-4; *Existential Personalism*, Proceedings of The American Catholic Philosophical Association (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1986, vol. LX, 1986); M.A. Krapiec, *I-Man: An Outline of Philosophical Anthropology*, (Connecticut: Mariel Publications, 1983); Andrew N. Woznicki, *Existential Personalism* (Connecticut: Mariel Publications, 1980); George Huntston Williams, *The Mind of John Paul II*, (New York: The Seabury Press, 1981).
11. Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, vol. II (Madrid: BAC, 1967), pp. 810-820. See also Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, pp. 80-90.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 106-108.
15. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 264.

16. Cf. Karol Wojtyla, "Participation or Alienation?," *Analecta Husserliana* (Holland: D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1977), pp. 61-73. By the same author, see "The Person: Subject and Community," *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. 35 (1982), 35, pp. 273-308.

17. Cf. Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, pp. 264-265.

18. *Ibid*., p. 267.

19. Cf. *ibid*., p. 268; see also, Wojtyla, "The Person: Subject and Community," p. 288.

20. Cf. Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, pp. 271-276.

21. *Ibid*., p. 277.

22. *Ibid*., p. 280; see also Wojtyla, "The Person: Subject and Community," pp. 300-302.

23. Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, p. 282.

24. Cf. *ibid*., pp. 294-295.

25. *Ibid*., p. 297.

THE PERSON AND MORAL GROWTH:
The Dynamic Interaction of Values and Virtues
GEORGE F. McLEAN

INTRODUCTION

The general theme of this volume reflects a deep sensibility both to the goals of education and to its present challenge. It is eloquent testimony of deep general concern for human development and lays the basis for real hope.

The particular theme here concerns persons as dynamic subjects and their moral experience. It challenges us to confront two essential dimensions of our heritage: on the one hand, the stability and obligation of a natural law based upon the eternal and, on the other hand, the free and creative dynamism of humankind in fashioning its world. Often these have been understood in such manner as to pit one against the other. The former is seen to bespeak eternal fixity, the latter change and improvisation; the former is built upon what is objective, the latter upon human subjectivity; the former prizes surety, the latter exploration; and the former is expressed as law and obligation, the latter as freedom and spontaneity.[1]

In part this reflects the stress upon the freedom of the subject which was characteristic of the Enlightenment and undergirds, not only the founding revolutions of our countries, but the recent and more existential assertion of the person. Unfortunately, in this light efforts to affirm stability, responsibility and obligation in the moral order too often have been interpreted as rejections of the dynamic character of person and hence of personal growth. Conversely, attention to the person and to subjectivity have seemed to some an abandonment of the eternal in man.[2]

Consequently, in education today we find ourselves before the question which moved John XXIII to convoke Vatican II -- and perhaps even Mihail Gorbachev to write his *Perestroika* -- namely, how can the newly appreciated dynamic forces of person and of freedom deepen and promote the struggle of the next generation to realize its dignity as image and people of God? This was thematized philosophically by John Paul II, while still Cardinal of Krakow, in the following manner:

The problem of man's subjectivity is today of paramount importance for philosophy. Multiple epistemological tendencies, principles, and orientations wrestle in this field and often give it a diametrically different shape and sense. The philosophy of consciousness seems to suggest that it was the first to discover the human subject. The philosophy of being is ready to demonstrate that, on the contrary, the analysis conducted on the basis of pure consciousness must lead in consequence to its annihilation. It is necessary to find the correct limits, according to which the phenomenological analyses, developed from the principles of the philosophy of consciousness, will begin to work to enrich the realistic image of the person. It is also necessary to establish the basis of such a philosophy of person.[3]

In this I would underline the term "enrich," for when we attend to the meaning of the new and more dynamic sense of the person for the project of moral education there is danger that our response might be reduced to drawing up a list of mere external additions to classical approaches. This would suppose basic satisfaction with the results of earlier approaches and/or look upon the new sensibilities regarding the person as relatively superficial or merely rhetorical.

If, however, the traditional objective order seems no longer to inspire, while the new existential sensibility seems unable to provide a basis for order, then the task seems rather to dislodge both from their too limited preoccupations so that each can be enriched and strengthened by the other. For this we need a new basis upon which to conceive the project of moral education. Where should we look; upon what can we build?

From the present dilemma it appears that an adequate contemporary approach must promote a sense of transcendence. Freedom must be seen as more than spontaneity, informed choice or even self-determination if young people are to escape the raging egoism, self-centeredness and narcissism they have been bequeathed from without and which emerges from within. On the other hand, this transcendence must not be other-worldly for their moral life is their struggle to build their life and their world.

Together these suggest that moral education today should concern the person in its process of gradually shaping relations with others -- whether in home, neighborhood, work-place or world -- according to unity and truth, love and beauty. In direct contrast to egoism, here the real concern is to create a world shaped by values at once personal and communitary as is the life of the Trinity itself.

By focusing in this manner upon the human project as life with others in community, we can hope to break free from the present dilemma of exclusive concentration either upon the self which then degenerates into egoism, capriciousness and narcissism, or upon the law which then comes to be seen as at best unrelated and at worst an impediment, to the human project.

Such a developmental approach does not bracket or diminish prior insights regarding the obligatory character of the moral law or the moral freedom of the person. What it does is challenge education to aid students: (a) to a conjoint concrete discovery of law and freedom in their own experience, (b) to an awareness of the codification over time of such experience as tradition and heritage, and (c) to the development of new and concrete meanings of this tradition in their homes and communities, now and in the future, and (d) to the development of the personal moral capabilities required for their realization.

In order to search out the implications of this for the educational process we need first to distinguish and treat serially two complementary dimensions of personal transcendence. The first concerns our conscious and willed relations to things, and especially to persons. As reaching beyond oneself this might be called horizontal transcendence; it is the realm of values. We must see if approaching moral education in terms of the process of human growth can unite effectively the concerns for objectivity and norms with the subjective elements of passionate concern and creative commitment.

Next, it will be important to assure our ability to act consistently according to our values. This will direct our attention to the process of personal growth or vertical transcendence in order to sort out its multiple dimensions and to clarify the role of virtues for one's proper development and operation.

Together these will lead to the conclusion that the essence of moral growth and hence of moral education consists in bringing into convergence the dynamisms of these two dimensions of personal transcendence, namely the horizontal opening to others in which we develop values, and the vertical growth of our capabilities through the development of virtues.

PERSON AND VALUES: HORIZONTAL TRANSCENDENCE

Freedom and the Good

A philosophical analysis of human action can reveal important dimensions of the person.[4] The need to act shows that at birth the person, though a subject and independent, is not perfect, self-sufficient or absolute. On the contrary, persons evaluate themselves and their circumstances, become conscious of their needs and possibilities, and assume toward these a dynamic stance of hope and desire. Persons then are essentially active, dynamic and even in a sense creative subjects.

Correspondingly, human activity is experienced as essentially responsible. This implies that, while the particular physical or social goods attract one to act, they do not overpower the person. Whatever their force, the person is able to situate them within a broader commitment to the good, on which basis in principle one can overrule the attractive force of any particular good. When one does choose a good it is the person -- not the good -- that is responsible.

Together these point to the two foundations of personal 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, a person's will is not limited to, and hence by, any particular good or set of goods; its openness to any and all particular goods manifests a basic orientation to goodness itself.

To this analysis in terms of the realities or the being involved, for moral education it is important to add a phenomenological description of the emergence of this reality in one's consciousness. Whence can a young person have concrete access to a sense of being related to goodness itself by which he or she is free from slavery to any particular goals? If this could be uncovered they would have a crucial resource for establishing responsible direction over their actions and interactions with others. Such actions, in turn, would constitute a field over which they have command --indeed a ludic space upon which one is invited to play in the broad aesthetic and creative sense of that term.

I would suggest that this relation to Goodness itself is not only a matter of revelation, but emerges also in and as the personal histories of persons and peoples. As such it forms the base of their cultures. For this let us begin with the history of our own origin and growth.

We depend upon our parents in an obvious manner for physical life and well-being, but even more for the love which suffuses their actions toward us. It is only in this context that in our earliest months we are able to develop the basic interpersonal attitudes of trust and confidence. For infants and young children these are not theoretical propositions; they set the first horizons in terms of which a person responds to others and progressively integrates his or her world.[5] Throughout life these attitudes continue to make it possible to be truly moral, rather then merely egoistic, defensive or manipulative.

In the development of this basic openness to the good the experience of uncalculating and unmeasured love, as often expressed by grandparents and other family members and special friends, are of crucial importance. Being less preoccupied with the details of a child's life than the parents, they often can express this love more calmly, forcefully and unambiguously. As the child grows, still broader circles of family and friends take on increasing importance by keeping concretely before us dimensions of life which go beyond issues of technical competency or economic success.

For similar reasons the character of the school itself as a social unit, the way students are treated by teachers and administrators, and the standards of personal interaction between students, all must convey this deeper sense. In addition the message of the horizons of the curriculum concerning the dimensions of reality can be either restrictive if time and effort are

focused solely upon the development of technical competencies, or expansive if broadly human concerns are introduced through more humanistic content and methods.[6]

The same is true of a person's later experience, including their work and civic environments. All the circumstances of our life convey a sense of its meaning, of the dimensions of the reality in which it is lived, and hence of goodness.

Nor should this be limited merely to the present, for we are born into a history, tradition and culture which bears the cumulative results of the most extended processes of trial and error, of learning what promotes and what destroys life. Perhaps more importantly, this reveals the basic terms in which life can be lived rather than destroyed, that for which we should hope and strive, and the good in terms of which all have their meaning. This sense is conveyed through the language, art, literature and concrete customs of a people. Education must treat this heritage as the precious resource of moral formation.

Above all, this takes place through participation in our religious community whose teaching, stories and rituals, such as those of Holy Week and Easter, express these human horizons, critique all actual realizations, and inspire toward a life that is more rich and generous.

What then should we conclude regarding this sense of goodness which mankind has discovered, in which we have been raised, which gives us dominion over our actions and which enables us to be free and creative? Does it come from God or from man, from eternity or from history? I like the answer of Chakravarti Rajagopalachari of Madras:

Whether the epics and songs of a nation spring from the faith and ideas of the common folk, or whether a nation's faith and ideas are produced by its literature is a question which one is free to answer as one likes. . . . Did clouds rise from the sea or was the sea filled by waters from the sky? All such inquiries take us to the feet of God transcending speech and thought.[7]

The Objective Character of Goods

The work of moral education is to learn how to direct our resulting freedom in relation to the particular goods which constitute our world. Hence, it is important to look more closely, first into the nature of these goods themselves taken objectively, and then into their emergence in our consciousness or subjectivity. It is in the elusive and challenging interplay between these two that the drama of the self-realization and the development of moral life take place.

How can we discover what is meant by "good"? This first appears in our conscious experience as the object of desire, namely, as that which is sought when absent. This implies that the good is basically what completes a being. It is the "per-fect," understood in the etymological sense as that which completes or realizes us through and through. Hence, once achieved it is no longer desired or sought, but enjoyed.

This is reflected at each level of reality. On the mineral level each thing holds onto the being or reality it has and resists losing this. The most that even our greatest technical powers can do is to change or transform one kind of thing into another: just as we cannot create, we cannot annihilate. At the level of living things, given the right conditions, plants grow toward their full stature or fulfillment, i.e., toward their perfection or good. Animals promote their life more actively in seeking the food and shelter needed for their growth and in protecting this, even fiercely when necessary.

When we come to persons the reality of freedom described above if inadequately understood could reduce goods to what is subjectively appreciated. This would leave us in a realm consisting not of realities, but of wishes. Hence, it is important to note the objective character of goods. As

actually realizing some degree of perfection in themselves, that is, objectively, and thereby able to contribute to the perfection of others, goods are the basis for an interlocking set of real and determined relations. These relations are based upon both the actual perfection things possess and the potential perfection to which thereby they are really related. Hence, goods -- and, by implication, our values which reflect them -- are not arbitrary or simply a matter of wishful thinking. They bespeak rather one's real fulfillment and the reality required for whatever would contribute thereto. In this ontological sense all beings are good to the extent that they exist and can contribute to the perfection of others.

The moral good is a more narrow field, concerning only one's free and responsible actions. This shares the objective reality of the ontological good noted above, for it concerns real things and actions. Objectively, that is, on the basis of what they themselves are, they stand in perfective or destructive relation to themselves or others, including the physical universe and our response to God. Many possible patterns of actions are morally right because they really promote the good of those involved. Others, precisely as inconsistent with the real good of persons or things, are objectively disordered or misordered.

Values as the Subjectivity of the Good

However, because this realm of the objectively good relations which are possible is almost numberless whereas our concrete actions can be only relatively few, it becomes necessary to choose. This is not only a choice between the good and the bad in general; in each case we must determine which of the many possible goods we will render concrete. However limited the options, acts have their moral status in essential dependence upon our will as dynamic subjects.

Thus, in order to follow the emergence of the field of concrete moral action, it is important to examine not only the objective character of the goods involved -- whether of persons, actions or things. In addition one must consider these actions in relation to the subject, namely, to the person who, in the context of society and culture, appreciates and values the good of an action, chooses it over its alternatives, and eventually may bring it to actualization.

Here the term `value' is of special note. It was derived from the economic sphere where it meant the amount of a commodity required in order to bring a certain price. This is reflected also in the term `axiology,' the root of which means "weighing as much" or "worth as much." This has objective content, for the good must really "weigh in" or make a real difference.[8]

But the term `value' expresses this good especially as related to a will which actually acknowledges it as a good and responds to it as desirable. Thus, different individuals or groups, or possibly the same but at different periods, may have distinct sets of values as they become sensitive to, and prize, distinct sets of goods. More generally, however, what takes place over time is a subtle shift in the distinctive ranking of the degree to which they prize various goods. By so doing they delineate among the limitless order of objective moral goods a certain pattern of values which, in more stable fashion, mirrors their corporate free choices. This constitutes the basic topology of a culture; as repeatedly reaffirmed through time, it builds a tradition or heritage.

By giving shape to the culture, values constitute the prime pattern and gradation of goods which persons born into that heritage experience from their earliest years. In these terms they interpret and shape the development of their relations with other persons and groups. Young persons peer out at the world through cultural lenses which were formed by their family and ancestors and which reflect the pattern of choices made by their community through its long

history -- often in its most trying circumstances. Like a pair of glasses, values do not create the object, but they do reveal and focus attention upon certain goods and patterns of goods rather than upon others.

Thus values become the basic orienting factor for one's affective and emotional life. Over time, they encourage certain patterns of action -- and even of physical growth -- which, in turn, reinforce the pattern of values. Through this process we constitute our universe of moral concern in terms of which we struggle to achieve, mourn our failures, and celebrate our successes.[9] This is our world of hopes and fears, in terms of which, as Plato wrote in the *Laches*, our lives have moral meaning and one can properly begin to speak of virtues.

PERSON AND VIRTUES: VERTICAL TRANSCENDENCE

Dimensions of the Person

If the set of values we elaborate is not to remain merely a set of preferences or pious wishes, however, it is necessary to complement them by the development of concrete abilities to act morally. This concerns not only one's will as a disincarnate spirit, but one's body and psyche as well. As truly self-determining, the person is not merely the moderator of a bargaining session between these three, but is the dynamic subject in whom all of these dimensions converge to establish a moral personality.[10] The progressive development of this ability to act through a series of levels might be called one's vertical transcendence and will focus ultimately upon the development of virtues.

On the bodily or somatic level there are such dynamisms as the pumping of blood or the digestion of food. These are basically non-reflective and reactive; they are implemented through the nervous system in response to stimuli. Generally they remain below the level of human consciousness, from which they enjoy a degree of autonomy. Nonetheless, being an integral dimension of the person as a whole, they are implicit in one's conscious choices. I count upon, and calculate for, an increase of adrenaline and blood in moments of challenge; I depend upon a good breakfast to get through an arduous day.

The dynamisms of the psyche, in some contrast to the more reactive character of somatic dynamisms, are based within the person amd are typified by emotivity. They range from some which are more integral to the 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 and play a central role in the proximity one feels to values and to the intensity of one's response. Secondly, they are relatively spontaneous and contribute to the intensity of a personal life.

This, however, does not suffice to make them fully personal, for personal life is lived not only in terms of what happens to me or in me, but above all at a third or free level, where I determine what happens. Indeed, this can range beyond and even against my feelings. As was seen above, personal actions are carried out through a will which, being open and responsive to *the* Good, is not determined by any particular good or value; hence in the final analysis it is up to the person to determine him- or herself. This means that personal consciousness, not only reflects oneself or upon oneself as an object of knowledge, but is reflexive or self-aware. As Descartes pointed out -- perhaps too strongly -- this manifests that we are not only body but

spirit. It is in this precise juncture of body and spirit[11] that man images God in this world where his life as moral should be a saving force.

Personal Growth

Moral actions derive from my self as a dynamic subject or person, and not merely from my powers of intellect, will or body. Hence, in deciding to act and acting I determine, not only my actions and their objects in the world, but equally and even primarily myself. This is self-determination -- and hence self-realization and self-fulfillment -- in the strongest sense of the term. Not only are others to be treated as ends in themselves; in acting I myself am an end.

This must be stressed in education. One must learn to take *all* our actions seriously because, whatever else they do or do not succeed in realizing, the moral quality of our actions as good or evil certainly builds or diminishes us as persons.

In this light it becomes crucial to be able to know and to choose actions which are truly conducive to the realization and fulfillment of persons in community. To do this persons must be able to judge the true value of what is to be chosen, that is the objective nature of these acts and their effect upon both others and the one who acts. This is moral truth; and it includes a judgment concerning whether this act will make the person good in the sense of bringing true fulfillment, or the contrary. Hence, while it is important to note that moral development cannot be reduced to the achievement of new levels of ability to solve moral dilemmas, the ability to judge rightly in moral matters remains nonetheless one of the essential factors of moral growth.

In determining to follow that judgment one overcomes, transcends or goes beyond determination by stimuli and even, in some cases, by culturally ingrained values. Through deliberation and voluntary choice such environing factors must be transformed from physical, psychological or social forces of brute spontaneous repetition into acts of self-awareness, self-possession and self-government. This opens new possibilities for free and creative action in concert with others.

Virtues as Personal Growth

This vertical transcendence enables one to shape not only one's world, but in that process one's self. This can be for good or for ill, depending on the character of the actions: by definition those are morally good which contribute to the development and perfection or fulfillment of oneself as a person and of one's community. The function of conscience, as the person's moral judgment, is to discern this moral good in action.[12]

For the person in action the work of conscience is then not merely a theoretical, but a practical judgment. For this reason a project of cognitive development in relation to moral reasoning is too limited a program of moral education. Beyond knowledge, one's reference to moral truth must constitute also a sense of duty, for actions which are judged truly to be morally good are experienced also as what one ought to do. When these are exercised repeatedly in the process of life, patterns of action develop.

They are habits in the sense of being repeated; they are the modes of activity with which we are familiar and in their exercise -- along with the coordinate bodily and psychic dynamisms they require -- we are practiced. As with a pianist or violinist, with practice comes facility and spontaneity. As a result they constitute not merely the pattern of the basic, continuing and pervasive internal influences which shape our life, but, even more, they give us the ability to do

what we choose. For this reason in the unity of mind and body, one's set of virtues has been considered classically to be the basic indicator of what one's life as a whole will add up to -- or even, as is often said, what a person will "amount to."

Moral freedom consists in this ability to follow one's conscience. In the field of moral education some refer to such growth as the development of competencies. As this could be interpreted as mere technique rather than as fully human growth, however, I prefer the more classical term, "virtues." These abilities consist first of dynamisms within the person, but they must be protected and promoted by the physical and social realities outside of man. This is a basic right of the person -- indeed, *the* basic right -- because only thus can persons and people strive for self-fulfillment. For educators this points correlatively to a basic duty -- perhaps *the* basic duty -- namely, to assist their students in the development of these abilities, competencies or virtues.

MORAL GROWTH: TOWARDS A COINCIDENCE OF VALUES AND VIRTUES

It is possible to chart a general set of virtues, each required for particular circumstances -- Part II of the *Summa* is essentially such. As with values, however, while helpful in clarifying the overall terrain of moral action, such a general list of virtues would not articulate the particulars of one's own experience or be the stuff of one's actual capabilities. Nor would it help sufficiently in sensing the appropriate next steps for a particular person in his or her concrete road toward self-realization in relation to the Good.

This does not imply that such properly personal 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 I who must decide. In so doing I enrich my unique fund of virtues. One cannot act without courage and wisdom, but each exercise of these is distinctive and typically my own. Progressively, act by act, they mold a distinct personality as they facilitate my distinctive exercise of freedom. In this process I become more mature and correlatively more unique: often this is expressed simply by the term: "more personal."

Correlatively, in this process my values come to reflect, not only the general lines of my culture and heritage, but within these what I personally have done with its general set of values. Concretely, I have shaped and refined these through my personal, and hence free, search to realize the good in myself and in my world. Hence, my values reflect both the present circumstances which our forebears could not have experienced, my own free response to these circumstances and the unique specification of my virtues which these entail.

Perhaps then in the final analysis moral or character development as a process of personal maturing consists in bringing into harmony along the vertical pole of transcendence my personal pattern of virtues with my personal set of values. In this manner I achieve a coordinated pattern of personal capabilities for the realization of my unique response to God, All-Good

Finally, though free and hence properly my own, this is not done without others; as was seen above, one's self-realization and self-fulfillment is essentially with others. For this reason, the vertical search for harmony within myself as moral development must be mirrored in a corresponding horizontal search for harmony between modes of action and values in the communities and nations in which we live. 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 one's search for self-fulfillment is no less a search for that dynamic harmony both within and without which is called peace.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C.

NOTES

1. "Structure and process, substance and accident, matter and energy, permanence and flux, one and many, continuity and descreteness, order and progress, law and liberty, uniformity and growth, tradition and innovation, rational will and impelling desires, proof and discovery, the actual and the possible, are names given to various phases of their conjunction, and the issue of living depends upon the art with which these things are adjusted to each other." John Dewey, *Experience and Nature* (La Salle: Open Court, 1925), see G. Kreyche and J. Mann, *Perspectives on Reality* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966), p. 379.
2. Cornelio Fabro, *God in Exile: Modern Exile*, tr. A. Gibson (New York: Paulist, 1968).
3. Karol Wojtyla, "The Task of Christian Philosophy Today," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association*, 53 (1979), 3-4. This was written as the introduction to his "The Person: Subject and Community," *Review of Metaphysics*, 33 (1979-80), 273-308.
4. This goes beyond the basic law that actions follow needs and continue only in relation thereto found in Jean Piaget, *Six Psychological Studies* (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), p. 6. See Karol Wojtyla, *The Acting Person* (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1979), pp. 48-50.
5. See Richard T. Knowles and George F. McLean, eds., *Psychological Foundations of Moral Education and Character Development: An Integrated Theory of Moral Development* (Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1992), especially ch. X, Richard T. Knowles, "The Acting Person as Moral Agent: Erikson as the Starting Point for an Integrated Psychological Theory of Moral Development," pp. 239-273.
6. See Kevin Ryan, Thomas Lickona and George F. McLean, eds., *Character Development in Schools and Beyond* (New York: Praeger, 1987).
7. C. Rajagopalachari, *Ramayana* (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1976), p. 312.
8. Ivor Leclerc, "The Metaphysics of the Good," *Review of Metaphysics*, 35 (1981), 3-5.
9. J. I. Mehta, *Martin Heidegger: The Way and the Vision* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press, 1967), pp. 90-91.
10. Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, p. 197.
11. James Collins, "The Bond of Natural Being," *The Review of Metaphysics*, 15 (1962), 539-572.
12. *Ibid*., p. 156. See Joseph J. Kockelmans, *Martin Heidegger* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne Univ. Press, 1965), 24-25 and 56-57.

FAMILY VALUES IN VENEZUELAN URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS
ALEJANDRO MORENO O., S.D.B.

Reading in detail the rough draft of the extraordinary report above by Jose Luis Vethecourt, suddenly I get up from my desk and walk around my neighborhood. I find Nora, who is no older than forty, but looks like sixty, holding her last child in her arms; it is the eighth, from her fifth man, with whom she no longer lives. I say "Hello" to William, who asks for my blessing; he is seventeen years old, four fingers higher than a meter, with a baby face -- they called him the "flea." I go into Carmen's house where I am offered a cup of coffee. Domingo stops me on the street and asks me if I got him the job. Carlitos, sixteen years old, walks around; he just retired from first year high school because his divorced parents don't want to pay for his bus ride; besides his shoes are in bad shape, but there is no money to buy another pair. I go back to my desk.

At least in Venezuela there is a man who does not fit into Jose Luis's model. It is the man who lives at the margins, at the corner of the roads of technology, positive philosophy, group rationality and sectarian morality.

As in *A Happy World* by Aldous Huxley, there is a place for the "savage" where feelings still exist, for the human word, values and Christianity, if perhaps a little *sui generis*. Yet is it not precisely in his *sui generis* manner where the originality and possibly the hope of such a person lies?

The marginal -- I prefer to call them people.

MARGINAL CULTURE

This is better called a culture of resistance because in it many significant values subsist and resist being invaded, conquered or destroyed. In either case, he is at the margins, fortunately at the margins, from that senseless road toward total death that others blindly follow and also below marginalized in their narcissistic burial of everything human and productive about life.

I have been reading *The Transparent Egg* by Jacques Testart, who is the father of the French project called FIVETE, consisting in the *in vitro* fertilization and implantation of zygotes in the female uterus. The author confesses his terror with the prospects that these biological techniques unlock for the future. He writes:

> I believe that the time has come to pause, the time for self-limitation by the researcher. The researcher is not the executor of every project that is derived from the logic of technology. . . . I, a researcher in assisted procreation, have decided to stop myself. It is not a question of research in order to do better what we now do, but, rather, research aimed at producing a radical change in the human person, in which procreative medicine is joined to predictive medicine. Let the fanatics of the artifice calm down. The researchers are many and I am fully conscious that in this matter I find myself alone. Restless men, those who at one time were called "humanists," and today are called "sentimentalists," question themselves. But let them do it quickly.

And he adds with anguish and valor:

> One cannot continue applying the logic of research to what already gives indication of representing an enormous harm to humanity. I revindicate a logic of non-discovery, an ethics of non-research. Let us finish with the farce of thinking in terms of a neutral research, where only the applications are good or bad. Prove to me when a discovery has not been applied.

He ends the book with this affirmation: "The day will come in which the balance of the humanity which remains will be totally enclosed in the memory of man."[1]

Certainly, as a result of the road taken by technological humanity, we may reach the point where man will be only a memory. This will happen if we allow the civilized to do away with the "savages."

Paul VI dared to say that development was the new name for peace; but not this development. John Paul II had to correct him twenty years later: progress has blinded even the more enlightened, but not those who have stayed farthest from its frontiers.

Paradoxically, history teaches us that liberty surges from the oppressed, authentic wisdom from the ignorant, from those negated as men.

> Blessed are you, Father, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the learned, but have revealed them to mere children (Luke 10:21).

I do not defend pain, hunger, oppression, injustice. But I want to point out clearly that it is not a matter of taking people to the highways of death, where death is cold and without hope, where hunger runs away from the body to the spirit, where oppression lives in man's interior as in his house and where injustice is so limitless that one can no longer perceive it because it surpasses perception. The point is that the true man who still lives in the outskirts attains human joy where pain is not without hope, satiety is shared, liberty is opened to love, and justice remains as a daily quality in human relations. The point is that man continue to live and not just become a memory.

It would seem that in the present civilization there is nothing human for which to look. But let us not be so pessimistic and radical; perhaps there are still some latent crumbs of humanity, conscious as Testart's "sentimentalists" who do not resign themselves to the disaster. Among the people, those who look find much: "Look and find" (Luke 11:9).

I am not proposing a mystification of the people; the seeds of death reside also there. But in the people the forces of life are better able to resist sudden attack. Hence, I propose going to the people, our Venezuelan Latin American people, our people marginalized from progress, to find there humanity, culture and the ethics that can respond positively to the challenge of the 21st century and beyond.

It is indispensable to dissect down to the marrow with the scalpel of criticism this culture and enslaved civilization; one must thank Jose Luis for the merciless lucidity with which he does this. But we have also to take into our hands the lantern of Diogenes and look for man wherever he may be found. Perhaps we will discover that the lantern is a miserable instrument because the object for which we are looking has such dimensions that only a powerful lamp can serve our purpose. Let us open the doors and windows to hope.

Still in our country an old Castilian romance is sung that may go back to the times when the frontier existed between Moors and Christians. A gentleman returns from the Moorish quarters where he went to see a tournament. On the way he finds a captive Christian girl, with whom he falls in love, but soon finds out that she is his sister. Upon reaching his house he exclaims:

> Open the doors and windows
> locks and grates.
> I thought I was bringing a woman
> and I bring my sister.
> Let us look for a man, that we will bring a brother.

Julian Rodriguez is a professional philosopher and theologian who is quite familiar with our marginalized neighborhoods. He has written a beautiful book titled "From Latin America: Does God Exist?" In this it is not the existence of God that interests me, but his characterization of the Latin-American man, who for Julian Rodriguez is conscious of being inconclusive, unfinished, and the reverse of his creativity.

> The reality of the people brings him to consciousness, a people that by means of one or another form of slavery moves toward liberation. The true understanding of what is happening in South America requires that one listen to the occurrences that make up our history. It requires, therefore, a significant capacity to understand the language and everyday gestures of what has been lived, often in the form of alienation, of what springs spontaneously, of what has not yet been categorized.[2]

With the ear -- the Biblical attitude of being opened to the total revelation of the other, and with the eye, the positivist posture of the observer who objectives and reifies the other while taking it over as a reality that inevitably stops being reality -- another can be heard without alienating him from the life of our people. In this way one knows integrally by dialogue and not by objectifying schematizations. In this way the author finds for himself the profundity of our man. "From the reality of the Latin American man of oppression and marginality arises his vigorous struggle for being something more than what he is and for not getting lost in the nonsense of nothingness. In the depths of oppression he breathes expectation, radical hope."[3]

This refers to an expectation that is not illusion or deception, but fundamentally hope, "waiting expectation," according to Rodriguez. Hope is the essential condition of what constitutes him as existence-in-situation. Radical hope, constitutive of man, takes him discover himself as project, as total aperture to the future: "It is to look for what is coming."[4] Technological man, in order to name him in some way, is constituted as closed within himself, within his own self-narcissistic contemplation, with his artifacts which in turn are closed within themselves and perfect. In contrast, the common man is open, imperfect and inconclusive. From the existential position of one and the other, there emerge clearly divergent ethics.

From here onwards I will use for reference my own lived experience in a peripheral neighborhood of Caracas, a national micro-world wherein one can find Andinos and Orientals, Tuyanos and Barloventeños, Laneros and Deltanos from the Orinoco, Amazones and Zulianos, people from the coast and from the interior, from the plain and the mountains. So as not to miss any aspect of the Venezuelan popular reality which is also international, there also are

Colombians, Peruvians, Ecuadorians and others.

AN ETHICS OF RELATION AND GIFT

In the relationships that come and go and in the gift that is given or denied, I discover the crucial, interdependent centers of the popular ethic. They define good and evil. This refers to authentic good and evil, and not to good or bad taste, to what is functional or nonfunctional. And it is good or bad because the relational acts and gift are supported in the free determination of each.

The people attribute liberty and hence quasi-absolute responsibility to each person without accepting cultural, social or psychological conditioning that may otherwise limit or suppress such accountability. Only when pathology is evident, or ignorance demonstrable, will an excuse be accepted. Though a drunk excuses himself as not knowing what he is doing, this is not accepted as true, for it is observed colorfully that there are some things that even a drunk will not eat. In this sense good and evil acquire an elemental, primary rigidity, non-nuanced by personal reflection concerning the complexity of the human act. Certainly, there is in such a conception misunderstanding, but not one disconnected from compassion, as I will soon show. Neither is the liberty of each person to do good or evil limited by considerations of age. A child of only a few months may be chastised: "Don't be fooled, he knows what he is doing." To say that someone is immature because his actions do not correspond to his age is understood as an indication that such a person wants to continue enjoying the delights of youth that are no longer legitimate for him. Reprimand and punishment are always directed to a free being who acts from a fully personal decision.

In spite of the rigidity and simplicity with which good and evil are understood, for the common man no one is truly evil. Every human being has an intimate depth of goodness that calls for compassion. Evil attracts and one succumbs, but he is not "bad." He is responsible for his evil; but evil does not constitute his real self. There is in this view a Christian-Catholic understanding of sinful man conceived as regenerable in his root, different from the Protestant concept of a nature corrupted by original sin. The hope of our people has roots in the cultural soil of their religious tradition. Compassion then is not complicity in evil; rather, it is unconditional acceptance of the profound being of the other based on the indestructible hope in renewal. Beyond one's evil, there is a person, his or her son or daughter, brother or sister, a friend, or simply one's neighbor, that is, one's being-in-relation-to-another, that makes one worthy of a gift.

Compassion is but one of the multiple forms of communicative solidarity reserved for the dark moments of existence. Thus, although this may be surprising in a people characterized as profoundly dependent, compassion emerges from an autonomous ethics sustained by freedom, i.e., the ability of one to give or deny his or her gift in a personal decision. It is not an heteronomous ethics for which good and evil are imposed from the outside on the constitutive passivity of the human subject, an ethics of impurity and purification.

Life in the slums is a constant praxis in relation to other people. I dare say that it is practically an inevitable function of the space, of the architecture. The hardships of farm life encourage one to leave. From the ample spaces of his fields and the dispersion of towns, the country habitants move into the limitation of the suburban world. Contact with nature is substituted by human contact. Their marginality frees them from being dominated by the artifacts of civilization, which still are used by man and not the opposite.

In this context of permanent human living, an ethics centered on the person and not on things or institutions is maintained and reproduced. Neither is this ethics based on money; in effect it is not possible to speak of an ethics of saving. The marginalized continue to believe on Providence. With all the possible shadows, economic insecurity and lack of foresight, they maintain themselves open, giving of themselves and receiving others within the framework of an insecurity perceived as normal, and which safeguards one from the temptations of an enclosed egoism.

The good continues to have primacy over interests -- the good being, among other things, sharing. This sharing does not solve anything definitively in the majority of cases, nor does it assure one of a future. But then value is understood in terms of the present, in what is communicated and lived moment by moment. Relation and gift are always actual.

One shares and experiences joy without provisions. Friday or Saturday night one festively participates in a beer bash. It does not matter who pays: one who does not have any money participates equally because he who has shares without calculating costs.

One shares also when a need or occasion to help presents itself; it is not necessary that the need be urgent. The expression, "A plate of food is denied to no one" is an indisputable norm. Help is directed at an immediate and concrete need. It does not matter if the need is prolonged in a constantly renewed immediacy; help would always be renewed in temporal permanence. Hence in the slums there are no abandoned children. When someone loses his or her home and becomes an orphan or is abandoned, there is always a family that makes room for the needy child. No one thinks that by receiving a child they are doing a heroic or meritorious action. This enters into the ethics of gift and relation with the naturalness of an action that is performed for the simple reason that there is a person in need. No computations are made for the future. Benefits derived from the work which may be performed by those under one's care are not taken into consideration, nor are problems or budgets considered. In equality with the other children, the new member of the family will remain there as long as he needs to be or until he wishes to leave. His freedom is in no way conditioned by the gift, which is totally gratuitous.

The gratuitousness of the gift necessarily conspires against an ethics of efficiency and production, and, thereby, of a systematic and regulated rhythm of automotive efficiency. It is not a matter of what may be foreseen or can be programmed, but precisely what cannot be foreseen, what is due to the surprising decisions of the one who gives the gift and communicates of him or herself.

A trend today in social psychology, that originated in rural areas but developed with great interest in one of our classical universities, has shown that the Venezuelan man is motivated not by the need for gain, but by the need for affiliation and power. Researchers have succeeded in refuting the positivist motivational scheme of human behavior and its attempt to explain the reason for our underdevelopment. In a study I have also amply criticized the ideological suppositions on which such research is based.[5] Here I would only like to point out different motivational schemes that obey distinct ethical systems: one, a partisan ethics of development and efficiency; the other, a universal ethics of gift and relation.

The apparently insuperable failure of the Venezuelan left can be explained, in large measure, as a result of a fundamental error of focus, a species of original sin that continues unredeemed because no one is willing to do penance. Though those on the left have liberated themselves from many dogmatic theories of the past, they continue to maintain a notion of man that derives directly or indirectly from Marx, namely, that labor is constitutive of man. Following the classical orientations, our left has thereby centered its efforts in the labor sector, although this

has not responded. There is here a basic error. It has not occurred to the well-intentioned revolutionaries that the common Venezuelan man is not a *homo faber* but a *homo convivialis*. His realization is not in working, but in fellowship, in sharing daily living. The privileged position of popular solidarity is therefore not the factory, but the neighborhood. The popularity of neighborhood organizations -- so numerous, varied and original in the last years -- bears this out.

Our people do not organize themselves according to explicit and well-programmed projects, but in relations of community wherein spontaneous short-term and concrete projects arise. Our revolutionaries despair before this alleged incapacity for planning simply because they do not see that they move within an ethical conception of life which is radically at odds with that followed by the people. Ironically, in the final analysis the ethics of the left is not substantially different from bourgeois ethics, it so much abhorres.

Community living is thus the natural space for relations and the giving of oneself as gift; it is the ground of solidarity. Community fellowship is, to a certain degree, constituted hierarchically in the order of importance and value. The first in this order is the family, which is still extensive although who knows for how long. The popular Venezuelan family, predominately matriarchal, is a microcosm of extremely complex relations whose nexus I have proposed to unravel in an ambitious research project hardly initiated.[6] The provisional conclusions cannot be articulated here. Nonetheless, it seems indisputable that the family microcosm has an energetic-affective nucleus, a vortex in which all bonds are linked. The center to which I refer is the*mother*, or, possibly, *maternity*, not understood as an abstract concept but as an actuating concrete reality. As energizing and bonding nucleus of community relations, the mother provides a particular model of solidarity and communicative affectivity.

From an ethical viewpoint the relations with mother come to some degree to be the paradigmatic model from which one learns of good and evil. Thus the popular Venezuelan ethics acquires maternal qualities that differentiate it from other ethics qualified by the father. This explains a good deal of the ethical lights and shadows. For example, there is a certain maternal softness that characterizes the ethical practice in our people, a certain avoidance of disciplinary action in both personal and social matters.

The mother, immediate fountain of ethics, is transcendent. In the community and representational world of Venezuela, the mother is not a concrete woman who happens also to be mother, but a mother and nothing else. Her maternity makes her transcendent; it constitutes her. She is a universal concretized in history in this woman. One learns in this way, beyond local contexts, a transcendent ethics easily connected with God -- a very maternal God, to be sure.

In this way the family is the first domain in which an ethics of community and transcendence subsists. From the family irradiates an ethical worldview that affects all the social spaces which are permeated by a species of family inspiration, whether for communication or rejection. If the group of friends, the work team or the social organization does not manage to reproduce in some way the relational family model, be it symbolically or concretely, it will find serious difficulties in subsisting and functioning.

There is here an important limitation that education ought to consider. It is difficult for the Venezuelan man to transfer this ethics of relation and gift to large groups, to broad systems of solidarity. Thus, he finds it difficult to give himself to a cause, to become part of a social movement, to enter into a complex system of relations. This is not easily lived as a good, nor is its negative as evil.

A person acquires meaning when he is available. It does not matter then that he even be a stranger. Juan has various children. Two of his daughters wait for a jeep to take them to Petare. The driver in order to avoid another vehicle coming in the opposite direction crashes against the railing. He himself takes them to the hospital and is arrested. When Juan finds out, he immediately goes to the hospital where his is informed that the driver has been detained. When he learns that his daughters are being taken care of, he goes to the detention site. Upon finding out that the driver is a father who has no other means of providing for his family than his work, Juan immediately goes into action. The victim becomes the principal advocate for the perpetrator. This case can be generalized.

Community cohesion reflects a call to responsibility for the other with whom it is easy to identify oneself, even in the most adverse circumstances. A first aggressive reaction may be followed by mutual help. When this does not happen it is probably more from fear of rejection than from resentment.

Put in general terms, we can affirm as a principle that life acquires sense insofar as it is related or dedicated to others as equal persons. This should not be understood in merely positive terms of assistance and generosity; it is valid also when egoism and negativity are at work.

The value of solidarity and social disapproval for its contrary is dominant. Every action that signifies preoccupation for the other is always appreciated, from taking a sick person to the hospital, to finding a placement for a child in a school, to collaborating in the construction of a stairwell. The fulfillment of this principle of solidarity is above all else. Self-sacrifice is easily secured. One is willing to leave aside what is important to one in order to collaborate with whomever is in need. And one takes risks with the aim of solving an actual problem, leaving the future to Providence.

Reciprocally, each person counts on others. In this way one's own progress or that of one's family is never an individual matter; one always counts on others. No one establishes nor improves a ranch with his own strength. To look for work, find a placement or resolve a political problem, one goes to one's family, godparents, friends, neighbors or influential friends of one's friends. Complex networks are formed based on family relations, not on interests. The same attitude that surfaces and is nourished by a general ethics of relation, is extended to institutions of government. People expect government to help. While much criticized by those who move in another conception of ethics, for the common man this is most logical and natural. The popularity of our democratic governments is a function, in great part, of the tacit acceptance of the values of the people; values that are not, in turn, exempt from deviations and vices.

The world of relations, whose energetic nucleus is the life of the family, as has been said, produces solidarities with what we can still call evil. Rarely are any charges pressed against another; no one even accuses another. In the slums everything is known, but police investigations will not manage to get any information. Here it is not a question of complicity, but of solidarity with one's neighbors. Sometimes the solidarities cross, as in the example of an unfaithful couple. In this case a conflict is resolved in favor of the one who is closest. Gossiping also follows this line of preferential proximity. If the offender is closet to one, say a neighbor, then there is silence; if it be the victim, he or she receives this same treatment.

The delinquent also obeys this ethics of proximate relation. He does not, for instance, commit his crimes in the slums; he neither mugs his neighbors nor strangers within his own neighborhood. The delinquent will act in other neighborhoods, but not in his own; if he does, he will be ostracized by his neighbors.

Sharing the gift of self in communication takes place not merely with regard to material things, but also and perhaps above all with regard to the person through personal gifts of affection, conversation, joy or sadness. This includes the phenomenon of visiting for the simple reason of visiting, of seeing each other or of "telling jokes," where one shares laughs or simply time.

Celebration has its stellar moments, whether of joy, sadness or religious experience. It is time outside of the clock; it is symbolic, mythical time pertaining to another dimension of reality. The feast lasts until exhaustion or alcohol overcomes its participants. In this festive environment personal, human relations dominate above all and acquire a state of almost total purity. The same may be said of a wake, which the less affected members convert into a feast while those who truly share in the grief comfort with their presence the one who grieves. What is valuable is the gift of presence, not its efficacy. In religious celebration in the slums, there are no problems of time. The priest there does not have to worry about the length of the religious services; no one leaves as a result of fatigue or boredom. Communion with transcendence is a communication of gifts not limited by any other conditions. There is a great capacity for celebration and for living humanly what they celebrate. That is, they live with warmth and fraternally from the most profound depths of their being. That is why life can be supported; nothing is unsupportable.

This is very evident in suffering. To say that the people are fatalistic because they apparently do not revolt against suffering shows a lack of understanding. Leaving aside the fact that their daily experience constantly confirms that rebellion is counter-productive, people embrace suffering as an intrinsic component of existence. It is a reality that makes sense, just as much as joy makes sense. For this reason they do not despair, nor do they depend on evasive mechanisms to alleviate suffering. At least for the majority of cases alcohol is not used as a means to forget, but above all for enjoyment in the company of others. When pain presents itself no one frees himself from it, but accepts it and shares with others.

Sacrifice is connected with suffering. With regard to the reality of sacrifice there is not a penitential attitude; the concept of penitence as reparation for sins or bad actions seems even quite foreign to the popular mentality. Sin or evil is forgiven and that is it. At most one is asked not to repeat it; but if it is forgiven, one does not ask for something in return. In fact, this is what a mother does with her children. It is possible that one is not forgiven, but in this case neither does penance have any meaning. When on Holy Wednesday someone dresses in the garb of the Nazarene and walks on his knees before an image, it is not a penitent, but someone who gives of himself as a gift to whoever has asked for this sacrifice. One fulfills a promise, not pays for a sin.

Suffering has meaning as relation and gift both when one fulfills a promise and when it becomes necessary in human interchange. The fact that something costs does not impede one's obligation to perform it when it is an inevitable condition of the relation.

Thusfar I have given preference to aspects we consider positive in our popular culture. Consequently, it could seem that I am presenting an idyllic picture of the marginalized world. This is not my intention. In the slums there is good and evil, ethics is opposed and followed as in any other environment. Ethical principles are both observed and transgressed; both obedience and transgression enter into the same general and transcendent paradigm.

What remains is to analyze the place in this framework of distinct areas pertaining to morality: sexuality, economics, work, etc. The limits of this paper and of my own expertise do not allow for a consideration of these areas. However, there is a need to analyze and reflect on these areas about which so much is said without due seriousness.

I have concentrated on highlighting the contours of popular ethics insofar as it represents a divergence from the ethics promulgated by the civilization of progress and development, which is an ethics of death and domination.

Interested minds concerned with the survival of humanity in the 21st century and beyond need not despair; not all is lost. Some of our brothers and sisters still conserve and live ethical values that we also love, but they do not thematize them. We can drink from their fountain of life and draw strength for their struggle.

Not in pessimism, but in anguished preoccupation, we must recognize that they are there -- but we must ask for how long?

NOTES

1. Jacques Testart, *L'Oeuf Transparent* (Flammarion, 1986).

2. Julian Rodriguez, "From Latin America: Does God exist?" (Caracas: Editorial Salesiana, 1987).

3. *Ibid*.

4. *Ibid*.

5. Alejandro Moreno, "Cómo somos los Venezolanos? Crítica de una visión ideologizada," *Anthropos*, n. 13-2 (Caracas, 1986).

6. Two initial works have been published: "El Vínculo Afectivo con las Figuras Parentales a través de una historia de vida,"*Anthropos*, n. 14-1 (Caracas); "El Vínculo Afectivo a travé del Lenguaje Cotidiano," *Boletín AVEPSO*, v. 10, n. 2, August 1987.

CHAPTER XII
AN INQUIRY ON FAMILY VALUES IN VENEZUELA
HECTOR RODRIGUEZ

THE PROBLEM

> Most of the time to talk about the family is like talking into a void. Apparently we are not interested in the family. The family is like the air we breathe daily: a vital element without which we would die. But we never think about it, except when we fear it to be contaminated or when we cannot breathe properly. That is the family. It is important but we think little about it, for we never go deeply into its values. We think about the "poor family" only when something is going wrong; we need somebody to take the responsibility for all the bad things.[1]

This text from the book, *Familia Incompleta* of the Christian Family Movement, introduces us to the strengths and weaknesses of the family. It is the oldest human group: in every place, culture or time, men and women have come together, begotten children and tried to raise them. The family also has been changing through time according to changes in the environment. It has undergone a process of institutionalization in order to protect persons, provide more security, and in a way to enable one to find oneself. But as circumstances change new needs arise and earlier institutions can prove insufficient to fully satisfy them. Families today have an identity problem. What was considered essential to the family as an institution is being systematically undermined. We find that points of reference which lent stability to the family have become useless and no longer function. Families are formed and destroyed for reasons that have nothing to do with them individually.

The old definition of the family as the "fundamental cell of society" no longer obtains. It can no longer be said that "The family is the place where the child starts to grow and obtain values, where he goes from indifferentiation to integration, from dependency to independence and free creative expression."[2] The abnormalities through which the family is passing mirror those of our whole society.

Some characteristics of a sub-developed society are:

- great migrations
- demographic growth
- a young population
- high rent per capita
- unfair distribution of the commodities
- bad nutrition
- high unemployment and criminality

In such an environment it is difficult to create a typical family. As the documents of Puebla say: "The family is no longer uniform; it is affected in different ways by factors which may be: social (social injustice), political (domination and manipulative), economic (salaries, unemployment) or religious (secularism)."[3]

One set of research interviews about the family asked three questions:[4]

1. Which aspects of the family situation appear to be the more alarming?
2. What positive aspects can be found in the family?
3. What factors or causes most affect the present family situation?
The answers were as follows:

(1) *Alarming aspects* of the present family situation:
- family disintegration: divorce, abortion, drugs, unfaithfulness and devaluation of women;
- irresponsibility: unwanted children, families with more than one father, single mothers, abandoned children;
- weak preparation for family life: more a biological and social impulse than an option of life; and
- lost values: irresponsibility, ignorance and materialism.

(2) *Positive aspects* of the family:
- some still believe in the family and its mission;
- best value among the lower class: hospitality;
- acknowledgement of one's mother: her love, fidelity and presence;
- progress: parents want to educate and advance their children;
- some religiosity: God's presence and some popular religious practices.

3. *Factors that affect the actual family situation*:
- moral deterioration: devaluation of work, a consumer society;
- unjust structures: unfair distribution of wealth, analphabetism, lack of opportunity;
- negative influence of the media;
- lack of personal and family intellectual growth.

From such characteristics the family will be reformed in a way that emphasizes its positive factors. The family's present condition diverges from the way it should be. As a social institution its change is necessary in order for it to last, for if it does not change it will die and disappear.

Finally, most of the changes and crises of the family are filters which eliminate unused customs and emphasize its essential aspects, namely:

1) to create free people with conscience and responsibility,
2) to transmit the faith, and
3) to promote the integral development of society.

These are but a few of the many important services of the family in society.

CHANGE IS FUNDAMENTAL IN THE FAMILY

Every day the changes experienced by the family are deeper. These transformations tell us of different ways to live family life. Some time ago the family was the center of protection, security, education, recreation and, in some cases, of work. These functions have disappeared. We can say that now the family is more an affective place for individual encounter and growth.

If the family is based on love its authentic realization is more difficult to achieve, but at the same time there are more types of family lives.

In view of the change in the function of the family, we shall analyze the new characteristics of the family.

Conjugal Function: Nowadays love between husband and wife is an essential condition. It is authentic, sincere and does not have the old social pressures. The new attitudes toward sexuality have opened some doors in the relationship between the partners, especially harmony and sexual complementarity. Communication between husband and wife has increased, leaving behind the idea of marriage just to have children.

The predominance of the husband has decreased; now the woman is in charge of more areas, has greater responsibility and is more equal. Conjugal stability is the desired goal, but is difficult to achieve because:

1) the way adults were educated according to a good model for marriage, and

2) permanent engagement is thought of as slavery, taking away freedom especially as regards the sexual dimension of life.

Biological Function: Sexuality is understood as an expression of love; it helps communication, growth and the complementarity of persons as a couple. Every day the distance between sexuality and procreation grows greater; sometimes the two are totally separated. To consider sex as the only way to develop the person and a stable conjugal relationship creates a false expectation that cannot be fulfilled at the biological level alone.

Economic Function: This also has changed. The man is no longer the only one who works, while the wife takes care of the house; children used to work for the total capital of the household. Now, both husband and wife work; children also work, but use the money for their own expenses. This change is not always accepted. In some cases the husband may be absent so that the woman must manage everything by herself. When she works and earns a higher salary than her husband, this too can create conjugal conflict.

Cultural Function: The transmission of ideas and of personal and social values is best done through family. Nowadays, universities, schools, movies and television have more power to transmit a message.

Many people consider the family itself to be an obstacle to its own evolution and progress. One of the bad things about the actual family is that it no longer transmits the values and criteria which serve to preserve it.

Parent-child Relations: It is here that the greatest changes are observed. At present the idea of having children is carefully planned. It is no longer important to have descendants as an insurance against old age. Nowadays, a family of four is considered numerous in the middle and higher classes. This confirms a change in the concept and reality of responsible parenthood, which begins with procreation but lasts until the child becomes an adult.

Since Venezuela is a young country, young married couples have as their sole objective the education of their children. Once this is accomplished the couple falls into a hole of empty

monotony. In reality the youngsters are not sufficiently mature when they strike out on their own.

Whereas authority used to lie with the parents, the classic father-figure now has less influence on the children, at least until their adolescence. Indeed, all members of the family share in authority. Affection or love also has become very important, overshadowing education and blind obedience.

Women: A last aspect which, though not a function, has been a factor in the exercise of all family roles is the advancement and liberation of women. The real meaning of this must be discovered, put into place and assimilated in all its richness. However, the idea of a male world has been so internalized that any change in this is considered a struggle for power; this is why we tend to see a liberated women's world as one where women rule and men obey. In truth women have acquired a sense of their dignity, more access to culture, work and politics. These have forced them to leave home and, in a way, have made them better women.

In ways not previously possible this has changed family relations, from a permanence of women at home and the matriarchal family. Because this new situation is not yet well assimilated, some women exaggerate their new roles and leave home completely, even when this means an increase in lonely children deprived of affection. This is because women have not replaced the previous contributions when they stayed at home, while, moved by a false idea of masculinity, men often do not help.

CONCLUSION

Frequently we hear both statements that the family is an anachronism and regrets that it is not what it used to be. The above is a socio-anthropological reflection on the actual situation of the family which remains the basic structure of society and church. Good examples are needed as models for the new generations.

NOTES

1. *Familia Incompleta* (Caracas: Movimiento Familiar Cristiano, 1974), p. 7.
2. "Manual para la Formación de Agentes de Pastoral Familiar. Opto de Familia" in *Un cambio a partir del niño* (La Guaira, 1987), p. 9.
3. *Documentos de Puebla* (Bogota: Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano, 1979), n. 572.
4. *Reconstruir la Familia un reto para Venezuela* (Caracas: Secretariado Permanente del Episcopado Venezolano, 1980), pp. 42, 45.

REFERENCE

Valores Básicos da Vida e da Familia. (Sao Paulo: Conferencia Episcopal Dos Bispos do Brasil, 1980).

Francisco, Consuelo and Roberto Zarama. *La Familia hoy en Amèrica Latina* (Bogota: Indo-Americano Press Service, 1980).

Marciano Vidal. *Valores éticos de la Familia* (Madrid: PPC, 1986).

Frank Musgrove. *Familia, Educación y Sociedad* (Navarra: Verbo Divino, 1975).

Jean Piaget, et al. *La Neuva Educación Moral* (Buenos Aires: Losada s.a., 1960).

STRUCTURES OF COGNITIVE AND MORAL DEVELOPMENT
ANIBAL PUENTE

THREE EDUCATIONAL THEORIES

From the educational point of view, many hypotheses for explaining cognitive and moral development are based on three theories: the romantic theory, the cultural transmission theory and the progressionist or cognitive-developmental theory.

1. *The romantic theory* prevailed in the last century. J.J. Rousseau in his book *Emil* referred to the basic principles of this view; outstanding among them are the expression principle and the freedom principle. Within this theoretical approach the integral development of the subject physically, intellectually and emotionally is accepted as a fundamental commitment. Thus the school and the family must design environments that facilitate the development of all the potentialities possessed innately by learners.

From the psychological point of view, the romantic theory has its parallel in the organic-genetic theory whose main representative is Freud. The psychological theory conceives the child's mind as an organism (or plant) biologically prepared to grow as long as the environment nurtures its development. For Freud, moral development occurs in a manner that parallels physical development, and there are a series of stages related to psycho-sexual development. These stages are basically hereditary though there are some social factors that could favor or delay their expression. Therefore, moral development depends on the natural and spontaneous evolution of impulses and emotions.

From the sociological point of view, with the romantic theory arises individualism, which claims that morality emerges from the individual as an expression of personal action. The individual is, chronologically and morally, prior to society. All values are derived from the individual and they express themselves in society which is made up of individuals (Spiro, 1951). Contrary to other individualistic theories, this one does not consider that cognitive factors play a fundamental role in the development of morality nor in the development of moral judgment.

2. *The cultural transmission theory* conceives the mind as a "tabula rasa" upon which the experiences of the environment are inscribed. The mind is initially empty and passive, determined by factors from the physical and social environment. This theory is inspired by associationism and its principles: stimulus-response, reinforcement, punishment, etc. . . . Locke, Watson, Thorndike, and Skinner are the most relevant representatives of this theory. From the cognitive point of view it is assumed that concepts and structures are a reflection of all that is outside the individual in the physical and social world. The individual's development is brought about through direct instruction or through the imitation of adult models with emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge, abilities and skills. The acquisition of moral behavior is governed by the same general principles of learning. For this theory the origin of morality is not the individual, but society.

The societal approach (Durkheim, 1976) understands morality as a matter of accommodation of the individual to societal values through processes of adaptation and

internalization. Society is prior to the individual, chronologically and morally. It is the source of all the values that are reflected in the individual.

According to this approach, moral behavior is governed by rules. To the degree that an individual accepts and follows the rules established by society, to that degree the individual will be moral or immoral. From this perspective, the individual must be educated for discipline and adhesion to the community. When these two aspects are strongly instilled, individuals are able to live in society because they are morally prepared to obey and enforce the rules. Morality is not a system of customs, but a system of obligations. Thus, it is necessary to develop in man a sense of discipline and deference for authority. Rules are equally prescribed to all, and those who enforce them are to be obeyed and respected.

Moral acts do not exclusively pursue personal purposes. "Moral action is that which pursues impersonal or supra-individual objectives; thus moral purposes are those that have society as its object" (Durkheim, 1976, p. 219). "We are moral beings only to the degree that we are social beings" (Durkheim, 1976, p. 223). Society is the purpose of morality and its artisan.

The Durkheimian conception is deterministic and heteronomous. The individual is a product shaped by the elements of the social environment such that free will plays a secondary role. The true motivations for morality are directed toward the satisfaction of group interests and the individual is a function of the social environment. Durkheim (1976) underscores this aspect when claiming that the rules that prescribe moral acts are freely desired and freely accepted, which means an enlightened approval.

3. *The progressionist or cognitive-developmental theory* is dialectical since it rejects the dichotomy between maturity factors (innate) and environmental factors. Both have a role in the person's definition and both function in an articulated way; otherwise there may be factors that delay both cognitive and moral development. Sometimes, certain innate factors begin to conflict with environmental factors, and from their resolution more advanced phases of development and more mature moral behaviors emerge.

The cognitive-developmental theory prevails at the moment; it originated in Plato, was given a new meaning by Hegel and lastly incorporated into the psychological point of view by Dewey and Piaget. Piaget and Dewey claim that mature thinking does not depend either on genetic or social factors; rather, it is the result of the reorganization of the psychological structures derived from the interaction between the organism and the environment. To understand Piaget and Dewey it is necessary to clarify the concept of cognition.

Cognitions are structures internally organized as a system of relations and as a set of beliefs. These structures are rules for the processing of information that an organism receives or for the connection of several events. Children's events and experiences are organized and actively processed; this is not merely a process of repetition or accumulation.

Cognitive development, defined as change in the cognitive structures, supposedly depends on experience. However, such effects are not considered as learning in the classical sense (training, instruction, modeling or practice). For example, if two events are presented in temporal proximity, it is probable that the child interprets the phenomenon in terms of a category as causality and not in terms of a simple associative relation. Simple associations can help to generate a structure, but this is basically "internal" and "stable", though "modifiable."

JEAN PIAGET

Cognitive Development

According to Piaget, species inherit two basic tendencies; the first one is adaptation: organisms change their behavior as a reaction to environmental changes. The second tendency is organization: certain organisms' structures are affected as a consequence of certain behaviors. Adaptation involves two basic processes: assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation takes place when a person uses certain behaviors that are either natural or learned. Assimilation also occurs when a person discovers that the result of acting upon an object, using an already learned behavior, is not satisfactory, thereby developing a new behavior.

> Organization is inseparable from adaptation. They constitute two complementary processes of the same mechanism; the first being the internal aspect of the cycle of which adaptation is the external aspect. These two aspects of thinking are inseparable; adapting to things, thinking is organized, and by organizing itself it structures the things (Piaget, 1952, pp. 7-8).

That is, organisms search for balance and harmony, but the latter is never reached in a complete way because contradictions and disequilibrium constitute the bases for moral and intellectual growth.

There is a certain moment in a child's development when he or she begins to feel the presence of contradictions in his or her thinking. This is a clear index of what Piaget defines as confusion. During this phase there seems to be a rupture of the existing intellectual structures followed by internal reorganizations towards new patterns of thinking.

The cognitive-developmental theory is structural and hierarchical; that is, cognitive and affective development are parallel to the changes and transformations of the structures of thinking. It is assumed that cognitive structures pass along several stages (Table 1) and in relation to this there have been several hypotheses that need to be confirmed:

1. The process of intellectual development is hierarchical and continuous.
2. Each stage of development supposes the acquisition of certain structures of thinking (hierarchical integrations).
3. Each stage of development involves qualitative changes.
4. Individuals reach different stages within the hierarchy though all of them could also be reached.
5. Cultural factors can accelerate or delay development, but stages remain unchanged from culture to culture.

Moral behavior acquisition refers to an active change in the response patterns before problematic social situations, and not merely to the learning of rules society imposes on the individual. Educators and psychologists following this theory underline the importance that cognitive development has as the basis for moral development. It is also assumed that cognitive development is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition to reach certain stages of development.

Moral Judgement

According to Piaget, the development of moral judgment is a direct consequence of cognitive development: the moral cannot be understood or explained without a complete comprehension of the cognitive.

Play is the best laboratory where a child's judgment and behavior can be explored in relation to rules. Two aspects can be studied: the practice of rules and awareness of them. In relation to practice, it is observed how children apply and adapt rules in terms of age and cognitive development. In relation to conscience, emphasis is placed on observing how they represent the obligatory character of the rules and what level of awareness they have concerning their obligation to follow them.

After several years of longitudinal and cross-sectional studies, Piaget concluded that children pass through two stages:

1. Rules are imposed from the outside, and are considered to be sacred.
2. Later, a process of internalization, mutual consent and autonomous conscience occur.

Each stage leads to a certain type of behavior. In the first stage, any of these two behaviors can take place: rebellion or obedience. In the second, cooperation is a conviction of individual and social utility (Table 2).

Mifsud (1985) proposes three behavioral laws: motor, egocentric and cooperative which coincide with three types of rules: (a) the motor rule (preverbal) is independent from all social relation and is governed by reflex schemes and circularity of movements; (b) the rule due to one-sided respect restrictive; and finally (c) the rational rule is governed by mutual respect and reciprocity.

Four Successive Stages in Rule Practice:

Stage 1: Motor and Individual
The child plays with marbles according to his own wishes and his motor customs. These are motor rules rather than collective rules. "Ritualistic" schemes are established, but play continues to be individual.

Stage 2: Egocentric (2-5 years)
The child receives from the outside world the example of codified rules. But, in imitating these examples, the child plays alone or with other children without intending either to overcome them or standardize the varied forms of play. Two elements can be found: imitation of others and the individual use of examples.

Stage 3: Growing Cooperation (Towards 7-8 years)
Preoccupation about mutual control and standardization of the rules is found, but a certain oscillation with respect to the general rules of the game continues to prevail. Children who play together, when questioned separately, give different information about the rules.

Stage 4: Rule Codification (Towards 11-12 years)
The code of rules is known by all the children and the game is regulated in all the details of its procedure.

Three Successive Stages in Rule Awareness

Stage 1: The Rule is Not Coercive
Because it is a motor rule and also because it is followed as an interesting example, not as a compulsory reality. (We are at the beginning of the egocentric stage.)

Stage 2: The Rule Is Considered Sacred and Intangible (From 6 years on)
The rule is considered to be of adult origin and of an eternal essence, so that any proposed modification is considered by the child to be a transgression. (We are at the climax of the egocentric stage and in the middle of the cooperative stage).

Stage 3: The Rule is Considered a Law Due to Mutual Consent (From 10 years on)
It is obligatory to obey the rule if one wishes to be loyal, but it can be transformed on the condition that everyone agrees.

From Piaget's proposal one may conclude that the child passes through (1) an heteronomous morality which is the product of the pressures and unilateral respect that the adult world imposes, and (2) an autonomous morality which gradually emerges from the development of the "ego" towards mutual respect.

During the heteronomous stage, "moral realism" can be observed. This is "the tendency of the child to consider the values that are related to them as existing in themselves, independently from conscience, and as obligatorily imposed regardless of the circumstances in which the individual finds himself" (Piaget, 1977, pp. 92-93). Moral realism has three characteristics: (1) righteousness is defined by the observation of the rules; (2) rules must be obeyed without taking the spirit of the law into account; and (3) the child evaluates moral acts from an objective perspective without taking into account their intention.

An analysis of the characteristics of moral realism leads to the conclusion that this cannot be understood without knowing the cognitive development of the child; the latter is the cause of the former. The verification of the moral laws is a consequence of his concrete thinking, of his childlike realism. The contents of his conscience are things similar to the real world and these contents are reflected in the external world. Besides, the child is completely independent from any perspective. The adults are the ones who transmit the rules and their imperative and who constitute the most important element of the "world order."

During the stage of concrete operations, Piaget claims that children begin to have a less defined and more cooperative vision of the rules. They start to understand that all participants have to agree that the game transpire in an honest manner; otherwise, the players will refuse to play. As each player tries to win, everybody is interested in the rules, but these may be vaguely defined. If they are questioned about the rules, it is possible that the children give different explanations. At this moment the children are moving toward the stage of moral relativism, where they consider that rules, though firmly established, can be modified if all the members of the group agree.

It is cooperation that permits one to overcome "moral realism," objectivism and egocentrism so as to promote shared responsibility and consideration of an act's intentions.

In the same way that the notion of game was used to define the characteristics of heteronomous morality, the theme of justice serves to characterize the development of autonomous morality. Autonomy emerges at the moment when a child discovers that truth is

necessary in relations of friendship and mutual respect; and whenever conscience considers necessary an ideal that is independent from all external pressure.

The concept of justice, according to Piaget, is developed in a continuous manner through three periods. In the first (up to 7-8 years) justice is subordinated to adult autonomy and related to the domain of retributive justice. Any individual that breaks the rule regardless of particular circumstances, social class, sex, or context deserves a sanction proportional to the seriousness of the offense. The second period (between 8 and 11 years) is that of progressive egalitarianism. During this period the principle of equality comes to prevail while the principle of authority decreases. A sanction is not accepted without rebellion and only the sanctions that are derived reciprocally are considered legal. In the third period (beginning around 11-12 years) the principle of equality decreases to give way to the principle of equity. This principle refers to the development of equity in the sense of relativity. Instead of searching for equality in identity, adolescents search for it in relation to a particular situation. Justice is distributive since it is no longer considered as something identical for everyone, given that it is convenient to take into account the personal circumstances of each one. This kind of justice is more effective than that governed by the principle of identical equality.

Some extension to the Piagetian proposals has been proposed since they have been considered as a fundamental point of reference for the analysis of any modern theory about moral development and because they constitute a point of equilibrium between the perspectives confronted; besides, it enables comprehension of the cognitive-developmental approaches prevailing in the psychological domain.

L. KOHLBERG

Cognitive-moral Development

The theoretical frame of reference presented previously leads to the analysis of the implicit assumptions about moral development: the theory of cognitive-developmental morality Piaget (1932). However, a number of theorists before him were preoccupied with this theme: Baldwin (1906), McDougall (1908), Hobhouse (1906); more recent theorists such as Dewey (1932), and Mead (1934); and others such as Kohlberg (1964) and Bull (1969) who developed their proposals following the scheme of cognitive-moral development raised by the father of the Geneva School.

The most outstanding characteristics of the cognitive-developmental approach are found in notions such as stages of development, sequential organization and in a certain congruence between biological, intellectual and moral development. Other assumptions, according to Kohlberg (1976), are the following: (1) moral development is paralleled to cognitive development; (2) morality's basic motivation is rooted in the principle of acceptance, competence, self-esteem or personal realization; to a lesser degree, it responds to biological needs and the reduction of anxiety and fear; (3) the stages of moral development are as universal as the stages of intellectual development; culture offers common sources for social interaction, role adaptation, rewards and punishments; there are no basic differences among cultures; (4) basic moral rules and principles are structures that derive from the experience of social interaction more than from the internalization of rules that exist as external structures; moral stages are not defined by internal rules but by internalized structures between the individual and others; (5) the environmental influences on moral development are defined by the general

extension and quality of social and cognitive stimuli, more than by the influence of parents and experiences of discipline, reward and punishment.

The psychoanalytic approach is an eclectic approach since it accepts some of the assumptions of the previous approaches. For example, it shares with the socialization theory the principle of the internalization of the rule through the pressure exerted by society; particularly, it emphasizes parents as authority figures that inspire fear when their rules are not obeyed. On the other hand. it accepts from the cognitive approach the notion of stages of development more with a libidinous-instinctive character than with a moral character. The stages of development are related to the conscience development: id, ego and superego.

Kohlberg represents a prototypical figure of the cognitive developmental approach, while Hoffman represents the socialization approach.

The notions of Piagetian moral realism and relativism encouraged Kohlberg in his proposal of the stages of moral development. Kohlberg offers a detailed sequence of the stages of moral development and has been a pioneer in the study of their evolution. He divides development into three levels: (I) preconventional: judgment is exclusively based on self-needs and perceptions; (2) conventional: judgments take into account the expectations of the society and of the law; and (3) postconventional: judgments are based on principles that go beyond the specific law (Table 3).

Kohlberg evaluates the reasoning levels through the presentation of moral dilemmas. These describe situations in which a person must make a difficult decision. In fact, the dilemmas are situations impossible to solve in which "justice" is doubtful and "injustice" disputable. The important thing in these dilemmas is the exploration of the kind of moral judgment that underlies a possible action.

I. PRECONVENTIONAL LEVEL. Cultural labels of right and wrong are responded to, but are interpreted in terms of either physical or hedonistic consequences of action.

Stage 1. Punishment and obedience orientation: Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power determine action and are valued implicitly rather than in terms of their support of an underlying moral order

Stage 2. Instrumental relativist orientation: Action is determined by the instrumental satisfaction of one's own needs and occasionally of the needs of others. Reciprocity may be present, but is more a matter of *quid pro quo* exchanges than of gratitude, loyalty or justice.

II. CONVENTIONAL LEVEL. Maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group, or nation is perceived as intrinsically valuable. The attitude is not only one of conformity to expectations of a social order, but of loyalty to it, largely maintaining it, justifying it, and identifying with the persons involved in it.

Stage 3. Interpersonal concordance (good-boy) orientation: Action is determined by what pleases or helps others, with much conformity to stereotypical images of majority behavior. Behavior is judged by intentions for the first time.

Stage 4. Authority and social-order maintaining orientation: Action is governed by duty, respect for authority, fixed rules, and concern for maintaining the social order.

III. POSTCONVENTIONAL LEVEL. There is a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity apart from the authority of the groups of persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups.

Stage 5. Social-contract legalistic orientation: Action is defined in terms of general individual rights and standards that have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedural rules for reaching consensus. Emphasis is upon the possibility of changing the laws in terms of rational consideration or social utility rather than maintaining it rigidly, as in the previous stage. Outside the legal realm, free agreement and contract are the binding elements of obligation.

Stage 6. Universal ethical principle orientation. Action is defined by a decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles that appeal to logical comprehensiveness, universality and consistency. These are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings and individual persons.

From S. V. Owen, *et al. Educational Psychology*.

Critical Evaluation of Kohlberg's Theory

Kohlberg's theory has been criticized in two fundamental respects: its individualism and the primacy it gives to cognitive factors as sources of moral development. With respect to the first critique, Emler (1983; cf. Haney, 1983) charged that Kohlberg's theory maintains the "individual as the exclusive and sole focus of analysis" (p. 54). In Kohlberg's theory, Emler alleged that "individuals act autonomously and independently. . . . They do not cooperate or interact" (p. 55).

Kohlberg (1969) reacts against this critique claiming that "the basic unity of the self is a bipolar self-other relationship" (p. 417) and that "the self is born out of the social or sharing process" (p. 416). Kohlberg, (1984) claimed that the moral atmosphere in terms of collective rules and communitary sense can be a strong factor in the determination of moral behavior. However, Gibbs and Schnell (1985) insist on the individualistic emphasis of the Kohlbergian approach whose main manifestation is found in the higher levels of development. In the postconventional level the person has "differentiated his self from the rules and expectations of others and defines his values in terms of self-chosen principles" (Kohlberg, 1976, p. 33), "defining a moral theory and justifying basic moral terms or principles from a standpoint outside that of a member of a constituted society" (p. 192).

The message is very clear when one identifies the postconventional period with the true "differentiated individuality" and with the ideologically mature morality in which individuals can ignore the public standards in favor of the particular vision that each individual has. The individual truth is above the public truth.

Ideological individualism can generate our ruin because it can conceal several serious contradictions: anarchism and criticism of the rules as a sign of moral maturity (Hogan, 1975), and placing individual interests above the agreements and rules of a group (Wallace and Wallach, 1983). Gibbs and Schnell (1985) claim that the Kohlbergian theory is built on a very dangerous basis where moral subjectivism prevails. It creates a breed of supreme judges beyond society who can contradict it any time their opinion does not agree with the general rule.

Kohlberg and Mayer (1971) established the interactive position versus the romantic position. In the former it is supposed that individuals must not abandon their social context, but, on the contrary, that states of social inconformity are necessary to generate social reforms and progress, not anarchy. No one who goes to jail to defend the right to exploit somebody else for personal interests will be considered a saint or a martyr.

In recent Kohlbergian versions there is a tendency to de-emphasize and eliminate the sixth stage of the postconventional level. The critiques derived from several sources seem to show that such a period is not perfectly identifiable as a stage of moral reasoning, and, on the other hand, has certain flaws. Some researchers have even criticized the fifth stage as the end of moral development since there are several differences from culture to culture and this stage is not fully described. Edwards (1981) observed the differences in relation to moral development between two highly industrialized societies as certain Western countries and China. The interests of both societies are ideologically and politically different, and it is possible that their expressions, in terms of moral behavior, also are different.

Similar results were recently reported (Snare, 1985) from data collected in communities in Taiwan, India and Israel (Kibbutz), where it can be observed that a high level of moral development responds to communitary principles and not to clearly defined individuals. It seems that the elements used to describe the fifth stage of moral development are related to Western contexts and affiliated to such individual philosophies as those of Kant, Rawl and other philosophers; therefore, this stage is incomplete.

Another aspect of the critique, though to a lesser degree, is the emphasis given to cognitive factors. Kohlberg accused the socialization theory of being "emotional" and too affected by such feelings as "fear" and "anxiety." This theory mistakenly has placed the basis of moral development mainly on such feelings. Mind is first, and emotion second. Hogan and Busch (1984) claim that Kohlberg is wrong when he supposes that the motivation for moral behavior is mainly rational; reasons are not rational and sometimes irrational reasons are found at the basis of personality. A cognitive-structural position orients the person toward a world of abstraction without affective impulses or social commitments (Sullivan, 1977).

Emler (1983) explicitly relates the cognitive emphasis to individualism. Both come from the Cartesian philosophy that praised "rationality" as a principle of life and guide for behavior. Kohlberg's error is to place morality in the individual, but particularly serious is his notion of mature morality as consisting in individuals who act as rational thinkers.

Kohlberg's theory (1969, 1976, 1981) has also been called chauvinistic for being biased against women (Gilligan, 1977, 1982). This objection constitutes a strong obstacle for any psychological theory, but for moral development it becomes critical. Walker (1984) reviewed seventy-nine studies where differences in moral development in boys and girls were explored. Results are summarized in Table 4, ordered by levels of development.

One of the studies (Biaggio, 1976) sampled Brazilian girls of 10, 13, and 16 years old and the data obtained is favorable in terms of measures of maturity (275 vs. 235).

In the period of late adolescence and youth it is not frequent to find significant differences between sexes; however, in those cases in which differences were found, these favor the masculine sex, although the differences are often very small.

However, the studies reviewed in this period have been criticized for producing interactive effects in relation to statistical analysis, methodological designs and control of variables. Therefore, the pure effect of "sex" is confounded with the effect of non controlled variables. Further, during adulthood small differences are observed favoring the masculine sex. The

samples in this period were much more heterogeneous than in the previous periods and the results show combined effects, particularly with the occupational and the educational levels. The majority of the sampled women were housewives and their educational level was not the same as the men participating in the samples.

The general conclusion that can be derived from the data does not support the thesis that men reach developmental levels higher than the scale proposed by Kohlberg. From 108 studied samples only eight show significant differences favoring the masculine sex and in some cases certain methodological flaws can be observed.

To the hypotheses about the hierarchical nature and the universality of the stages of development a considerable amount of space has been devoted in the literature about morality and moral judgment. The principle of hierarchy establishes that development does not vary and that it is hierarchically consecutive. Each successive stage of moral reasoning represents a level of functioning more balanced with more integrated and differentiated structures.

Longitudinal studies (Colby et al, 1983) and experimental studies (Walter, 1982) reveal that moral development is consecutive and hierarchical. Each stage comprises the previous one and goes far beyond it, without gaps from one level to the next. It is possible that a subject who has reached a level of high development shows behavior typical of the previous stage, but these regressive states are not common. According to Kohlberg's theory, throughout the world individuals go through the same stages of development, but not all reach the most advanced stages. Each one of these is unified and structured, but a person can show a behavior belonging to two different stages, especially when he is going from one stage to another.

Some social scientists (Bloom, 1977; Buck-Morss, 1975; Edwards, 1975, 1982; Guidon, 1978) refuse to accept the hypothesis of the universality and permanence of the sequences of moral development. All of them consider that the ideological and political principles of a culture, as well as the environment and other factors, determine different values such that moral development would also be different.

Snare (1985) published an article that reviews 45 studies. 38 of cross-sectional and longitudinal character, developed in 27 countries with a range of cultural diversity so as to test the validity of the principle of cultural universality. From an analysis of this study several conclusions can be derived:

1. There is evidence which supports that the principle of universality is accomplished in stages 1, 2, and 3/4 with little variability from culture to culture, provided age and sample size are taken into account.

2. Stages 4/5 or 5 were reached by a very small group of subjects in almost all cultures, even when considering ages between 18 and 60 years. Besides, in those cases in which higher levels of development were reached, the variability of the reasons among subjects of the same culture and subjects of different cultures is higher than in the previous or intermediate stages.

3. The subjects that showed higher levels of development come from urban areas and frequently belong to culturally middle-class groups, while subjects coming from rural areas do not attain the postconventional level.

4. The handbook to evaluate moral judgments must be reviewed to embody other values emphasized by non-Western cultures, especially those related to collective solidarity and other cultural and ethnographic values.

5. The fifth stage of reasoning is not reached because the cognitive and social prerequisites are lacking. The cognitive prerequisite is that subjects are in the period of formal operations

while the social prerequisite demands conflict awareness among the societies to generate the need for universal principles that go beyond the conflict.

6. Certain rural communities are familiarized with themes related to death, life after death, and other religious beliefs which do not appear in the first stages, generating a bias against them.

MARTIN HOFFMAN: A SOCIAL APPROACH TO MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Martin Hoffman presents a social approach to moral development highlighting the role of factors external to the individual and feelings as sources of morality. The primary origin of morality and pro-social behaviors is society itself, especially the parents. Moral rules are initially external and the child slowly experiments with them as his own productions. This process of internalization and personal attribution is shaped by breeding patterns that parents impose. Generally, parents focus their attention towards certain aspects of the rules such as their contents and neglect others such as the person who dictated the rule.

Hoffman (1983) devotes some attention to the motivational aspects in children when they are in a conflict situation. For example, when a determined rule has been internalized but there exist strong impulses to break it in order to satisfy a desire, what can be done to induce obedience of the rule? Hoffman recommends using disciplinary techniques such as punishment, affectivity withdrawal and assertive power. Such techniques have a double role: on one hand, they serve to motivate children to change their behavior; and, on the other, they call attention to the parental figure. Once the second purpose has been accomplished, parents can cognitively and affectively influence their children, thus inducing behaviors in conformity to the rules.

When the motivation level is too low because the applied technique was not effective, the child can ignore his father; if the motivational level is very high, states of anxiety, affliction and fear can occur and interfere with the induced processing of information. Both extremes subtract efficiency from the socialization process; thus an optimal level of motivation is recommended to elicit attention, to increase personal attribution and to permit the induction processing.

Affectivity is fundamental not only for the learning of pro-social behaviors, but also in the generation of the reasons to act. Induction direct children's attention toward victims of punishment, thus awakening in them feelings of empathy.

The capacity to sense that somebody is in trouble is developed in infancy from the moment in which the child notices that the rest of the world possesses an existence different from his or hers. But in the first years of infancy, the child is egocentric and tends to suppose that others will share his feelings. Later on, when children are able to consider things from somebody else's point of view, they start to imagine how others would feel in a determined situation. At the end of childhood, they develop a capacity to put all these things together: the emotional response noticed in the other person and some abstract idea of his vital experiences (Woolfolk and McCune, 1983).

Hoffman's position is eclectic since it reflects influences from other approaches: behavioral, social learning, psychoanalytic and even, cognitive. Though in academic circles and in empirical studies this approach has not had so much acceptance as Kohlberg's theory, in practice it has produced relevant contributions which will be considered later.

The critique of Hoffman's theory can be summarized briefly as follows: (1) it conceives the subject as a passive receptor shaped by societal rules and values; (2) it emphasizes emotional factors derived from averse experiences while neglecting other experiences which may also be valid (Maccoby, 1983); and (3) it does not take into account the cognitive aspects which

determine moral judgment.

EDUCATION AS AN INDUCTIVE PROCESS OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

A democratic state cannot be conceived if it does not declare, promote and implement through education the development of such ethical values as respect for others, free determination, obedience to rules, equal opportunities, etc. To the extent that individuals internalize and practice the principles of personal and social justice, to that same extent peace and life together in a community are guaranteed.

Moral development depends on the context of stimuli oriented in cognitive and social terms. A subject cannot develop morally if in the substratum there does not exist a parallel cognitive and social development.

"Pure cognitive" stimuli are a necessary basis for moral development, but they do not generate it directly. That is, cognitive development does not automatically produce moral development. One can find individuals that have reached a determined cognitive level; however, their moral judgments and their behaviors are not in line with what is expected. Conversely, it has been shown that the absence of cognitive stimulation to reach stages of logical formal development can interfere with the acquisition of high stages of moral development. For example, in a Turkish town, it was observed that the majority of the citizens did not attain to the level of formal operations and, at the same time, evidences of expression of moral reasoning, i.e., the basis of formal thought, were not observed either.

There are five institutions that have a particular responsibility in promoting the development of moral judgment and behavior: the family, the school, the community, peers, and the church. Each one of these institutions can promote morality by taking into account the following techniques: role taking, direct or vicarious modeling, cognitive discussion, games and simulations and other assertive or punitive mechanisms.

Role Taking

What distinguishes social experience from experience with things is the fact that the former involves role taking, i.e., understanding other people's attitudes, being aware of their thoughts and feelings, taking somebody else's place. When emphasis is given to the emotional aspect in role taking, it is called empathy. Role playing (1) underscores both cognitive and affective elements, (2) involves a structured relation between the subject and others, (3) emphasizes an understanding of all the roles in the society to which the subject belongs and the relations between them, and (4) emphasizes that role taking is produced in all social interactions and in all situations where there is communication and not only in those that generate feelings of empathy or sympathy (Kohlberg, 1973).

When an individual takes alternate roles in different situations, he acquires a direct knowledge about the social and moral world: the functions of individuals in society, the rules and the motivations. In this way individuals become more sensitive, tolerant and cooperative with the members of their community. When individuals become more mature and participate more in groups they go through successive stages of development.

In order for the child to understand what is correct or fair as a balance or interaction among the interests of individuals involved (Stage 2) it is necessary that he or she have reached the

required level of role taking. Role taking is a bridge between the logical and the moral level: it is the cognitive-social level.

Role taking involves the individual from a cognitive-social point of view: (1) recognizes that everyone has his or her own interests and that these sometimes conflict, therefore the good is relative (concrete individualism); (2) recognizes the feelings, the agreements and the expectations of the group beyond individual interests; and (3) adopts the point of view of the system that defines the rules and the roles.

To what extent does the environment offer opportunities for role taking? The variations in the opportunities for role taking are a function of the child's relation with the family, the social group, the school and his or her social status. With respect to the family, the parents' disposition to permit or promote dialogue about values is a clear and decisive factor in moral development (Holstein, 1968). Families with child participation in "adult" conversations have levels of moral reasoning that are much clearer than those of less permissive families. The parents' and adults' moral discourse promotes and makes evident many conflicts and different points of view which are not easily understood by children. In fact, it induces role taking toward higher stages of moral development. In relation to the group of individuals who are in the same situation, children who participate in the process of group decision-making, exercise leadership and make suggestions in conflict situations show higher moral development. With respect to social status, it has been observed that middle-class children have more chances to take alternate impersonal roles than lower-class children. To the extent that a child is able to interpret feelings and thoughts of persons who are not affectively related to him or her, to that extent his or her level of moral development will be higher.

Another fundamental aspect is the variation of the social context where the child lives. The higher the variability, the more the number of different roles. If a higher class child relates with other children of the same class at school, at club and in informal games, he or she will probably be slower in his "empathic behavior" than another child of the same age and social status that has had the opportunity of sharing experiences with children of different social and cultural contexts. This same phenomenon occurs when boys relate preferably with boys or girls with other girls. To the extent that a child is offered different environments, characters and actions, he or she will be able to accelerate varied role taking, and be able to elicit more mature cognitive, affective and moral responses.

The Israeli kibbutz has been an excellent laboratory where numerous studies have been conducted about this topic (Amid, 1969; Devereux, et al, 1974; Fuchs et al, 1986). In all the cross-cultural studies, the human group that reaches stages 4 and 5 is mainly from the kibbutz. Kohlberg (1976) compared the kibbutz with the American orphanage and observes that, in spite of the fact that in both there are no parental figures, the stages of moral development that each attains is absolutely different. In the kibbutz group adolescents frequently develop to a level 4 or 5, while in the orphanage a high percentage is found at level I and the rest in level 2.

The explanation can be related to the kind of context and prevailing social values. At the orphanage not only did a parental relation not exist, but there was very little communication and role taking; communication among children was almost non-existent. The fact that adolescents did not fulfill the task of role taking experienced by almost all the adolescents of the same age chronologically and mentally was due to the deprived environment. On the other hand, adolescents in the kibbutz participated actively in all the community jobs, made decisions in the organization and reasoned about certain decisions; they also defended the principles of

cooperativism and collectivism.

Imitation and Learning by Observation

The child, in the first stages, is an asocial and dependent being who requires an adult figure to satisfy his or her primary needs and interests. Parents, peers and teachers represent stimuli of an enormous amount of behaviors. The child observes them and imitates them almost simultaneously or with a certain delay. Delayed imitation constitutes a fundamental step that will produce symbolic representation.

The behavioral model proposes that the best way of acquiring new behaviors is by direct experience. That is, executing behaviors and experimenting with the consequences of reinforcement or punishment. Albert Bandura and his colleagues criticized the operant conditioning model because it ignores the cognitive factors involved in the learning process. They consider that the response produced when encountering a particular situation corresponds more to the expectations we have than to the real consequences.

Bandura and Walters (1963) showed that children become more aggressive after observing an aggressive model, whether it is real or symbolic. The repeated demonstration that persons and even less complex animals can learn by mere observation of other persons or animals has been a challenge to the behavioral notion that cognitive factors are not necessary to explain learning.

Learning by imitation is so strong that human beings acquire a great number of behaviors this way: motor skills, acquisition of spoken language and basically all behaviors defined as pro-social. In this last category one can find cooperative behaviors, respect for others, empathy, etc. A child can even experiment with intense emotions before situations he has not lived previously just by observing another child or an adult facing the real situation.

Some general suggestions can be extracted from this research:

- 1. Present a model that represents a slightly superior stage of moral development. The optimal unbalance is what Piaget recommends as a mechanism to generate increasing changes. There are studies that show that children imitate models which are above their development and neglect or do not take into account those models that are at a lower level.
- 2. To the child in a concrete period, present a model of the same age and sex or models that represent a certain affective value; more abstract models are not sufficiently motivating to be imitated.
- 3. Exhibit new behaviors through the model; these call the attention of the observers.
- 4. Present the model behavior with verbal instructions and comments about the appropriateness of executing the behavior and the possible consequences from the personal and social point of view that may be encountered when they are not taken into account. Verbal persuasion through suggestions and admonitions is a highly efficient technique if the children have an adequate linguistic competence and if, cognitively, they have reached the stage of formal operations.
- 5. Design situations in which children can practice the observed behaviors and accompany such behaviors with social and symbolic reinforcements. It has been shown that subjects imitate more and in a better way when the model is reinforced. Reinforcing the model behavior generates the following vicarious effects in the observer: (a) it increases the affective value of the observer towards the model; (b) it increases the process of attention towards the model behavior;

and (c) it increases the motivational level of the observer. All these effects are later reflected in the observer's execution in situations in which he or she must imitate the model behavior.

Family, parents, teachers, community and religious leaders would be more effective in their educational practice if they took into account the psychological mechanisms underlying learning by imitation.

COGNITIVE CONFLICT VS SOCIAL CONFLICT

Piaget indicates that the basis of all intellectual growth lies in disequilibrium. A subject modifies his cognitive structure when he encounters situations for which he has no response or when these are not sufficiently convincing to him or the members of his group. In this situation the subject will have to tune his structure of thinking. Tuning leads to growth and the search for other principles or concepts more appropriate to the particular situations they must confront. Blatt and Kohlberg (1975) took from Piaget the principle of disequilibrium and applied it to moral development. They propose that a good way to promote development is through discussion of dilemmas or real situations which have been experienced by others. The discussion groups should be formed by some adolescents who are in one stage of development along with others in the next higher level. It is assumed that the more advanced youths will present arguments and reasons that could create cognitive conflicts in the less advanced ones, and as a consequence it is hoped that the younger will progress in their process of moral development.

On the other hand, the interactive approach highlights some deficiencies of the cognitive approach (Haan, 1978, 1982; Haan, Aerts and Cooper, 1985):

1. Morality is not a mere matter of reasoning, it has social and emotional aspects. Morality cannot be understood as a "lonely act," as a "private experience"; on the contrary, it must be analyzed and evaluated within a varied context of relations. A moral act or judgment that does not take into account the relations of reciprocity, altruism or charity is probably a failure.

2. Morality involves an act of practical commitment in the sense that it must solve problems, not only understand them. To comprehend the conflict rationally does not mean that the individual is able to solve the conflict.

3. Moral development must be understood as an emotional conflict between one individual's interests and points of view and those of other individuals.

Haan (1985) accepts that conflict is a very useful technique that can be recommended, but he does not agree with the fact that conflict is only cognitive; it is necessary to extend the conflict to social and emotional areas.

From the interactive approach proposed by Haan another educational modality called "social disequilibrium" can be derived. In 1985, he conducted research whose purpose was to compare the effects of two curriculum experiences; one based on the principle of cognitive conflict and the other on the principle of social conflict. In order to do this, students were selected from an American university, all of them belonging to several groups: fraternities, etc. Five groups were invited to participate in five sessions during three hours to discuss hypothetical situations while ten groups were organized to play some games. The discussion groups were organized with the purpose of generating cognitive conflicts, while the game groups were designed to generate social conflicts.

The results obtained can be summarized as follows:

1. Development seems to appear more clearly through game techniques in which there are underlying social and emotional factors not present in those activities where cognitive aspects are managed.

2. The management that each subject performed both during the games and in the discussion groups was related to the functional value of the situation. The nearer the described situation, the more lively the conflict, also the kind of response of moral compromise was more concrete and higher in the scale.

From this research it can be concluded that the development of moral judgement can be accelerated through discussions that create cognitive conflicts, but that games generate more effective results. On the other hand, moral judgement is a part of a whole which is the moral system, but that the whole must include affective and social aspects. Such aspects were observed theoretically in Kohlberg's approach, but were not described sufficiently in practice.

RESPONSIBILITY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

Edwards (1982) suggested that the factors strongly associated with moral development during the first stages (1st to 3rd) are related to the development of empathy, role taking and other pro-social behaviors, such as altruism, reciprocity, commitment and conciliation. However, the acquisition of higher stages (4th to 5th) are more related to other kinds of factors such as responsibility, education and ideological and political commitments; that is, to experiences of a social nature in a supra-individual sense.

Tietjen and Walker (1985) examined the relation between leaders and other members of a community in a Papua, New Guinea society using Kohlberg's scale. The subjects who participated in this study were male subjects and included traditional leaders of the community, government leaders, religious leaders and others. Traditional leaders are those whose suggestions and opinions are heard and followed by the community although they are not authorities. They were between 69 and 73 years old, and their average educational level was one year and eight months. Religious leaders belonged to the Anglican church and their functions were related to preaching and education. They were between 34 and 64 years old and their average educational level was seven years and four months. Government leaders had experience in organization and community leadership. They were between 47 and 50 years old and their average educational level was nine years and three months. Finally, the nonleader members were men who had not taken any responsibility in the community; they were between 34 and 69 years old and their average educational level was three years and six months (Tables 5 and 6). The conclusions of the study can be summarized in the following points:

1. The leaders, regardless of category, gathered around stages 3(2) and 3, while the non-leaders concentrated their judgments in stages 2(1), 2 and 2(3). Similar results were obtained in a study (Harkness et al, 1983) carried out in a rural town in Kenya, which confirms that leaders reach significantly higher developmental levels than nonleaders.

2. The kind of orientations given by several subjects of the sample can be classified as follows: normative, utilitarianism, perfectionism, and fairness.

Utilitarianism (48.7 percent) has to do with the consequences of actions and the welfare of each person. Within the community examined, for example, this orientation meant compensating the offended part in order to have peace. Normative (27.8 percent) refers to respect for rules, rights, duties and obedience. Traditional and nontraditional leaders obtained higher scores in the scale than the other kind of leaders. Perfectionism (16.2 percent) emphasizes interpersonal and intrapersonal achievement taking the social scheme as model. In this category the traditional and the religious leaders obtained the highest scores in the scale, and they are supposed to watch for the communities' morality. Fairness brings out aspects related to justice administration and to individual rights (7.3 percent).

Colby, Kohlberg and Lieberman (1983) gathered normative and utilitarianism in stage A and perfectionism and fairness in stage B. Nisan and Kohlberg (1982) hypothesized that in traditional societies with stable rules it could be expected that subjects obtained moral reasoning levels corresponding to stage A, while in modern communities where rules are more variable and doubtful, moral judgements belong to stage B.

From the educational point of view, it can be claimed that experience in leadership execution, decision and responsibility taking can constitute a source for inducing judgment growth and moral behavior. Leaders in the communities practically are models who are permanently observed and imitated by common citizens. When leaders do not behave according to what is expected of them, conflicts are generated in the observers, which lead to regressive states.

Teachers must be aware of the fact that it is convenient to delegate responsibilities and exert control over those delegated. As leaders children learn to satisfy demands, to interpret other people's feelings and to administer justice. Adolescents frequently go beyond the level of demand because they have never been in leadership positions in order to learn how to conciliate interests that translate into justice not only for individuals but for the community, although their personal interests may be diminished.

Universidad Católica Andrés Bello

REFERENCES

Amir, Y. "The Effectiveness of the Kibbutz-born Soldier in the Israeli Defense Force," *Human Relations*, 22, (1969): 333-334.

Baldwin, J.M. *Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development*. New York: McMillan, 1906.

Bandura, A. & Walters, R.H. *Social Learning and Personality Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Berkowitz, M. "The Role of Discussion in Moral Education." In M. Berkowitz & F. Oser, eds., *Moral Education: Theory and Applications.* Hillsdale, N.J., 1985; Erlbaum, pp. 197-218.

Biaggio, A.M.B. "A Developmental Study of Moral Judgment of Brazilian Children and Adolescents." *Inter-american Journal of Psychology. 10* (1976): 71-78.

Blatt, M., Kohlberg, L. "The Effect of Classroom Moral Discussion upon Children's Level of Moral Judgement. *Journal of Moral Education* 4 (1975): 129-161.

Bloom, A.H. "Two Dimensions of Moral Reasoning: Social Principledness and Social Humanism in Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Journal of Social Psychology* 10 (1977): 29-44.

Buck-Morss, S. "Socioeconomic Bias in Piaget's Theory and Its Implications for Cross-Cultural Controversy." *Human Development* 18 (1975): 35-49.

Colby, A., Kohlberg, L. & Lieberman, M. "Longitudinal Studies of Moral Judgement." *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 48 (1983): 1-124.

Devereux, E.C., Shouval, R., Bronferbrenmer, U., Rodgers, R.C., Kar-Venake, S., Kiely, E. & Karson, E. "Socialization Practices of Parents, Teachers and Peers in Israel: The Kibbutz vs the City." *Child Development* 45 (1974): 269-281.

Dewey, J. "Experience and Conduct." In C. Murchison, ed., *Psychologies of 1930*. Worcester: Clark University Press, 1930.

Durkheim, E. *Educación como socialización.* Salamanca, España: Editorial Sígueme, 1976.

Edwards, C. "Societal Complexity and Moral Development." *Ethos* 3 (1975): 505-527.

. "The Comparative Study of the Development of Moral Judgment and Reasoning." In R. Munroe & B. Whiting, eds.,*Handbook of Cross-Cultural Human Development*. New York: Garland, 1981, pp. 501-527.

. "Moral Development in Comparative Cultural Perspective." In D. Wagner & H. Stevenson, eds., *Cultural Perspectives on Child Development*. San Francisco: Freeman, 1982, pp. 248-278.

Fuchs, I. Eisenberg, N., Lanzarowitz, R.H. & Sharabany, R. "Kibbutz, Israel City, and American Children." *Moral Reasoning about Pro-social Moral Conflicts* 32 (1986): 37-50.

Gibbs, J & Schnell, S. "Moral Development vs Socialization." *American Psychologist*. 40 (1985): 1071-1080.

Gilligan, C. "Beyond Morality: Psychoanalytic Reflections on Shame, Guilt and Development of Altruistic Motives." In T. Lickona, ed., *Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research and Social Issues*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976, pp. 144-158.

. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Haan, N. "Moral Development: A Critique of Kohlberg's Sequence." *University of Ottawa Quarterly* 36 (1978): 282-305.

. "Can Research about Morality Be 'Scientific'?" *American Psychology* 37 (1982): 1096-1104.

. "Process of Moral Development: Cognitive or Social Disequilibrium?" *Developmental Psychology* 21 (1985): 996-1006.

, Aerts, E. & Cooper, B. *On Moral Grounds: The Search for Practical Morality*. New York: New York University Press, 1985.

Haney, C.W. "The Good, the Bad, and the Lawful: An Essay of Psychological Injustice." In W.S. Laufer & J.M. Dauy, eds.,*Personality Theory. Moral Development and Criminal Behavior*. Lexington, M.A.: Lexington Books, 1983, pp. 107-118.

Hersh, R., Paolitto, D. & Reimer, J. *Promoting Moral Growth*. New York: Longman, 1979.

Hoffman, M.L. "Affective and Cognitive Processes in Moral Internalization." In E.T. Higgins, D.N. Ruble & W.W. Hartup, eds., *Social Cognition and Social Development: A Sociocultural Perspective*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1983, pp. 236-274.

Hogan, R. "Theoretical Egocentrism and the Problem of Compliance." *American Psychologist* 30 (1975): 533-540.

. & Busch. C. "Moral Action as Autointerpretation." In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz, eds., *Morality. Moral Behavior and Moral Development*. New York: Wiley-lnterscience, 1984, pp. 227-240.

Holstein, C. "Parental Determinants of the Development of Moral Judgment." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Berkeley, California, 1968.

Hobhouse, L.T. *The Moral in Evolution*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1906.

Kohlberg, L. "Development of Moral Character and Ideology." In M.L. Hoffman, ed., *Review of Child Development Research*. Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

. "Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Socialization." In D.A. Goslin, ed., *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969, pp. 347-480.

. "Development as the Aim of Education." *Harvard Educational Review* 42 (1971): 449-496.

. "Continuities in Childhood and Adult Moral Development Revisited." In P.B. Baltes & L.R. Goulet, eds., *Lifespan Developmental Psychology*. Second edition. New York: Academic Press, 1973, pp. 179-204.

. "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive Developmental Approach." In T. Lickona, ed., *Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research and Social Issues*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

. *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice*. *Essays on Moral Development*. Vol. 1. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981.

. *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Essays on Moral Development*. Vol. 2. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.

Maccoby, E.E. "Let's Not Overattribute to the Attribution Process: Comments on Social Cognition and Behavior." In E.T. Higgins, D.N. Ruble & W.W. Hartup, eds., *Social Cognition and Social Development: A Sociocultural Perspective*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1983, pp. 356-370.

Mead, G.H. *Mind. Self, and Society*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1934.

Mifsud, T. *El pensamiento de Jean Piaget sobre la psicología moral: Presentación crítica.* Madrid: España, Editorial Limusa, 1985.

McDougall, W. *An Introduction to Social Psychology*. London: Methuen, 1908.

Nisan, M. & Kohlberg, L. "Universality and Variation in Moral Judgment: A Longitudinal and Cross-Sectional Study in Turkey." *Child Development* 53 (1982): 865-876.

Owen, S., Froman, R. & Moscow, R. *Educational Psychology: Introduction*. Boston-Toronto: Little Brown & Co., 1981.

Piaget, J. *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench & Trubner, 1932.

. "The Role of Action in the Development of Thinking." (H. Furth, trans.) In W.F. Overton & J.M. Gallagher, eds.,*Knowledge and Development: Advances in Research and Theory*. Vol. 1. New York: Plenum, 1977, pp. 17-42.

Snarey, J. "The Cross-Cultural Universality of Social-Moral Development: A Critical Review of Kohlbergian Research."*Psychological Bulletin*. 97 (1985): 202-232.

Spiro, M. "Culture and Personality: The Natural History of a False Dichotomy." *Psychiatry* 14 (1951): 19-46.

Sullivan; E.V. "A Study of Kohlberg's Structural Theory of Moral Development: A Critique of Scientific Cultural Bias."*Human Development*. 17 (1977): 81-106.

Tietjen, A.M. & Walker, L.J. "Moral Reasoning and Leadership Among Men in a Papua New Guinea Society."*Developmental Psychology*. 21 (1985): 982-992.

Turiel, E. "An Experimental Test of the Sequentiality of Developmental Stages in the Child's Moral Judgments." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 3 (1966): 611-618.

Wallach, M.A. & Wallach, L. *Psychology's Sanction for Selfishness: The Error of Egoism in the Theory and Therapy*. San Francisco: Freeman, 1983.

Walker, L.J. "Sex Differences in the Development of Moral Reasoning: A Critical Review." *Child Development*. 55 (1984): 677-691.

Woolfolk, A.E. & McCune, L. *Psicología de la Educación*. Madrid, España: Editorial Narcea, 1983.

STRUCTURES OF COGNITIVE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT
P. LUIS AZAGRA, S.J.

Piaget: Cognitive Psychology and Moral Development

The most recent studies of cognitive psychology relating to the ethical awareness are those developed at Harvard University over the last thirty years by the late Lawrence Kohlberg and his collaborators. Their work fell at mid-point between "Skinnerian" behaviorism and "Rogerian" humanism. The first gave psychology more scientific rigor; humanism introduced an enriched conception of the human being.

In this very simplified context there arose a line of psychological reflection known as cognitive psychology. Its inspiration came from the studies of the Swiss researcher, Jean Piaget, who came to psychology by way of biology. His most important contribution was to trace the psychological development of the child. Focusing upon the cognitive process he looks to intelligence tests not for the differences in answers, but for the reasoning used by children at their different ages. His interest was not differential psychology, however, but what was common in the process of cognitive development. From the cognitive process Piaget proceeded to the social and affective, bringing out the relation between them. These studies suggested a study of the process of moral judgment formation in children, and its relation to the socialization process implied by the development in the cognitive and affective areas.

In this development Piaget observes two axis: a development from egocentrism towards socialization and toward founding moral judgments.

Kohlberg: The Development of Moral Judgment

Kohlberg's studies appeared in this context.[1] In general they have been called a "theory of the moral development." His original idea consists in taking Piaget's concept of the different stages of cognitive structures, and applying them to the study of moral judgment. He concluded to three levels, each with two different stages, in the development of moral judgments. This division does not come from preestablished definitions, but from an empirical analysis of the form of people's reasoning. He tries also to bring out what is common to the process in different people, rather than their differences. His method focuses upon the reasoning used to answer preestablished moral questions or dilemmas.[2] His clinical method, which allows the subjects more liberty to express their different types or forms of reasoning, is directed toward identifying their different ways of reaching moral judgments. His interest is more in the process than in the answers.

Kohlberg called his three levels of moral judgment: preconventional, conventional and post-conventional. Each of these levels has two stages, forming Kohlberg's six stages. The notion of stages implies the following: (1) qualitative differences in the way of thinking, (2) the formation of an overall structure, (3) constituting with the others an invariable sequence, and (4) hierarchical integration of the prior stages.

Preconventional Level: At this level the child responds to rules which give a sense of good or bad. This is enforced by their physical consequences: good means reward, bad means

punishment and pain. These consequences are impressed by the physical power of those who enforce the rules: parents, school, adults.

This level includes two stages:

Stage 1 - **Punishment and obedience**. In this stage the reasoning is very elemental: the immediate consequences especially on the negative side (punishment), and the consequent submission to authority are evaluated as constitutive reasons of good and bad, without any reflection on what might justify the punishment, reward or obedience to authority.

Stage 2 - **Instrumental orientation**. This is still concerned with actions; now, however, these are justified by the good will of the subjects providing a criterium for good and bad. Relations begin to appear in the formation of moral judgment, but on a pragmatic basis, rather than as a matter of justice or loyalty.

Conventional level: On this level inclusion in a social group appears as a value, without looking at consequent pleasure or pain for the subject. This level includes the following two states:

Stage 3 - **Interpersonal Relations**. The opinion of the group is important. This attitude is not just a matter of convenience or to avoid punishment, but one of identification and loyalty: one's intention is noted and valued.

Stage 4 - **Law and order**. Inclusion in the group is expanded to cover the broader society; moral judgments are based in the social order as basing ethical values.

Postconventional level: Without doubt, this level has led to more controversy from the philosophical point of view and may be the hardest to diagnose from the answers to the moral dilemmas. On this level the intention is to reach a self-definition of the moral values that will go further than authority or the opinion of the group. This level includes two stages:

Stage 5 - **Legalistic orientation of the social contract**. The goodness of the actions is defined in terms of individual rights recognized by society through its laws. There is more emphasis upon legal value, moral strength and obedience to the Constitution and to laws. Changes or amendments in the Constitution bring a thought that leads to the following stage.

Stage 6 - **Universal ethical principles**. Here the good is defined by one's conscience based upon ethical principles chosen by oneself. These are universal principles of justice, equality, human rights and respect for the dignity of the person.

This sequence of stages in moral judgments progresses according to age, but the social environment and education can accelerate or delay it, and at times even terminate it.[3]

Kriekemans: Pre-Moral Stages

Kohlberg's studies begin with children of ten years of age. For Kriekemans,[4] moral formation is important also at an earlier stage. For him it is necessary in the first two and a half

years to cultivate the "biological conscience: a well functioning body. At this stage it is necessary to emphasize the sense of order that will help the child find the road to his goals. It is also very important in this time of his life to receive and understand love which is necessary to make possible a well-ordered constitution. With R. Scholl, he agrees that trouble of harmony with the mother is the moment of the birth of conscience.[5]

Kriekemans's second stage extends to age four. Here the child is beginning to distinguish between his ego and the super ego. There is not yet the concept of the interior ego, but the appearance of the practical ego allows the child to speak with himself. This pre-moral stage is related more to the development of social relations than to the development of morals. Two important mechanisms develop at this stage: the first relates us to a model and the second strengthens our autonomy. Identification without opposition would lead to conformism; equilibrium between both mechanisms brings about the formation of a healthy consciousness. The third stage, until age six or seven, emphasizes the formation of a realistic attitude towards valuing. There is also the magical development of the norms which are accepted not because they are good or bad, but because they are universal. Kriekemans does not consider these stages to be yet part of the moral world; still they are very important for the current formation of the future personality.

The fourth stage, until age nine or ten, constitutes the beginning of moral life. Here there appears a sense of duty; it is "the age of reason". Next comes the stage of deliberation when the child discovers numerous possibilities of action, begins to deliberate, and develops his moral judgment. This stage is attached to the first stage of the Kohlberg method, since the child starts to consider alternatives and participates in situations as a "role player."

In the formation of moral judgment, as in the development of cognitive operations, there is an interaction between the person and the external world, as well as with physical and social realities.[6] That is why so much effort is put into the diagnosis of the development of the youngsters' moral judgment through the parents, schools or classroom discussions. Such studies here are relatively recent but include those by Irma Matute[7] regarding the formation of moral judgement, Arelys Moreno,[8] Ana Maia Ferrer,[9] Levys Faias,[10] and Cornelia Gathman and M. Angélica Romero.[11]

Development of Moral Judgment: Biography and History

Despite the fact that interaction between the organism and environment is fundamental to Kohlberg's focus, the specific contribution of these studies remained in the field of consciousness. They did not take account of the external reality which interacts and makes concrete the debate over the behavior of the subject in his moral life.

The pre-conventional stage with its orientation toward avoiding punishment-pain and obtaining pleasure directly or instrumentally can be compared historically with the hedonistic ethic built upon the goal of acquiring as many forms of pleasure as possible since life is uncertain and those pleasures may not be attainable in the future (Richard B. Brandt).[12]

This constant insecurity and the fear leads one to establish a social contract in which one renounces one's own rights in favor of a supreme power, the state, Society, etc. Hobbes holds the social contract between people to be the basis for morality.[13]

Motivation: From Judgment to Actions

For Kohlberg motivation is fundamental to providing orientation regarding the significance of personal life, and therefore a sense to its moral dimension. Without an ideal, inspiration or reason for living it is difficult to achieve the commitment needed to direct us to a moral life. Victor Frankl considers this search for a purpose in life to be the primary motivation of a person, not a secondary rationalization of one's instincts, for a person is able to live and die for his ideals and values.[14] What is that inspiration, that search for the purpose of life that will bring us to the integration of moral action? Savater would ask: "Where will we find something really fundamental for human existence, something one will really appreciate and not just as an instrument"?[15]

For many centuries the religious dimension was for many the inspiration and orientation that gave sense to life. Today the significance of religious thinking is of less extension and depth. That is why we ask ourselves what is the ideal that motivates and gives youth a purpose in today's world? It is interesting to observe how in the post-war period there have been so many studies and treaties about ethics and morals. In this century in many countries two or three generations of young idealists dedicated their best years to the moral and ethical ideal for which they went to war. It was a fight to defend honor, home, nation, liberty and justice. (Before going to war, Muslims declare it a holy war.) Most of the revolutionary movements of history have been based on moral and ethical aspirations for liberty, equality, fraternity and justice (Octavi Fullat).[16]

It is evident that the ethical ideal of liberty and democracy inspired a generation that fought, suffered and worked for it. But it is difficult for the young to see in today's system the ethical issue that inspired it. The laws of time have crystallized in forms of power whose defense generates corruption. Today, especially for the young, politics does not represent an ethical idealism.

However, the ideal of rejecting injustice still lives. It grows every day because of a more humanitarian coexistence between the members of society: people feel closer to each other, there is solidarity between nations, war becomes less likely and peace more necessary.

There is need for basic studies for the motor of ethical dynamics. Psychologists usually explain in detail theories of motivation based upon biological and social necessities. When it comes to explaining the motivations for moral actions such as honesty, ideals, loyalty, love, etc., however, usually they give only reductive explanations as if these were defense mechanisms.

At this point we might leave psychology aside and look for explanations in faith and teleology, for the spirit that gives strength to our hearts. Perhaps we will have to look for explanations in memories and heroic actions such as those recounted by Robert Coles,[19] which, if analyzed according to Kohlberg's method, would be a preconventional or premoral stage. It is possible that there might be found there also the solution for the fundamental problem of how there develops the conceptualization, moral judgment and commitment for a life in the service of goodness and justice.

Universidad Catolica Andres Bello
Caracas, Venezuela

NOTES

1. Lawrence Kohlberg, *The Philosophy of Moral Development* (San Francisco, Harper, 1984); *The Psychology of Moral Development* (San Francisco, Harper, 1984).

2. Richard H. Hersh, Joseph Reimer and Diana P. Paolito, *El crecimiento moral. De Piaget a Kohlberg* (Madrid: Narcea, 1984), p. 52.

3. Charles Dennis Marler, *Philosophy and Schooling* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975), p. 232.

4. A. Kriekemans, *Pegagogia General* (Barcelona: Herder, 1977), chap. XI.

5. R. Scholl, *Das Gewissen des Kindes* (Stuttgart, 1956), p. 27, cited by A. Kriekemans (*op. cit*), p. 427.

6. Lawrence Kohlberg, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

7. Irma Matute, *Desarrollo Socio-Emocional* (Manual del Estudiante, Caracas, Instituto de Mejoramiento Profesional, 1987).

8. Arelys Moreno, *Desarrollo del Juicio Moral en estudiantes de distintos estratos sociales de Caracas* (Caracas: UCAB, 1987).

9. Anna Maria Ferrer,, *Desarrollo del Juicio Moral en el niño guajiro* (Maracaibo: URU, 1985).

10. Levy Farias, *Para una definición más comprensiva del juicio y la madurez moral* (Caracas: AVEPSO, 1986).

11. Cornelia Gathman and Maria Angélica Romero, *Desarrollo del Juicio Moral en estudiantes de niveles socioeconómicos alto y bajo en Caracas* (Caracas: UCAB).

12. Richard B. Brandt, *Teoría Etica* (Madrid: Alianza, 1982), p. 382.

13. Alasdair Macintyre, *Historia de la Etica* (Buenos Aires: Paidós, 1970), p. 133.

14. Viktor E. Frankl, *Man's Search of Meaning* (Washington: Square Press, 1985), p. 121.

15. Fernando Savater, *Invitación a la Etica* (Barcelona: Anagrama, 1982), p. 66.

16. Octavi Fullat, *Filosofías de la Educación* (Barcelona: CEAC, 1978), p. 288.

17. Gustavo Gutierrez, *La Fuerza Histórica de los Pobres* (Lima, 1979), cited by Moreno Rejón, p. 93.

18. Rejon Moreno, *Teoría Moral desde los Pobres* (Madrid: PS, 1986), p. 154.

19. Robert Coles, *The Moral Life of Children* (Houghton, 1986), p. 27.

CHAPTER XIV
AN EVALUATION OF COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT AND MORAL EDUCATION
ROBERTO ZAPATA G.

The chapter of M. Brabeck below regarding some psychological theories of moral development proposes an integrated moral theory and comments regarding an ethics of love and those working in this direction. These pages will add elements about an integrated psychological model as a foundation of a theory of development and moral education in its diverse stages: childhood, adolescence and youth. I do not pretend to refer to all the aspects of this theme, which would entail psychological models for moral development, the processes of moral development, moral conduct, moral education, and an integrated psychological model for development and moral education.

Rather, I will focus on three aspects: (1) moral education and its "traditional profile" as power generator of better foundations; (2) psychological theories regarding morality; and (3) reflections on Kohlberg's proposal for a developmental theory and moral education.

MORAL EDUCATION

Interest in moral education has been one of the forces that has played an important role in the search and generation of a psychological model for moral development. The different psychological theories of moral development inevitably end up contributing to moral education. Conversely, the crisis experienced in what can be called the traditional model of moral education led to the search for psychological models that explain and can serve as a basis for such education. In some way, it is supposed that moral education would be better if there were a better explanation of the psychological structure of moral conduct, or if we understood better the psycho-evolutionary development of morality.

Piaget (1975) considered that the basic defect of traditional moral education resides in the atmosphere of authority it implies and inspires. Its result is to develop a moral over the students, as if it was enough for it to be presented "with the authority of the teacher." Eventually, the moral "lectures" would reinforce that moral of obedience with a system of stimuli and punitive sanctions. This is what Kohlberg has called a moral education reduced to the mere socialization of the student. In the end, it is Durkheimian: education is reduced to conformity with social norms and rules.

To limit moral education to inculcating some virtues in the students through a series of examples from the adult world, accompanied by reward and punishment stimuli, leaves little difference between teaching table manners and education. Morman Bull characterizes traditional direct moral instruction by:

- its abstract character, which means that it has been imparted in an abstract and general way that prohibits vice or proclaims a virtue.
- its deductive rather than inductive character, which means that the virtue proclaimed was justified by turning to a supernatural authority and transcendental sanctions.

- its passive character; in traditional moral education the student was a passive subject: the teacher taught and the child learned, that is, the child had to obey and accept without discussion.

Further, drawing upon Piaget's investigations, Bull emphasizes continuously that the abstract character of traditional moral education does not take into consideration the evolutionary psychology of the child. In the end, traditional moral education is to be blamed for being a process of socialization, that is, of inducing conformity to rules or norms. The crisis of moral education is rooted in this practice which, in turn, has produced a crisis in the lives of many people.

J. Wilson of Oxford University has dedicated his life to the study of moral education from an educational point of view. He talks about eight ways to educate morally; these informal ways of educating lead to promoting a mistaken notion of morality and in the end to its crisis or disuse ("eight things people do to avoid thinking") (Wilson, 1973). A brief summary of each of these follows:

- authority: a way of not thinking is by obeying or rebelling. These opposite forms are alike inasmuch as in both cases there is a firm escape from personal reflection: in obeying one takes what the other says, and in rebelling one goes against everything conventional just to oppose.
- ideal people: to limit oneself to imitate an admiral person without knowing why.
- purpose and meaning: some people think that everything is given in life, that the only thing to do is follow blindly some universal or spiritual rules, thereby making obsolete the need in one's life for everyone to choose by themselves.
- special experiences: some people take as a point of reference a special experience which serves them as a source of authority, for example an intuition, a feeling, etc. These could be valid experiences, but one always must think about them and not follow them without evaluation.
- "faith": another defense for avoiding thinking is expressed thus: "The reason is too limited; one must make a leap of faith," forgetting that the faith does not eliminate reason.
- "this is what they taught me": one believes what they have told us in our childhood without evaluating this belief. In that way something is right or wrong because it is what has always been said.

The fundamental question a moral education must ask is: while respecting people's autonomy and beliefs, how to educate persons who will be capable of transforming the surrounding world and creating a society with more justice and in which importance is given to fundamental and ethical values. Basically, it is a question of how to educate a responsible person capable of living according to ethic principles.

THE STUDY OF MORALS: KOHLBERG AND OTHER MODELS

It is not possible here to refer to the most important psychological models now in use. I will limit myself to some general observations on a number of models and focus upon the one which attracts more attention and interest nowadays, but this should not lead us to ignore the other points of view. Inclining towards a theoretical model does not mean that it has solved satisfactorily all our worries; in this sense it is not presented here as a model.

Cognitive Development Theories

In twenty years the cognitive-evolutive theory has become one of the main theoretical frameworks for the study and comprehension of human behavior. Hundreds of studies have been made about moral development (Sprinthall, 1986).

The international scientific community has an enormous debt to Lawrence Kohlberg, whose contributions in the area of moral philosophy, moral development and moral education qualitatively compare to those of Freud and Piaget, though they have studied broader subjects.

But neither Kohlberg and his moral development proposal nor cognitive psychology is exempt from limitations or critiques. This is not the moment or the place to evaluate cognitive psychology. In other chapters there have been references to this aspect. There are both coincidences and discrepancies in the theories of the development of moral knowledge. Among moral psychologists many have been concerned to establish a sequence of stages with their corresponding levels in the development of the child and adolescent. There is no unanimity among them, though with their contribution we can construct a sufficiently valid theory about the development of the moral sense. Piaget (1932), Bull (1969), Beltran (1977) and Gilligan (1982), to mention authors from different geographic areas, exemplify the coincidence and divergences on this point.

We could group them all under theories of cognitive-evolutive development and in consequence they would all agree that "all development demands and shares a certain degree of evolution." To talk about moral development is to talk about the evolutive formation of the moral personality. This would indicate that the development about which we are talking is structural and corresponds to the ages in which moral personality is developed. At adulthood moral development implies growth and variation within the structure; but the development to which we are referring relates to the ages in which the moral subject receives his or her basic structure (some talk about structure development) (Langdale, 1986). That is why the horizon of reflection is circumscribed to the stages from childhood to youth.

Some factors create divergent approaches. First, to talk about moral development in a psycho-evolutive way, in terms of the moral personality, supposes the acceptance of the notion and reality of stages organized within a more or less stable sequence. Second, there is a difference in the interpretations of what evolves, what is developed; what evolves is the "moral conduct," but this concept contains various factors. Thirdly, we should mention the philosophical worldviews and their implications for understanding the developmental structure. As Kay used to ask some time ago (1976), is moral development quantitative or qualitative? Is it gradual (slow) or does it depend upon critical situations? Does it depend on heritage or on the medium?

Other Models

There are two large alternate groups: (1) the person-centered and psychodynamic models or explanations, and (2) the theory of social learning.

Regarding the first there are some good reviews like those from Henry (1983) and T. Tice (1980). Many new and renewed arguments insist upon the utility and need of approaching morality from the perspective of the psychology of personality.

Without disregarding the contribution of Freud's psycho-analytical theory about the super-ego, most recent theorists could be synthesized in three groups: the inter-actionalism of N. Haan (1977, 1978, 1982), his theory of interaction between moral development and the development of

the ego; the socio-analysis of R. Hogan (1973, 1975, 1982; Hogan, Johnson and Emler, 1978) or their socio-analytic theory of conduct and moral character; and finally, the morality template model of Lifton (1985) or what could be called the "consensual representation of the moral personality," which we all have on a conscious or semi-conscious level and which leads us to judge actions as moral or immoral.

We regret that in the latest theoretical studies everything related to personality has been omitted. In that sense, the study of morality is not well focused because almost absolute primacy has been given to the process of intellectual development. On the other hand, and in contrast with the theories of cognitive development, some think that for a theory of morality to be really comprehensive it should be able to explain some key theoretical relations. Its fundamental points would be: (1) the constant development of the moral stages throughout life; (2) the consequences of going from one stage to the other; (3) the criteria for establishing that a determined stage has been achieved completely; (4) the origin of the moral stages and values; and (5) the relationship between morality and concepts like good-bad, just-unjust, social laws and universal ethical principles.

A detailed review of the theory of social learning can be found in Burton (1984) and Burton and Casey (1986). Although the investigations by those adhering to the theory of social learning still center on the development of the capacity and ability of the child to overcome the temptation to break the moral norm, it is true that some important theoretical changes have occurred as well. Lately, the study of the cognitive processes and how these influence the internationalization by children of norms and rules imposed from outside (especially important in this sense are the studies of Mischel and Mischel, 1976, 1983) have achieved great importance and are very similar to other studies proposed by the cognitive development trend (Rest, 1984; Kohlberg and Candee).

AN EVALUATION OF THE THEORY OF L. KOHLBERG

Here we want to center our attention on L. Kohlberg and his theory, and for various reasons: first of all, because this author's work is the one we know the most, the one we have studied more thoroughly, and have seen develop in practice. Also because it has become an obligatory reference for those involved in or concerned about the teaching of morals -- even many alternate propositions, to a large degree begin from the experience had with this theory; thirdly because for many years in our milieu interest has developed regarding its contents and it has generated much research, especially in some schools of education and psychology. Two theses have been done (Vanez, 1987) in the Catholic University Andres Bello's School of Psychology, both supervised by Luis Azagra. Similar efforts have been made in Rafael Urbaneta University of Maracaibo (Ferrer, 1985) and at The Metropolitan University (Quintero and Herrera, 1984; Quintero, 1987), as well as in such other sources as the review:*Matute* (Social-emotional Development. [Caracas, Instituto de Mejoramiento Profesional del Magisterio, s/f]). *The Journal of Moral Education* (1977) presented an evaluative review by scholars from various disciplines -- psychology, education, philosophy, etc. In other years many equally interesting evaluative studies appeared: W. Conn focused on structure; P. Philbert (1975) criticized some of the philosophical factors based upon the philosophical tradition of virtues and habits; Craig (1977) centers his attention on the formalist character of Kohlberg's theory. These and many other observations led to the publication by Kohlberg of a reformulation and response to the critiques (Kohlberg, Levine and Haver, 1983). Especially, we would like to focus upon the following

aspects:

    1) a global evaluation of the theory,
    2) the weakness of the formal theory,
    3) the concept of justice,
    4) the proposal of an evolutionary moral education system,
    5) the notion of habit, and
    6) the role of affection

A Global Evaluation

Kohlberg's work deserves recognition for its theoretical and investigative effort, for its verification in different cultures, and for having tried to distinguish the specific modes of the moral judgment and to explain the ethic-philosophical background present in his theory. He has managed also to use his theory for educational proposals. His attempt to generate a theory of moral development and moral education in terms of universality (valid for all) in a pluralistic world, and centered upon the principle of justice, is a truly notable contribution. In a world where there is a tendency to refuse many values or to limit ethics to the individual's perspective, in a world of moral relativism, this ethical effort is really to be praised. Some positive aspects which cannot be forgotten are: his interdisciplinary, investigative support, its pedagogical application, the dynamic vision of the human person, the importance given to justice, his three levels of moral development, and the proposal of an evolutionary moral education that respects the individual and is centered in the development and formation of moral judgment.

Let us consider now some of the critical issues: the first two evaluations are from ethics, while the other comments are from psychology and pedagogy. We note both these aspects because throughout his work he has claimed not only psychological but ethical validity for his theory.

The Weakness of the Formalistic Theory

Kohlberg frequently insists that his study of moral judgment is centered on the formal and not on the material aspect; in other words, what is of interest to him is the structure of reason present in a moral judgment, not the moral content. But, can one separate the form and content of the moral judgment? He centered his attention on the formal structure while trying to suggest some moral principles capable of illuminating the moral judgment. This seems not possible without some principle of content. Indeed, in Kohlberg there are some principles of content-justice (equally and reciprocity), human well-being, respect for society.

Kohlberg insists so much on form because his interest is to elaborate a universal theory, valid for all cultures; he wants to formulate six stages of moral judgment that would be valid universally. At the same time, the rational structure of the stage includes some principles, as guides for acting. When Kohlberg points out ethical principles, he tries to present them in a formal way as functional principles, rather than as principles of content.

Often the understanding of the moral judgment has been limited to answering or solving a moral problem, making the moral judgment a matter of casuistry. This is especially characteristic of traditional moral education. That is why we consider valid Kohlberg's worry when he insists

upon the decision-making process of forming the moral judgment, rather than reducing it to the structure of stimulus and response.

But the same concrete moral judgment needs some principles of content for reference. This is the case of children when they do not know what to do in a concrete situation and ask if an action is right or wrong. In this case, it is useless to present them with a formal principle of justice, because they would not understand it. On the contrary, we would have to translate into content the formal principle of justice, although Kohlberg has told us that this is indoctrination. All will depend on how the content is presented, but the formal principle of justice also could be considered as indoctrination. A minimum of principles of content seems indispensable in order to make a concrete moral judgment. In the post-conventional level there is no problem, because each would assume these principles automatically, but at the lower levels we encounter this problem in moral education.

Education implies two elements: formation and information. The formation is oriented towards the realization of the potentialities of the students; it seeks the integral growth of the person. But is it possible to have formation without information? If we are discussing abortion, for example, it is right to insist upon the maturity of the moral judgment, but it is essential also that those who participate reach a conclusion about the theme. To reach that conclusion, one has to be based in concrete principles and principles of content such as the right of human life and personal responsibility.

Content and form cannot be separated: the formal structure influences the way of assuming the content, but also the content corrects the formal structure and enlarges it, because it presents elements that have to be integrated in the formal structure. For the same reason, moral education has to provide both formal elements (the formation of the moral judgment) and material elements (the necessary information that a moral judgment has to integrate).

The Concept of Justice

We can summarize Kohlberg's theory in this manner:

1. The development of the moral judgment is considered philosophically in terms of universality and prescriptiveness (Hare, 1972); in Piaget's terms these translate psychologically as better integration and differentiation.
2. This development is assumed in the principle of justice, because philosophically it implies reciprocity of rights and duties and considering impartially from the perspective of a conflictive situation (Rawls, 1973). This corresponds to Piaget's psychological concept of balance. Moral development is considered as a philosophically and psychologically better moral equilibrium.

In Kohlberg's theory the concept of justice is crucial because it is the only principle capable of solving moral conflicts (Kohlberg, 1981). But, what does Kohlberg understand by "justice"? In summary we could say that it is a method of distributing or defining claims that have two elements:

- distributive equality, treating everyone equally; and
- commutative justice or reciprocity, fulfilling treaties, repairing damage, gratitude, etc.

But equality has priority over commutative justice or reciprocity. Kohlberg (1971) gives us a list of contents, but insists that the principle of content is primarily a method of solving the rights and duties involved in a conflictive situation between people. But, what does he understand by claims? Does he refer to a conflictive situation when there is an overt explosion, or does it include latent injustices when the victim of the injustice is quiet because he has no voice? This vision of the principles of justice seems to reduce moral expression to a minimum by limiting it to the conflictive. But the principle of justice is also in force when the other does not claim his rights. It includes improving social relations between the strong and also between those who are not that outstanding. In other words, instead of talking about distributive justice and commutative justice, we would talk in terms of social justice, because only social justice lets us look from everyone's perspective in an impartial way. The concept of social justice involves questioning society itself, whereas the concepts of justice used by Kohlberg tend to accept as good the prevailing social order.

Kohlberg also states that benevolence, in the sense of love, empathy, sympathy, human worry, humanism, etc., can never be a principle of option. By not taking these into account his theory handles a very limited concept of "benevolence." If we understand benevolence as altruistic preoccupation for others, then it is a principle of option, because it implies the perspective from which the principle of justice takes shape. Worry for others, as an altruistic attitude, not only is a requirement for experiencing the moral conflict, but also a mechanism of moral resolution, because where there is no concern for others there could be no considerations for equality and reciprocity.

It is then indispensable for a principle of concern for others to accompany a principle of justice. Only such an attitude permits one to assume justice as a criterion of one's option in a moral conflict. To state simply, as he does, that it is a "principle for decision-making" or of option does not eliminate the fact that the principle of justice is also a principle of content. It is a principle of option precisely because it is a principle of content, because it formulates criteria for reaching a decision.

Kohlberg elaborates John Rawls's theory of justice, describing it as an expression of the six stages. But what explains this adhesion to Rawls, and does he assume Rawls's ideas? Rawls says much more than Kohlberg uses and given the importance that it has in his theory, the concept of justice needs to be clarified. It would appear to need to include or integrate the following elements:

- Justice can be understood from those who suffer injustice. It is not appropriate to limit the concept of justice only to the perspective of everyone; it would be more just to say that the principle of justice implies the assumption of the perspective of those who are disadvantaged.
- Vision or perspective permits not only the perception of conflict, but also causing conflict, if necessary. This was the case of Martin Luther King in the United States and Bishop Romero in El Salvador, etc.
- A real principle of justice implies an altruistic attitude, the principle of concern for others.
- Lastly, the principle of justice cannot be relegated to an individualistic posture; it has to be expressed in content. Justice refers to an objective order, not only to a subjective one. Justice belongs to the sphere of meta-ethics in that it implies a worldview.

Here we can locate some of the discoveries of those who propose moral development in terms of feelings of love, compassion, care, etc. (Lyons, 1983). Perhaps, as Langdale indicates

the ethic of justice is more logical, rational, objective and associated more directly with the moral thinking, while the ethic of care of Gilligan and others is more intuitive (illogical and irrational), more subjective, and more directly related to moral feelings. Feelings and reason are two aspects of the same reality, man himself. The principle of justice needs a principle of affective concern for others because a just man is one who loves others, while one who loves must be just in his judgments. Kohlberg does not agree with this position, although sometimes he gives the impression of being convinced that what is said here is understood in his proposal.

A Proposal for a System of Evolutive Moral Education

The disadvantage of the moral education proposed by Kohlberg is that it seems indispensable to have deep knowledge of the theory. Some authors (Bolt and Sullivan, 1977; Hers and Reimer, 1984) have noted the dangers of using the Kohlbergian method without a previous knowledge of his theory. We would add something related to the previous point, but more oriented to moral education.

Kohlberg emphasizes the importance of the formation of moral judgment in terms of an education for justice. The moral education proposed by him respects the individual and at the same time stimulates the development of moral judgment, the criteria of its choice and discernment. This is extremely valuable. But as was noted above, the almost total absence of content because moral education cannot limit itself to the development of the general power of moral judgment (how do I judge a situation or a problem?), but has to decide upon a determinated posture in the presence of a moral problem (what should I do?). We insist that we do not think that moral education has to be reduced to some concrete responses, but along with the formation of moral judgment it is necessary to help the student, respecting him, to have an ethic posture. In moral judgment not only do we need to know how to come to a decision; we need also to have a minimum of content from which to make a decision. In moral education the presentation of some attitudes, like a starting point, from which to base a moral decision is indispensable. B. Lonergan notes in his book *Insight* that judgment is based upon information.

Kohlberg defends the validity of the system of moral education he proposes, stating that it is not a doctrinal system. But we must be careful not to understand this as ethical neutrality, because ethics imply a lack of neutrality inasmuch as an ethical posture means an option in favor of some values.

Lately, we ask if the moral system proposed by Kohlberg is "for the system "meaning, does it prepare the students for society with some values or does it only prepare them to integrate and form society, as is. In theory, the goal of moral education is the fifth or sixth state, the principles of justice for the ethics of a society. But as mentioned before, considering the central importance that this concept has in his theory, Kohlberg considered it important to define more clearly what is meant by justice in order for it really to be possible to affirm or deny that the moral education he proposed is appropriate for the existing moral system.

The Notion of Habit

It would seem evident that Kohlberg has some kind of prejudice against "moral habits." No doubt moral education centered exclusively in habits or moral features has its deficiencies, as he states. He holds also that a moral education based on the teaching of virtues leads to the reduction of education to mere socialization, because if we define our moral objectives in terms

of virtues and vices, we are defining them in terms of reward and punishment, with the dangers this involves. He seems to understand virtue as a social value, that is, those qualities society considers right.

But that is not the only way to interpret it. Philibert (1975) criticized this concept without referring to Kohlberg. Haring (1978) recognizes that there is a certain aversion among psychologists towards these concepts. The real meaning of virtue has nothing to do with the desire of self-perfection; on the contrary, virtue implies that our leitmotif or fundamental option integrates body and soul in our lives and in consequence transforms our desires, our institutions, our imagination; these fundamental intentions become our fundamental attitudes. This is the real meaning of the word "virtue." If then by habit or moral virtue we understand a way of confronting reality or an attitude, then a moral education which includes the formation or stimulation of attitudes, as recommended by W. Kay (1976), is perfectly conceivable.

Kohlberg's moral stages are rational attitudes whose different levels each bespeak a particular attitude which enables one to make a moral decision. If an attitude also determines the preference of a person in deciding in one sense or another in a situation (Berelson and Steiner, 1964), we are getting a better integration of rationality and affection. In the end, a moral attitude, which is a modern expression of what virtue really means, is the principal source of moral judgment, for a fundamental option is expressed in corresponding attitudes from which concrete moral judgment depends.

In sum, we cannot agree with the statement that a moral education which promotes the formation and development of attitudes, such as the altruistic attitude, is reduced to a mere socialization because to have an attitude implies being a follower of stable principles.

The Role of Affection

Another critique of Kohlberg has been that his theory does not clarify the role of affection in the moral judgment. In reality many of his references induce us to think that all his attention is centered in rationality, because it is the cognitive aspect that seals the morality of a decision. In Kohlberg (1971b), we find strong statements on this matter: "We state that in the personality, the moral strength is of a cognitive character. It is true that moral decisions are involved in affective forces, but affection is neither moral nor immoral. When an affection appears and is oriented in moral directions, then that affection is moral; any other way it is not").

But, cannot the same be said of rationality? Kohlberg says that affective forces are amoral per se and only when reason directs and assumes an affection, can we talk about the morality of an affection. But, following the same reasoning, we could say that by itself reason is amoral and enters the field of morality only when it is directed towards a moral object and implies values. Further, the role of affection in the moral judgment is of great importance. A person can have some principles of justice and equality, but at the point of decision affectivity or feeling plays an important role. It can be expressed in terms of prejudice; in this case the moral judgment is justified from the prejudice that interprets the principle of justice and equality in a partial way. We believe that the cognitive and affective elements have equal importance in the moral judgment, and that it is not valid to give a subordinate role or no role to affection.

Thus it is necessary to explain further the role of affection in moral judgment, because affection and feelings grow and mature. The affective experience of a child and of an adult are in no way the same. For the child, love is a feeling strongly related with egocentrism, while for the married adult it can become a feeling of self-giving and family life. This affective experience is

going to impact moral judgment because a loving experience, in terms of self-givenness, would ease the objectivity of the equality principle, while love with an egocentric base would distort it.

Similarly, role-taking has a very important affective aspect. Adhesion to the principle of justice needs cognitive understanding and affective support to be used in a role-taking situation. Further, one has to see everyone's viewpoint, including the one we do not like because of racial prejudice, social status, or whatever. In order to be able really to assume the principle of justice (equality and reciprocity) it is indispensable to have the feeling of love towards everyone.

Universidad Nacional Abierta
Caracas, Venezuela

REFERENCES

Beltran, J. "Estructura y evolución del comportamiento moral", *Rev. Esp. de Pedagogía*, 35 (1977), 235-275.

Berelson, B. and Steiner, G.A. *Human Behavior: A Inventory of Scientific Findings*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1964.

Bolt, D. and Sullivan, E. "Kohlberg's Cognitive-developmental Theory in Education Settings: Some Possible Misuses",*Journal of Moral Education*, 6 (1977), 198-205.

Bull, N. *La educación moral*. Estella: Verbo Divino, 1976.

Burton, R.V. "A Paradox in Theories and Research in Moral Development", in W.M. Kurtines and J.L. Gewirtz, eds.*Morality, Moral Behavior, and Moral Development*. New York, Wiley, 1984.

and Casey, W. "The Social-Learning Theory Approach", in G.L. Sapp, ed. *Handbook of Moral Development, Models, Processes, Techniques, and Research*. Birmingham, Alabama, Religious Education Press, 1986, pp. 74-91.

Craig, R. "Forma, contenuto e giustizia nel guidizio morale" and "Lawrence Kohlberg e lo sviluppo morale. Alcune reflessione", in R. Tinone, ed. *Il fancuillo, filosofo morale*. Roma, Armando Editore, 1977.

Colby, A. and Kohlberg L. *The Measurement of Moral Judgement, Vol. 1, Theoretical Foundations and Research Validation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Conn, W. "Postconventional Morality: An Exposition and Critique of L. Kohlberg's Analysis of Moral Development in the Adolescent and Adult". *Lumen Vitae*, 30 (1975), 213-230.

Duska, R. and Whelan, M. *Moral Development: A Guide to Piaget and Kohlberg*. Dublin, McMillan, 1977.

Ferrer, A.M. "El desarrollo moral del nino guajiro". Trabajo inédito. Maracaibo, Universidad Rafael Urdaneta, 1985.

Gilligan, C. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Hann, N. *Coping and Defending*. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

. "Two Moralities in Action Context", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36 (1978), 286-305.

. "Can Research on Morality Be Scientific", *American Psychologist*, 37 (1982), 1096-1104.

Hare, R. *Essays in Moral Concepts*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Haring, B. *Free and Faithful in Christ, Vol. 1 General Moral Theology*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1978.

Henry, R. *The Psychodynamic Foundations of Morality*. New York: Karger, 1983.

Hogan, R. "Moral Conduct and Moral Character", *Psychological Bulletin*, 79 (1973), 217-232.

. "Moral Development and Personality", in D. DePalma and J. Foley, eds. *Moral Development: Current Theory and Research*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1975.

. "A Socioanalytic Theory of Personality", in M. Page, ed. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (vol. 29). Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.

and Johnson, J and Emler, N. "A Socioanalytic Theory of Moral Development", in W. Damon, ed. *New Directions for Child Development* (vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1-18.

Kay, W. *El desarrollo moral*. Buenos Aires, El Ateneo, 1976.

Kohlberg, L. "Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-developmental Approach to Socialization", in D. Goslin, ed. *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969.

. "Education for Justice: A Modern Statement of the Platonic View", in T. Sizer, ed. *Moral Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

. "Stages of Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education", in C. Beck and E. Sullivan, eds. *Moral Education*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

. "From Is To Ought: How To Commit the Naturalistic Fallacy and Get Away with It in the Study of Moral Development". E.T. Mischel, ed. *Genetic Epistemology*. New York: Academic Press, 1971b.

and Gilligan, C. "The Adolescent as A Philosopher: The Discovery of the Self in a Postconventional World", *Deadalus*, 100 (1971), 1051-1086c.

and Colby A. and Gibbs, J. "The Domain and Development of Moral Judgement: A Theory and Method Assessment", in J. Meyer, ed. *Reflections on Values Education*. Waterloo, Ont., Wilfrid Laurier Press, 1976.

. *Essays in Moral Development. Vol. 1 The Philosophy of Moral Development*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

. *Essays in Moral Development. Vol. 2 The Psychology of Moral Development: Moral Stages, Their Nature and Validity*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.

and Candee, D. "The Relationship of Moral Judgement to Moral Action", in W.M. Kurtines and J. L. Gewirtz, eds. *Morality, Moral Behavior and Moral Development*. New York: Wiley, 1984.

Langdale, Ch.L. "A Revision of Structural-Development Theory", in G.L. Sapp, ed. *Handbook of Moral Development. Modes, Process, Techniques and Research*. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Educational Press, 1986, pp. 15-54.

Lifton, P. "Individual Differences in Moral Development", *Journal of Personality*, 53 (1985), 306-334.

Lyons, N. "Two Perspectives: On Self, Relationships and Morality", *Harvard Educational Review*, 53 (1983), 125-145.

Mifsud, T. *El pensamiento de Jean Piaget sobre la psicología moral: presentación crítica*. México: Limusa, 1985.

Mischel, W. and Mischel, H. "A Cognitive Social Learning Approach to Morality and Self-Regulation", in T. Lickona, ed. *Moral Development and Behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

. "The Development of Children's Knowledge of Self Control Strategies", *Child Development*, 54 (1983), 603-619.

Peck, R.F. and Havighurst, R.J. *The Psychology of Character Development*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.

Philibert, P. "Lawrence Kohlberg's Use of Virtue in His Theory of Moral Development", *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 15 (1975), 455-479.

Piaget, J. *Le judgement moral chez l'enfant*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1932. (Traducción española: El criterio moral en el niño. Barcelona: Fontanella, 1977, 3a. ed.)

. *A dónde va la educación*. Barcelona, ed. Teide, 1975.

Quintero, A. "El desarrollo moral en niños de preescolar inscritos en colegios católicos y laicos", *Trabajo inédito*. Caracas: Univeresidad metropolitana, 1987.

Rawls, J. *A Theory of Justice*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973. (Versión española: Teoría sobre la justicia. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1979.

Rest, J. "Kohlberg Defended", *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 60 (1982), 387.

. "The Major Components of Morality", in W.M. Kurtines and J.L. Gerwirtz, eds. *Morality, Moral Behavior and Moral Development*. New York: Wiley, 1984.

Sprinthall, N.A. "Affective Processes", in G.L. Sapp, ed. *Handbook of Moral Development: Models, Processes, Techniques, and Research*. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1986, pp. 146-166.

Tice, T. "A Psychoanalytic Perspective", in M. Windmiller, N. Lambert and E. Turiel, eds. *Moral Development and Socialization*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1980.

Vidal, M. *La educación moral en la escuela. Propuestas y materiales*. Madrid: Edi. Paulinas/Verbo Divino, 1981.

Wilson, J. A *Teacher's Guide to Moral Education*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1973.

Yanez, A. "Reaplición de losestudios de Kohlberg en estudiantes de psicología", Tesis de Grado inédita. Caracas: UCAB, 1987.

LOVE AND CARE:
The Psychological Integration of Moral Development
MARY BRABECK

In Plato's *Apology* Socrates says to Callias: "If your two sons were horses or bullocks and you wanted to have them trained, you would send them to a horse trainer or an animal trainer; but now they are boys, to whom will you send them? Who is it that knows what a man and a citizen ought to be?"

Up until the last two decades, psychologists in the United States have been curiously inattentive to Plato's question. In the 1920's two researchers, Hartshorne and May tried to study moral virtue by examining such character traits as honesty. They conducted their research on a large sample of students in a variety of situations, using 33 tests of deceit and concluded from their exhaustive study that there is no such thing as the trait of honesty. Perhaps because of Hartshorne and May's discouraging results, the study of morality was abandoned by mainstream psychologists during the next 50 years. During that time, psychologists were consumed with the pursuit of objectivity. Empirical, predictive validity was the goal of a science that was, itself, developing. Psychologists avoided any attempts to advocate a moral stance; Plato's question, "Who is it that knows what a good person ought to be?" would not be answered by U.S. psychologists.

PIAGET AND KOHLBERG

Yet in the late 1950's Jean Piaget's (1932) work on the universal development of children's logical reasoning and moral judgments about rules, came to the attention of a graduate student at the University of Chicago. Lawrence Kohlberg, who (1969) was to change the discipline of psychology by daring to present his theory as an answer to Plato's question.

Kohlberg began his inquiry into morality with the observation that since the holocaust of World War II, moral relativism is untenable. Kohlberg had been active in smuggling Jews out of Nazi Germany and his life-long "work" was an inquiry into the conditions under which it is morally defensible to break the law. Kohlberg extended Piaget's observations that the ability to think about moral issues is tied to one's intellectual development and that intellectual development follows a universal, hierarchical sequence. He proposed that this development through the sequential stages is due both to the maturation of the person (it is age related) and to experience (proper educational experiences will promote development). Kohlberg challenged the prevailing view that moral behavior is the consequence of shaping by the culture and socializing agents. He argued that even a child is a "moral philosopher," who actively constructs the moral meaning of social interactions.

If one is to understand the way that a child constructs moral meaning, Kohlberg argued, one must use a methodology which engages the child in solving moral dilemmas. Thus, Kohlberg's methodology for studying the development of moral reasoning consisted in describing moral conflicts to people of all ages, of different social groups, and from different cultures, and inviting them to make judgments about social relationships and conflicting rights. He asked people to determine what is fair and what is unfair, and to justify their decisions and choices. From the responses of individuals at different ages, Kohlberg described the six stages in the development

of structures of meaning that people impose on the moral dilemmas. His theory is summarized on Table number I. Following the neo-Kantian philosophy of John Rawls (1971), Kohlberg argued that humans are capable of deciding the right thing to do and making moral choices that are guided by the "Golden Rule": that justice be accorded each individual, and that fairness, reciprocity and respect for others and for the sanctity of human life guide moral choice.

Cross cultural studies have examined Kohlberg's claim that moral reasoning as he defined it is universal and is not culture bound. Research on Kohlberg's theory has been conducted in Mexico, Israel, Turkey, Taiwan, Zambia, India, the United States, many countries in Europe, as well as in Venezuela. Kohlberg's cross cultural and longitudinal studies of the development of the individual's moral reasoning over time (Colby, Noam) have demonstrated that the pattern of moral development, at least for the first four stages of his theory, occurs across cultures in a predictable sequence.

This sequence (see Table I) begins with concern for one's own rights, and moral choices are made on the basis of the consequences (e.g., punishment or rewards). The middle stages of development are characterized as conventional, and moral action is judged on the basis of conformity with the expectations of others or with the rules and laws. At the highest stages, moral choices are made on the basis of one's contractual obligations guided by the universal principle of justice.

AN INTEGRATED THEORY

Kohlberg has defined an important aspect of the moral agent, how one defines what one ought to do. However, we know too well that knowing the good does not always translate into doing the good. St. Paul says, "For the good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do (Romans 19: 366-317). Research on Kohlberg's theory and moral actions (Rest, 1986) has shown that moral deliberation alone is not sufficient to ensure moral behavior. A number of writers, including Kohlberg (1985) have recently argued (Rest, 1983) that morality is multi-faceted and that his theory captures one component of morality, moral reasoning -- the ability to arrive at a moral conclusion regarding what a person ought to do. However, morality is more than the rational determination of the moral ought; it involves also the ability to see that a situation has moral dimensions. James Rest (1983) calls this moral sensitivity. Morality requires that one have the motivation to behave morally; often we call this moral character. And in order to behave morally the person must have the skills to determine a moral solution.

The psychology committee of the moral education project of the Council for Research in Values and Philosophy worked for two years to develop an integrated theory of morality that addresses the limited focus of Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning. Figure I presents the model that the committee developed. At the center of this model is the self, which we view as a moral agent with the moral virtues that motivate moral behavior. The self has three components: cognition, the ego, and affectivity.

The circle of cognition represents the thoughts, beliefs and ability to use reason to know what is the good. This is the circle in which Kohlberg's theory is instructive. Thus, in our model as the child matures and is instructed by parents, the child learns to reason about what is the right or the moral way to behave. In the early years, the child behaves morally in order to avoid punishment or in order to get something the child wants, for example, a child at Kohlberg's stage two will reason: If I am good and do good things, my parents will be good to me, will reward and

praise me for being good. Therefore, I will act in good ways. As the child becomes more conventional in moral reasoning, the child will view morality as conforming with the "Golden Rule" of doing unto others what you would that others do to you, or, at stage four, abiding by the rules of the country or the rules of God.

The circle of the ego represents developing knowledge of who one is. The model draws heavily from Erikson's theory of the developing ego and the resulting virtues of the ego which help guide moral action. The ego develops as the child matures and becomes physically more competent and as society (parents, peers, teachers) presents new challenges and expectations. Thus, the baby experiences love and care from a parent and develops a self that is trusting; from this the virtue of hope begins to develop. A toddler develops the muscles that enable him or her to walk and parents begin to expect the child to exert greater self-control. With this physical maturation and new expectations from parents, comes a new sense of autonomy and the virtue of will begins to develop.

The affective component of the self also is developing during childhood,. The child must learn to handle negative feelings such as anxiety and fear and to control aggressive impulses; positive emotions such as anger at injustice, and empathy and compassion must be acquired. One must become skilled in empathically understanding others, and develop from that a concern for maintaining harmonious relationships, sensitivity to the needs and concerns of others, and care about their well being.

The self and its virtues in our model are central but the three components that form the virtuous self overlap. Affect influences cognition as when our concern about the suffering of others leads us to advocate a just way of treating them. Affectivity and cognition are affected by the developing ego. For example, when the child has developed the virtue of will, the child has the moral character necessary to delay self-gratification and to act as reason would indicate one ought and as feelings move one to do. Thus, our model is interactive. The components of cognitive, affective and the socialized ego interact in the process of developing moral virtue (See Knowles' chapter in Knowles & McLean, 1992 for an elaboration of the model.) Our model is also a developmental model that charts the different challenges presented to the individual, and the resulting changes in the affective, cognitive and ego components of the self. These developmental challenges and changes of the cognitive and ego components are described in Margaret Gorman's chapter, and I will not go into them further here. Rather I shall turn to some recent work among American psychologists on the affective component of a moral character. In another chapter Margaret Gorman and I present our psychological research on emotions related to morality: anger, anxiety, guilt, shame and love. I will discuss the development of one of these emotions, love.

LOVE AND CARE AS MORAL EMOTIONS

The Christian heritage has always emphasized the virtue of love. We are told that God so loved the world, he sent his only son (John 3:16). Love is called the "greatest virtue" (1 Corinthians 13:13). Jesus said, "By this they will know you are my disciples: that you love one another." We are commanded to love our neighbors as ourselves (Leviticus 19:18, Matthew 19:19) and even to love our enemies (Luke 6:27).

Yet it is only recently that psychological theories of morality have paid attention to the ethic of love. Erik Erikson (1968) described love as an adult virtue that transcends bodily needs, ego or social aspects and involves concern for others beyond one's self. However, Erikson did not describe how the virtue of love develops, nor did he fully examine what the virtue of love is. Recently, Carol Gilligan has used the work of Erik Erikson, as well as of Kohlberg, to develop her theory of love, which she has called an ethic of care. Other researchers (e.g., Nel Noddings, Jane Roland Martin, Nancy Eisenberg, Lawrence Blum, etc.) are examining the philosophical, theological, and psychological foundations of caring, love, empathy and altruism. Here I will focus on only one theory of the ethic of care, namely, the ethic of care described by Carol Gilligan (1982).

Carol Gilligan was a researcher working with Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning at Harvard University. While using the Kohlberg interview, she found that some respondents did not fit Kohlberg's scheme. For example, when asking children whether a man should steal a drug from a druggist in order to save his dying wife, some children saw the question as, should the man steal the drug or shouldn't he?" For these children, the issue was "what is the fair, the just thing to do for the man, the wife, and the druggist?" Other children saw the question as "should Heinz steal the drug, or should he do something else to save his wife?" For these children, the issue was "how can the man behave in a caring way toward his wife, and not hurt himself or the druggist."

Gilligan observed that the response to the second question was likely to be scored, in Kohlberg's interview scoring scheme, as lower than the response to the first question. She also observed that girls and women were more likely to frame the question as "how can the man behave in a caring way toward his wife, and not hurt himself or the druggist?" From observations such as these, Gilligan developed a theory that males and females frame the moral issue in different ways. Further, she argues that the different ways that males and females frame moral questions are attributable to fundamental psychological differences between them.

Males, she argues, define themselves as separate from others, and affirm that definition of self by referring to their individual achievements, and the rules that ensure protection of the rights of individuals. They see the world as hierarchically ordered and, thus, are more concerned about such abstract and highly individualistic principles as justice. Kohlberg's theory, she suggests, accurately describes their moral development.

Females, Gilligan claims, define themselves as connected to others, and affirm that definition of self by referring to their relationships with others and the caring response that reduces threats to harmonious relationships. They see the world as a web of connections and are more concerned about concrete, contextual solutions that protect people from becoming alienated or being hurt. She describes their moral orientation as guided by an ethic of care, that no one be hurt and no one be left alone. She labels this moral orientation that is guided by both reason and affect, a different voice. Thus the title of her book is *In a Different Voice*.

I have outlined what Gilligan (1977;1982) proposes are the differences between the ethic of justice and the ethic of care on Table I. Like Kohlberg, Gilligan (1977) has suggested that development of the ethic of care proceeds through developmental levels. She describes three levels and two transition periods in the development of the ethic of care:

Level I: Orientation to Individual Survival. At the first level, the self is the sole object of concern. Issues of survival of the self are of paramount importance and morality is a matter of imposed sanctions on the self.

- *The First Transition*: From Selfishness to Responsibility. During the first transition the moral conflict is between what one "would" do (what is good for me) and what one "should" do (what is good for the other person). Resolution of this conflict leads to the second level.

Level II: Goodness as Self-Sacrifice. This is the level of the conventional view of morality derived from social norms and consensus. Concern for others, particularly the feelings of others and the possibility of inflicting hurt, is of major concern to people at this level and goodness is equated with self-sacrifice and the need for approval. This level corresponds to Kohlberg's stage 3.
- *The Second Transition*: From Goodness to Truth. During the second transition the individual comes to see that a morality of care must include care of self as well of others. As the particular situation, intentions and consequences of action become more important than the evaluation of others, the next level develops.

Level III: The Morality of Nonviolence. The conflict between selfishness and responsibility to self is resolved at this level in a principle of nonviolence. A moral balance between self and other is achieved by equally applying an injunction against hurting. At this level care becomes a universal obligation to avoid hurting self and others.

For Gilligan the ethics of care is marked by concern with particular moral situations rather than abstract principles; with care for others and with concern that no one be hurt rather than with the rights of others; with the maintenance of harmony and loving relationships, rather than with moral rules; with fairness or respect for others. The motivation for moral action in Gilligan's care orientation arises from a concern for others, empathy with their pain, and love. In Kohlberg's justice orientation, the motivation for moral action arises from a desire to protect the rights of all individuals in a fair and just manner.

Gilligan has claimed that the development of the ethic of care is more likely to be found in the responses of women and girls then men and boys. How do these differences emerge; what accounts for different lines of development of the moral ideal for males and females? In part the answer may lie in the neo-psychoanalytic (Chodorow, 1978) description of male and female conceptions of self. This story begins with the observation that in virtually all human societies women are the primary care-givers, particularly during infancy and childhood when one's sense of self as male or female develops. Mothers form a more intimate bond with their daughters than with their sons because they identify more closely with the same-sex child. Because of this closer relationship, mothers encourage less psychological separation from their daughters. Consequently daughters develop a sense of self as intimately involved with the mother, and this generalizes to a sense of intimate connection with others. The girl's fundamental psychological understanding of self is, then, based on herself in relationship and affiliation with others.

In contrast, mothers perceive their sons as different from themselves and encourage greater psychological separation from the mother-infant relationship. In achieving his male identity, the boy must reject the close, intimate relationship with his mother. He must separate from his mother and identify with his father. Thus, in the earliest years, while the girl is pulled to define herself as affiliated with others, the son is pushed to define his self as separate from others (that is, in infancy from the mother). This separation, Chodorow and other psychoanalytic writers (e.g., Eichenbaum & Orbach, Dinnerstein, Flax) have argued, results in the male having a repressed relational self, and repression of intimacy and affiliative needs.

Because of these differences in early experiences, and the resulting differences in one's core sense of self, Chodorow and Gilligan see males and females developing different needs and feelings. Females have a greater need for affiliation, are more likely to become anxious when relationships are threatened, and are more empathic. Males, these authors suggest, have a greater need for independence, are more likely to become anxious when their autonomy is threatened, and are more concerned about achievement.

Society reinforces these differences (See for example, Eisenberg, Block,) by emphasizing individual achievement of boys and men and affective relational concerns of girls and women. For example, in the adult years as a mother and a wife, a woman is expected to maintain harmonious relationships, to be the empathic, caring center of the family and of both professional and informal groups. Men's occupational roles in the adult years become the dominant concern in their adult lives. Often these concerns leave little time for concerns about relationships or the development of affectivity.

According to Gilligan, men bring to moral dilemmas a sense of self as individual, achieving, autonomous and independent. They are more concerned with resolving moral conflicts in ways that protect their rights, and the rights of others; thus, the moral principle of justice, guides their moral thinking. In contrast, women bring to moral conflicts a sense of self as connected to others and a responsibility for maintaining close, harmonious relationships. The virtue that guides their moral deliberation is care.

What evidence is there for Gilligan's claims? First let me summarize what we know regarding male and females' ability to reason abstractly and to appeal to principles of justice. Recall that Gilligan has suggested that males excel in moral reasoning as described by Kohlberg. In recent meta-analytic studies (a statistical method that allows one to combine many studies to examine the degree of an effect) examining sex differences in justice orientation (Brabeck, 1983; Lifton, 1985; Walker, 1983; Walker and de Vries, 1985) males and females have been shown to be equally able to resolve moral dilemmas by appealing to justice principles. The few differences in moral reasoning that have reported finding females scoring higher tended to occur in homogeneous samples of school and university students, those favoring males were more heterogeneous samples in which the sexes differed in education and occupation. Since education and work experience affect moral development level, these experiences must be considered in evaluating sex differences. Thus, ample evidence is available to conclude that Gilligan's claim that males are better able than females to appeal to principles of justice when resolving moral dilemmas is not supported.

Are men and women also equally capable of identifying and responding appropriately to the pain, hurt of others? Are women and men, girls and boys, equally likely to engage in care orientation? We know that the socialization of girls and boys by parents, teachers, adult friends, family and peers, results in some consistently and reliably reported differences between men and women. We know that parents, teachers and peers treat boys and girls differently. We know that at a very early age children self select into some sex peer groups and that they report to have very little understanding of the other sex's group (Maccoby, 1985). We know that there are differences in friendship patterns among boys and girls: Girls have larger numbers of close, intimate relationships, boys' friendships seem to center around common interests, sports and work (Rubin). Girls and women are more frequently sought for support from both males and females (McGill) People expect girls to be more nurturing (Block), and girls expect that of themselves (Miller). We know that teachers and peers rate girls and girls rate themselves as more empathic and altruistic (Eisenberg). Boys are socialized more than girls to control the expression

of feeling, while asserting themselves; girls, more than boys, are taught to control aggression, including assertion, while they learn to regard the world of the family as their proper interest (Block, 1973)

We also know that while these differences are consistent, they are also very small and that gender alone is not a good predictor of a person's attitudes and behaviors (Hyde). Nevertheless, evidence suggests that girls and women are socialized to be more caring, empathic and concerned with relationships than males. But are these differences, such as they are, also found in studies examining the moral orientation of males and females?

The empirical evidence for Gilligan's argument that females, more than males use the care orientation is less conclusive than the research on sex differences in the justice orientation. This is to be expected for while studies of Kohlberg's theory stretch back to the 60's, work on Gilligan's theory is more recent There are, however, a few studies available that provide the beginnings of an answer to the question, are females more likely to use the care ethic than males. I have described these studies elsewhere (Brabeck, 1986; Brabeck, 1987; Bebeau & Brabeck, 1987) and will offer only a brief summary of what we have learned from these studies.

First, we know that the ethic of care can be identified in people's responses. The ethic of care has been identified and reliably scored in response to both real and hypothetical dilemmas (Lyons, Walker). This suggests that the ethic of care identified by Gilligan is indeed an aspect of moral response. Second, we know that most studies of the care ethic report males and females as equally able to use the care ethic (Walker, 1985). Thus, both males and females have been found to be concerned about the potential pain others might suffer, and consider human relationships important moral considerations. Third, when sex differences are found, females are more likely than males to use the care ethic (Langdale, Lyons, Haste) and males the justice ethic. This is particularly the case when people are asked to identify a personally experienced moral conflict and describe how they resolved it. I have argued elsewhere (Bebeau & Brabeck, 1987) that female dental students were as principled as male dental students in their moral reasoning, as measured by Rest's (Rest, 19) objective measure of Kohlberg's theory. However, females identified more ethical aspects of patient-doctor relationships.

The studies of the care orientation use different tests to assess the care orientation and even different definitions of care. They cannot, therefore, be considered definitive; much more research is needed. Nevertheless, these studies indicate that while the care-response orientation can be identified in the responses of subjects to hypothetical and real life moral dilemmas, the claim that females use a care orientation and males use a justice orientation is not clearly established.

In summary, the evidence from psychological research has shown that males and females are equally able to reason abstractly and equally likely to appeal to principles of justice when examining the moral imperative, when determining what one *ought*to do. However, while both males and females are capable of, and in fact often use, the ethic of care, females may be more likely than males to view the interpersonal issues of a situation as important, particularly when describing a real life, personally experienced moral dilemma.

Finally, I have suggested that Gilligan's theory of the ethic of care enlarges the description of morality offered by Kohlberg, and more fully describes the virtue of love offered by Erikson. The ethic of care that Gilligan heard in the voices of the women whom she interviewed and which has been found in subsequent research in the responses of both men and women expands our notion of morality to include the principle of caring for and nurturing life. Gilligan's work can be understood as adding what we have come to call the feminine principle: caring,

compassion and concern for others, to what we have come to call the masculine: the rational, abstract and logical.

I have suggested that Plato's question, "Who is it that knows what a good person ought to be?" is being addressed by a number of theorists. I have argued that this work expands our understanding of morality and suggests that an integrated moral theory is a theory of human potential in which autonomy is achieved in community. This view insists that the basic rights of individuals be respected and upheld, and that mercy be shown each person. It is a view which joins the affective ethic of care with the rational ethic of justice. Much work on how to help students develop the ethic of justice (Higgins, Power, Kohlberg,) has been accomplished. Researchers, theorists, and educators must now turn attention to developing a greater understanding about how care, compassion, love are developed and to designing curricula that will promote this essential component of morality.

Boston College

MORAL DEVELOPMENT AS THE NURTURING OF MORAL IMAGINATION: Moral Education, Cultural Inheritance, and the Transmission of Values

HENRY C. JOHNSON, JR.

> I do not know why the educators of youth have not long since made use of this propensity of reason to enter with pleasure upon the most subtle examination of practical questions put to them, and, why after laying the foundation in a purely moral catechism, they have not searched through biographies of ancient and modern times with the purpose of having examples at hand of the duties they lay down, so that, by comparing similar actions under various circumstances, they could begin to exercise the moral judgment of their pupils in marking the greater or less moral significance of the actions. They would find that even very young people, who are not yet ready for speculation of other kinds, would soon become very acute and not a little interested, since they would feel the progress of their power of judgment. . . . By the mere habit of frequently looking upon actions as praiseworthy or blameworthy, a good foundation would be laid for righteousness in the future course of life.   Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*. (Trans. Lewis White Beck)[1]

In approaching cultural inheritance, social change and moral education as the challenge of the 21st century for Venezuela and Latin America, it is important first to reflect on how we view this challenge and, consequently, on how we propose to meet it. Following this, I will offer a further critique and some practical proposals respecting both the problem and the sources of solution that are implicit in this structure. It should go virtually without saying, of course, that I can bring no solution with which to enlighten you. The sun, I realize, does not rise in the North. I can bring only a sense of sharing in the challenge (a challenge not only to Latin America but to civilization itself) and a deep sense of that Socratic ignorance which allows us both to share not our wisdom, but our mutual (and largely unsuccessful) experience. As in post-Periclear Athens, we need honest inquiry not sophistry, whatever its source.

THE PROBLEM AS A PROBLEM

Rapidly accelerating "social change", it is asserted commonly, has produced what can only be considered a "crisis" at a deep socio-cultural level, the implications of which directly affect the development of character and the moral formation of the young. The sources of the crisis can be seen to be: first, in an internal migration, essentially a process of chaotic urbanization which has eroded the solidarity of the family; second, in an "explosive immigration" introducing conflicting cultural traditions and histories; third, in the impact of the media (especially television), which, because their aim is to sell, build their content on what can at the most optimistically be called "hedonism"; and fourth and finally, in the turbulent shifts in the economy, linked to international politics, which have frustrated natural goals and expectations.

The crisis induced by these factors has produced a number of symptoms: corruption, violence, widespread drug-abuse. As a consequence, it is argued, we cannot expect -- even hope

-- simply to reassert the way of life or the core values of previous times, because, so to speak, the times have changed and the core -- if ever it existed -- has disintegrated into a complex of factors often not only contradictory, but destructive.

Meeting this challenge for our youth will entail: (1) a re-examination and reapplication in contemporary terms of the foundational values drawn from the cultural inheritance, and (2) a clearer understanding of the process of moral formation in "children" and "adolescents" in order to effect the desired change. The first task lies in the province of philosophy, the second in contemporary social and behavioral science. Hence, some propose a three-pronged attack: a philosophical program, a psychological program, a socio-cultural analysis, along with an educational process through which the results of this three-fold inquiry can be realized in practice.

In this customarily adopted general structure I find an important message, the reflection upon which has led me into what promises to be a rather radical reorientation of my own thought. As a consequence, what I have to say is unfinished. Furthermore, none of what follows is advanced as the solution to your problem; the problem is ours together. A recent survey of beginning college students in the United States showed that 76 percent of them think that being "well off financially" is either essential or very important. Only 39 percent believe it very important to develop a "meaningful philosophy of life". Twenty years ago the percentages were almost the reverse, 44 percent and 83 percent respectively -- suggesting a "very profound (change) in the society", according to the survey's director.[2] If you yourselves see the problem of moral formation as more starkly revealed in the past and present Venezuelan experience, that fact (quite apart from the pain) can mean that you will face it, not hide it as we are inclined to do under the appearance of success. In this way, as well as from the power of your own long historical reflection, there may arise guidance for those of us who can be more conveniently dishonest.

METHOD AS A PROBLEM

The provisional argument that I want to advance runs in two parts, roughly as follows: First, unquestionably, there is a philosophical problem and a critical inquiry attached to it. So, too, is there a psychological problem with its appropriate inquiry. Insofar as it is genuinely moral, moral development is a question that must be addressed through the method of philosophy. We must understand what is good and right and continually examine that understanding. We must also understand the dynamics of human development, of action and change in both youth and adults. The question of why human beings do what they do, or don't do what they don't do, clearly involves a subtle structure of behavior and the still mysterious relation of mind and body. But, while both philosophy and psychology are necessary, neither (I want to insist) is in fact sufficient for our practical and pedagogical purposes. Nor, even, are the two together. Our aim is not merely theoretical. It is to learn how to foster good character and conduct as we live in the world. It is not to think correctly alone, nor to act effectively alone. Intellect and affect meet for our purposes in life, in experience, in history -- however vague or theoretically untidy these terms are. Just as there is no question that philosophy and psychology have a place in our considerations, there is no question that moral action is both called for, and takes place in, the concrete world of ordinary experience, which is also set in a complex social and cultural system. Hence, we need also to examine the matrix of present social and cultural conditions -- which have a history deeply embedded in them, a continuity among the changes. Social-scientific

analysis can help us here, but it also will be necessary rather than sufficient. As with psychology (and even much of philosophy, perhaps), social-scientific method is abstract, analytical and often reductionist as well, furnishing an important and entirely legitimate perspective in itself but taking us away from the phenomenon we must deal with as educators and citizens. Our aim is to help persons become good and do what is right, not to make either little moral philosophers or little social and behavioral scientists.

The question for a realistic pedagogy, then, I want to argue, is not only how moral action can be analyzed and understood, but how it can be envisioned in the real settings of moral life and development such that it makes possible better moral response and, in time, a deeper, more stable moral character. I say "envisioned" because I am arguing that intellect and affect, dissolved and separated by an exclusive reliance on philosophical and scientific method, can best be united under life conditions by a vision of the situation and of the self acting morally, and that guidance for this is furnished neither by definitions or rules alone (from the philosophical side) nor some content-free sense of autonomous activity no matter how energetic (from the psychological side). To think without feeling is, to revise Kant's famous dictum, ineffective, to feel or act without thinking is surely blind. Neither, of course, is even really possible -- they are abstractions whose realm is mind, not life. Our problem as educators -- that is to say, for all of us in this case -- is rarely ignorance of defensible principles and definitions of the good. It is what it means for us to be good and to act rightly in an historic time and place, and how to enable persons to see that meaning for themselves and, we hope, to choose to pursue it.

We Are Our Children's Culture

The second element in my argument has to do with the "cultural inheritance" that has attracted so much attention. It is, we seem convinced, in some sense both the source of the problem and the source of its solution. But consider the following: The crucial content of moral development is, we have all agreed, contained in our culture -- as its vehicle at least, thought not necessarily as its fundamental source. That culture, however, while indeed radically determining our young, is not in fact constructed or even controlled by them. It is, as our very terms suggest, an inheritance, i.e., something given to them, bestowed on them by their elders. Hence, in its first instance, the moral development of the young is a problem of the adult community, the problematic nature of which is indeed manifest in the young, but in no sense owes its origin to them. "Their" behavior, so to speak, is in fact a symptom of "our" condition. As a corollary, attempts to change them apart from changing ourselves -- a matter over which, I suppose, we do have some power -- are in principle not only fruitless, but radically dishonest. Our predisposition to think that our primary task is to correct the young without relation to ourselves may even be yet one more serious symptom of the moral degeneration of us all.

Furthermore, respecting the educational implications of this argument, I doubt whether this process is, or ever can be, reduced to a technique. Indeed, the notion that the "challenge" we are addressing will be met by finding a technique is a testimonial of how captive we are to one of the most seriously morally debilitating element in our cultural inheritance -- the notion that the good can be "engineered" from without, apart from involving our own being and character -- a being and character which unites in us, before it does so in our children, society and culture, intellect and affect, past and future.

Before undertaking some further reflections on what the proposed analytical structure and justification have to say to us as moral educators, let me briefly recapitulate the argument. In

sum, I am saying that valuable and legitimate as they are in their own right, neither (1) abstract philosophical approaches -- i.e., approaches I will later call "juridical" because they focus on defining and justifying principles or rules for guiding behavior, nor (2) abstract empirical generalizations about human action and its development, i.e., theoretical analyses of "human" behavior will suffice. Even when seen as coming together in "life," if (3) that setting is itself apprehended in the similarly abstract categories of social-cultural science, the prescriptions of conventional moral philosophy and the generalizations of behavioral science are not sufficient as the foundation for an educational program of moral development. Furthermore, I have argued that (4) our justification of the needed project as a task to be performed on the young raises its own serious questions.

I would now add (5) that to see our task as a problem that is a consequence of largely outside forces (from the control of which we absolve ourselves as adults), fatally masks the nature of a cultural inheritance and further flaws any process of transmission. Clearly, we meet in this study as a consequence of a national and regional history that can be described as tragic in the classical sense. For now nearly five centuries, Venezuela and Latin America in general have been exploited by corona, caudillo, comerciante, and catedratico. The first two are obvious and have traditionally been useful for the purpose of self-exculpation. *Corona* and *caudillo* both represented an "externally" imposed power that it is difficult to fault our forefathers and mothers from falling under. It is less easy to absolve them or ourselves from exploitation by the *comerciante*, since he was welcomed rather more voluntarily as a refuge from the former. And, increasingly, and still more embarrassingly, the catedratico -- a figure first appearing in an Enlightenment that illuminated only an elite, and who now reappears as the technocrat -- the expert whose arcane knowledge controls, but cannot be shared with, those whose lives it determines. Finally, it has to be said that much of this was done *con clericia*, the Church as a political power exercising a shadowy influence over the centuries, not always or everywhere on the side of injustice, to be sure, but sufficiently frequently to prompt, or at least appear to justify, a widespread cynicism regarding the fruitfulness of theological solutions to our social and moral problems.

Now, I do not wish to appear an ungracious guest. I could construct an equally cynical and conspiratorial account of our past in the United States. Indeed, the radical historians have already saved me the trouble. But, the point is that whatever partial validity such a "history" may have, it is dangerous to invoke it too conveniently, to let it become in its own perverse way the conventional moral wisdom. What is now important, and has been at each stage in our social and cultural development, is how we respond to what we take to be our history, the choices we make in its presence. When used to explain why we are what we are and why we "can't help" being this way, invoking such a history comes dangerously close to what the Freudians call "attribution" -- the location of our difficulties outside ourselves as the cheapest form of absolution and self-protection.

But we need not look only to a remembered past to find a debilitating moral posture in our culture. Reflection quite appropriately points to the present as well, though perhaps not sharply enough. We must be clear, however, that here again they have pointed to *our* problems, not just those of the young. We do indeed wrestle, to paraphrase St. Paul, against economic and political principalities and powers, which can be seen to account for corruption and moral retreat. But they are not outside us. To pretend so is, to use your own delicious idiom, "to blot out the sun with your thumb." We choose to cooperate in these institutions and processes, to be willing citizens, daily thereby furnishing (in our willingness to conform) powerful "moral" images to the

young. If we need to confirm the proposition that our problems are not simply the products of an "ancient" history which we cannot escape, nor simply thrust upon us from the outside, we need only look at our current "mores", our present institutions and our roles in them.

Example: A now secularized *compadrazgo*, emptied of its erstwhile spiritual meaning and sense of moral responsibility. In the United States it is, we say, "the old boy network" or (even less flatteringly) "cronyism." It is doing favors for self-advantage under cover of what was once a sacred relationship. Like "Semana Sancta" and "Carnaval," it is nothing more than secularized self-indulgence.

Example: A judicial apparatus in which justice is sufficiently deferred and circumscribed as usually to turn into injustice -- at least for the powerless. Its only "virtue" appears to be garnering large revenues for the legal "profession" and an endless procession of bureaucrats.

Example: An even cruder self-indulgence born not of the bad (old) times but the good (recent) times in which relatively fewer and fewer have had more and more. The flights to Miami and New York (not to mention, London, Paris, and Madrid) to buy the good life and carry it back. Some stagger under burdens at the viasa gates in JFK and Miami International. "Ta barato; dame dos" is a moral maxim so plain that it could be a subtitle for this paper.

My purpose, however, is not a moral diatribe. The point is that social and cultural "conditions" do not, except under the canons of an extreme social and behavioral determinism, destroy the possibility of genuinely moral action, or ever weaken it. They do in fact call for it. Indeed, if we are to blame "the times" for our moral difficulties, it was perhaps the "good" times, not the "bad" times that began the process of decline. "Conditions" do set the terms of moral response, but they neither create it nor negate its possibility, let alone its content. And, particularly in the absence of more powerful and shared images, it is our day-to-day choices that embody what is "moral" for our young.

FINDING A NEW PERSPECTIVE

I am indebted to Robert Coles not only for some of the most important elements in the analysis I have just been making, but for prompting me to reconsider much in our traditional approach to moral education. In particular, his recent book, *The Moral Life of Children*, has lead me to look at many of the things about which I have just been talking. Coles "confesses" that, as a good and loyal Freudian behavioral scientist, he had always been inclined to subsume what children and adults thought and did under the standard psychological categories. When he began to look at the moral response people actually made to crises like racial conflict and the most demeaning poverty (not only in the United States, but in Latin America) these categories not only did not work, they obscured the process. He found that "these same children [who were in the grip of crisis] forged a moral life -- an outlook that often followed, rather than preceded, a series of events." He began to ask, "What sources give them the moral purpose they develop in the life they live?"[3] He gives no easy, finished answers. But there is something there in these people, something shared with family and others, that allows these persons to interpret the difficulties they have encountered and transcend them rather than simply becoming victims. Much of it is a religious content -- a content scrupulously avoided by orthodox behavioral scientists, or reduced to some mechanism that is at least faintly pathological. What these children carried was some interpretative images that sprang to life in the face of pain and conflict. They had come to possess in some mysterious way that eludes us (if only because our categories have kept us from looking for it) what can be called a "moral imagination." Through this imagination

they could see meaning and value to their lives and apprehend what a moral response would be. Through these images, so to speak, they could see what things meant and what they should do.

It is important to caution, however, that the argument I am trying to give relies on neo-romantic fiction. Whatever the shortcomings of what we might call, adapting Whitehead, the fallacy of mis-placed responsibility -- the notion that the moral problematic of our time lies largely with the young -- there can be no doubt that we must do something together with the young. While they have not made the conditions that demand moral response, nor are they the bearers of the culture out of which all of us must draw relevant moral content, the young are neither neutral nor automatically morally wise. No more than we, are they merely helpless pawns in a social-cultural game manipulated by powers "off the board." When they are confronted with occasions demanding moral understanding and choice, they must be able to see these situations in moral terms and have something to respond with. The moral educator's question is, then, a deceptively simple one: What do those in moral crisis need in order not just to think differently, but to respond differently, and how do they get it?

In the United States two of our most popular answers to effective moral development -- answers that are, unfortunately, widely exported -- are the cognitive-developmental approaches made popular by the work of the late Lawrence Kohlberg and the crudely psychological approaches disseminated by Simon and Raths under the rubric of "values clarification." The difficulty with the latter is that, while it may leave the individual "clear" about his "real" desires (descriptively seen as "values") and their potential empirical effects, he or she is left without guidance precisely at the point required by what we have traditionally defined as moral choice. Although, for example, I may come to see that I very much desire wealth (and hence it is a "value" to me), the question of whether I ought to pursue wealth (desired or not) in any particular case cannot be answered within this framework. Paradoxically, values clarification has been popular because it is thought to be "value neutral" -- though it is not, of course -- and hence socially and educationally less controversial.

Kohlberg's approaches, under a number of variant forms, do not evade the moral-philosophical foundations necessary for any scheme of moral choice or moral development. The problems arise over their form. Dykstra subsumes these approaches under the category of "juridical" ethics -- an ethic focusing on the form of the rules necessary for moral judgment.[4] As you no doubt know, this is an approach drawing heavily upon Kant and Piaget for its substance and method. The purpose of this paper is not a full-scale critique of either Kohlberg or any other particular method. Nonetheless, I want to examine some criticisms of the juridical approach that point, I believe, to a pedagogically better solution.

The juridical school focuses on models of rational moral choice as leading to, and shaping action seen as a kind of dilemma. In the now classic example, "*Heinz,*" whose "wife" is dying, must decide whether or not to steal a potentially life-saving drug from a "druggist" who refuses to give it to him without full price. The moral development question is at what formal level of principle will the person confronted with Heinz's moral dilemma choose to see and resolve the problem of choice. Clearly, this is all meant to point us to life, but it does not, if I may put it this way, appear to be enmeshed in any life we could recognize. It sets some parameters of choice as admittedly a necessary condition for acting, but tells us nothing about the carrying out of that action in ongoing experience -- and that seems to be as much a part of what we need to become moral as the results of a particular Kantian deduction.

There is in these approaches an attitude that is characteristic of much contemporary moral philosophy and moral educational theory as well. Its source is, I suppose, in the Kantian

tradition, in spite of the fact that it manifests itself variously as in both analytical and situational ethics. It is perhaps not too strong to call it a kind of arrogance, stemming from the notion that we can first think, and then will, virtually by ourselves, not only our own perfection but that of the world around us. In order to become good, we need others only in the sense that they need to think and will the same thing. Our lives have no other necessary interrelationship.

The Kohlberg method thus sems abstract, essentially private, non-historical, and culturally empty. (That Kohlberg recognized the inadequacy of the private may be inferred from his later work with the "just community," but that seems to me to be only a group effort at a still essentially private activity -- and it has not enjoyed marked success). Note that, in the dilemma, only Heinz has a name -- though the name is strictly speaking meaningless. Assuming he is a person, he meets moral choice only in formal objects who are abstract functions and conditions: "wife" and "druggist." Earlier, I suggested that principle and desire, the cognitive and the affective, are brought into unity in life. How do we understand life? In a narrative mode, I believe; as a story, peopled, full of history, and culturally conditioned -- never in the mode of naked intellectual deduction alone. Our moral life is lived in a world not of abstract functions and relations, but of persons and things, concrete times and places, feelings, longings, hopes, fears -- the characteristics, in other words, of our visions not our thoughts, and still less our internal mechanisms and drives.

It is customary to accuse Aristotle of "circularity" when he finally resolves the problem of moral choice in terms of what "the good man does." It seems to me, however, that in the shorthand style of the Nicomachean Ethics, we have in this appeal an important move, a stepping into moral life, into living, in the sense that I am trying to get at here. And, as you may have noted from the heading of this paper, even Kant himself, the supreme abstractionist, father to so much of contemporary moral and educational theory, insists that educationally it is not only rules for definition, but examples of action that must be considered.

NURTURING THE MORAL IMAGINATION

The problem, it sems to me, is that it is not simply moral rules but moral vision that is our concern. That is to say, images of what it means to be good, to do what is right, held in amoral imagination that gives a full account not merely of problems and principles, but of the rich context within which human beings always act. These images to which I refer are the moral images embedded in our culture, and our history. Because these images are embedded in a culture that transcends individuals and ages, they not only can be, but by nature are, transgenerational, linking us together rather than privatizing us as is so often the case in contemporary life. They are set in shared stories, enabling us to see our lives as stories -- stories that intersect and overlap with others' stories. They unite not only thought and emotion but the adult and the child. They are not images of moral principle, but of moral living -- though that does not mean that questions of principle are irrelevant to them.

In some further important respects moral images, set in social, cultural, and historical narratives, are potentially more fruitful than principles and definitions alone. Not only do they address life as it is or can be lived, they initiate moral reflection as a process. Perhaps even more importantly, they do not terminate it. Needless to say, conclusions must be drawn if human beings are to act, and the juridical mode reaches conclusions efficiently. Images of moral action, however, persist after the point of decision, continuing to draw us on and shape us. Our immediate thoughts and actions do not exhaust them.

By this point, I am sure you are saying, considering some examples of these "images," with all their mysterious power, is long overdue. They are, it seems to me, essentially of two kinds: real and fictional. They are mediated through history and biography and through literature, respectively. They rely upon art as the mode of appropriation -- but by art I do not mean some necessarily non- or contra-rational process. To be satisfactory for our purposes, they cannot be private, mere day dreams which we invent to please ourselves. They are communal. They are located in the culture and the history that we all both share and transmit, the latter not simply in the sense of "passing on", but continuously responding to and creating through our own speaking and actions.

Consider first two images, both in this case drawn from the Christian tradition. (The fact that they are drawn from the Christian tradition does not mean that no good moral images can be found outside it, nor that these images are unintelligible to others. Nor, conversely, does it means that images from outside this tradition are unintelligible within it -- crucial matters in a "pluralistic" society.) The images are Mother Theresa and the Good Samaritan in the biblical parable. One is contemporary, historical, "real." The other fictional, and (as is frequently the case) invented for a moral purpose.

The setting of the "Good Samaritan" is crucial. In this narrative, a lawyer interrogates Jesus, demanding a definition of the supreme moral-religious law. Jesus provides the orthodox formula: unqualified love of God and your neighbor. But the lawyer, wanting to "justify" or "vindicate" himself, poses a further problem: Who is my neighbor? How am I to recognize, to see him? The reply is a story, not a definition or a principle: A man, robbed and beaten and lying beside the road, is ignored by priest and Levite (both experts in making fine, principled judgments). An outcast Samaritan, taking pity (an affective response), washes him, bandages his wounds, carries him to an inn, pays his bill in advance, and promises to return. "Which," Jesus then asks, was "neighbor?" "The one who showed kindness," the lawyer responds. "Go and do as he did," Jesus concludes.

There is, of course, a complex of elements brought together in these few words, personal, political, theological. That is to say, there is an insight into life in a real world, and (thanks to the masterful art that forms and conveys the story to us) a world that is still real. We have no difficulty peopling it in contemporary terms. When you pass a derelict, a drunk or an accident victim on your comfortable way home, this story will haunt you, because you can't escape from it by invoking historical or cultural relativism. You can try to put it out of your mind, but you cannot really forget it, once you have heard it. There is emotion, thought, risk, sacrifice, continued responsibility -- all that and more. It was easy, as the lawyer knew, to give the principle; the question was what the principle meant in the sense of how it was carried out in living -- in a life that, because it is dynamic and personal and ongoing, cannot be captured in the most meticulous definition. Morality, character, virtue, is a doing, not merely a caring or thinking, and a doing requires a vision of action in context, not a formula. As Iris Murdoch insists, we must see the world rightly first, without "fantasy," as a part of seeing what is moral.[5] Finally, it is because it is a story, a narrative answer, that we can (indeed must) continue to puzzle over it, growing in our appreciation of it, as we continue living. It not only proposes a decision, it continues to judge us as we carry it out and long after that.

In the case of Mother Theresa, of course, we have a story still in process -- a story, it is worth noting, that continues the story we have just considered: When she found herself in India, she saw the poor lying in the streets, showed pity, carried them away, and paid their bill, for as long as it took. This was the simplest of acts: to enable human beings who have enjoyed no

dignity in life at least to die with dignity. As a "real" story, and a contemporary one, we can actually see her acts -- watch her hands and eyes, see her body as it expresses a consuming love totally without self-aggrandizement. We can hear her explanation of her acts -- her motives, principles, interpretations, and even her recommendations for us. And, we can go out tomorrow -- today, in fact -- and see right here in Venezuela those who, transformed by her story, are at work continuing her story. That is, we can do so if we dare. We probably won't, because that story is potentially revolutionary, socially (economically and politically), culturally, and personally. But the story won't go away -- if, that is, we choose to tell it and risk the vision it can bring about.

Finally, my original intent was to consider a third kind of image, one that might, broadly speaking, be called "secular" and, if possible, one that was Venezuelan in origin and context. Though admittedly I have had to search from afar, I have had difficulty finding any such story. When I first visited Caracas, my attention was drawn immediately to the three or four times daily playing of the national anthem on Venevisión, accompanied by illustrations from the life of Simón Bolívar. If it is still a custom, or if you remember it, I leave it to you to sort out the moral story in the jumble of nationalistic, militaristic and machismo images. It seemed to me nothing but a cartoon of an important life, crudely drawn and failing to manifest the richness of its subject. But it was, of course, an important moral image.

There are, I am told, for the very young the stories about "Uncle Rabbit and Uncle Tiger" (Tio Conejo and Tio Tigre), in which wiliness defeats threatening outside forces -- a domestic version of the Fables of La Fontaine, I presume, something like our Uncle Remus stories in the United States. Again, a significant "moral" image, especially in the absence of any others, but perhaps not the one we most want to communicate. There must be others, and better, but I must leave that to you.

We have, in the United States, a number of potential sources for the moral images I am talking about, though it is important to note that they are often considered old-fashioned and consequently not widely used in our schools. At the secondary level, for example, there is much that fills this function in the 19th and early 20th century fiction -- e.g., Melville's *Billy Budd* -- and a number of recent works by Walker Percy, James Agee, and Flannery O'Connor, to name only a few. Among the most powerful potential sources is Robert Bolt's splendid play, *A Man for All Seasons*, on the life of Thomas More (also available on film). The difficulty is that, when such works are included in the "literature" curriculum they are often looked at therapeutically rather than morally. They are, along with everything else, turned into psychological exercises designed to help us feel "normal" and "accepted," the exact opposite of the coming under judgment from outside our private lives that is characteristic of moral development. Sometimes they are included, but made the occasion simply for analysis, their plots examined for examples not of moral content, but of literary genres, or even the scientific "laws" of cause and effect! Not long ago, I saw a second grade class categorizing myths and fairy tales without once being asked to pay any attention to what they are trying to say. None of that will do, of course.

Among others, Coles singles out Harper Lee's brilliant novel, *To Kill A Mockingbird*, to show how the story (again, as a text or in its excellent screen version) can provoke the critical moral imagination of young and old. It is the story of Atticus Finch, a southern lawyer whose lot is to defend (unsuccessfully) a black man, Tom Robinson, on a charge of raping a "poor white" southern girl, Mayella Ewell. The main plot is seen through the eyes of Finch's two children, six-year-old "Scout" and her ten-year-old brother, Jem. There is also a sub-plot involving a mysterious neighbor, Boo Radley, a mentally handicapped boy who comes to the defense of the

children when the community vents its wrath on them because it cannot understand the father's willingness to do the simple, decent thing that his profession demands. Coles shows us how powerful these images are in stimulating moral reflection, in a concrete and personal way, by children and adults.

What does this mean for the content and program of moral education? It seems to me that Coles offers testimony that supports the ethic of vision held in the imagination about which I have been talking, though he does not propose to explain the process in the conventional sense. Coles draws few conclusions at all about the process in general. He finds it at bottom a kind of "mystery," which he addresses with remarks that are brief, open and tentative. Though couched in softly Freudian terms, they are designed rather to move us to a new kind of inquiry than to map authoritatively (let alone doctrinairly) the territory of moral development.

As Coles sees it, the process may go something like this: The child moves from the warm world of care for needs (the "garden," in Freud's terminology) and exclusive attention, innocent and self-satisfying to the experience of another form of concern. This concern involves a "No!" momentarily appearing to qualify love. The child struggles with self and others, give and take, limitation, a new sense of self and ideals, and a subjection to others' ideals -- the moral content of groups and institutions larger than the family. In this passage "east of Eden" there enter images that interpret and order conflict, shame, and confusion. Sometimes these are manifest in personal roles, the living witness of Martin Luther King, for example. Very often, he finds, they are Biblical. What does appear clear is that they are called for by events in which the persons find themselves. "A beckoning history," he says, "offers, uncannily, a blend of memory [of the goodness of the past] and desire; a chance of struggle for a new situation that holds a large promise, while earning along the way the approval of one's parents, neighbors, friends, and, not least, oneself." In short, "an ego ideal given a new lease on life and reality," the "moral life gets a wonderful charge of energy: an old dream has become newly sanctioned by a fateful turn of history." But, throughout, it is communicated and worked out in a vast array of images as the stuff of a moral imagination that sems vital to moral response.[6]

It is important to note, however, that these moral images need not be highly complex or philosophically contrived. Nor should they be, says even Kant, superheroic:

> But I wish they would spare them examples of so-called noble (super-meritorious) actions, which so fill our sentimental writings, and would refer everything to duty only and the worth which a man can and must give himself in his own eyes through the consciousness of not having transgressed his duty, since whatever runs up into empty wishes and longings for unattainable perfection produces mere heroes of romance, who, while priding themselves on their feeling of transcendent greatness, release themselves from observing the common and everyday responsibility, as petty and insignificant.[7]

We do not need Superman, of course, because he represents not a resolution of our problems but an escape from them by the intervention of a figure from outside. This, it seems to me, is not only a particularly important point in Venezuela -- consider, if you will, pre-election political scenes -- but also in the United States where secular (or not so secular) messiahs are becoming increasingly attractive as well. Yet, to make the simple task, the unsung responsibility, not merely "petty and insignificant" is a very difficult thing, especially after an age in which we have permitted ourselves to believe, as one United States school leader used to put it, that "every child can be a winner." My work takes me frequently into diaries and other biographical accounts of

very ordinary nineteenth century people. What often impresses me is just the way in which they see themselves as participating in an important, on-going history no matter how humble their roles. And it is just this quality that seems to separate us from these people and to measure in some sense our moral decline.

What, If Anything, Can We Do?

I will conclude with a few, very modest practical reflections. We cannot, I have been saying, simply transliterate philosophical or psychological talk into educational terms and have a regimen for moral education and character development. Philosophy, psychology and social science can contribute to a radically new regimen if, and only if, they are merged in a life of imagination and vision through which we do not "cure" the young or "set them straight," but in which we join together in the shared process of becoming good. Furthermore, I have been saying that the process is neither outside us nor forced upon us by some intractable social-cultural reality. Our ongoing history does call us, it does not coerce us. "Attribution" is not merely a defective psychological mechanism; it is at least an evil; it may indeed be a sin.

Whether my argument is accepted and, if so, what should follow from it, are questions that should properly be left to dialogue. What is most important, I have really been arguing, is for us to see the question in different terms as touching not only content and method, but cultural context as well. If "the culture" is both the source and the problem, what are we to do? How are we to build new (or revive old) images and narratives so that we can have a genuine moral story, a genuine moral history as a prelude to a "dreamed" future? There is, of course, no one culture anymore, a fact to which I have paid insufficient attention in spite of the fact that it has carefully been pointed out. And, to wait to transform all our societies and all our culture as a whole, is a counsel of perfection that immediately becomes a counsel of despair. We can, however, move to transform the institutions in which we choose to participate and for which we have genuine responsibility. The family (defective or not), the Church community and perhaps even our schools, are still open to our efforts in some sense. Business and politics, the conventional professions -- perhaps less certainly. What is certain, however, is that any change will involve us, not some target group -- our youth, transnational corporations, foreign militarists, or even a Medellin-type Cartel.

It would appear that only where there still remains some genuine pool of shared values can any of this reformation begin. And it is perhaps yet one more example of our modern hubris that we often prefer to think in grand, total terms. In the words of Stanley Hauerwas: "The development of men of truthful vision and virtue, however, will not come from wider society. Rather such men will come from the communities that have had the confidence in the truth of their images and symbols to use and embody them seriously and without embarrassment."[8]

Finally, I am really saying little more than many of your own leading thinkers and social critics have said, from Bolivar to Betancourt, not to mention a number of contemporary voices. The hope, the long dream, of a better world, a better nation, with more democracy and more justice, less poverty and less oppression for all, rests on the possibility of a shared moral vision. Nothing less. Without it, we shall be left condemned, in those poignant words of Bolivar, "to plow the seas."

School of Education

The Pennsylvania State University, PA

NOTES

1. Immanuel Kant. *Critique of Practical Reason and Other Writings in Moral Philosophy*, trans. and ed., Lewis White Beck (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949), Part II, "Methodology of Pure Practical Reason," pp. 251f.

As will be evident in the paper that follows, I do not attach this quotation because I think Kant provides us with the answers for moral education. Quite the reverse. However right he was about principles and rules, isolated as they are from history and human community, they furnish us with little understanding of our moral life. In this passage Kant means, of course, only to illustrate rules, not to find what is good and right by considering examples. When, however, he makes this concession to the problem of teaching persons to understand the good and the right, even seeing it as a kind of universal and natural phenomenon, he passes over something of great importance that his system cannot take account of. At the same time I do not want to suggest that Kant has nothing to say to us. That would be an equally egregious error.

2. Alexander Astin, in the 1987 Annual ACE-UCLA Study of the values of college students in the United States.

3. Robert Coles, *The Moral Life of Children* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1986), pp. 12, 13.

4. Craig R. Dykstra. *Vision and Character-A Christian Educator's Alternative to Kohlberg* (New York, Paulist Press, 1981).

5. Iris Murdoch, as discussed in Stanley Hauerwas. *Vision and Virtue-Essays in Christian Ethical Reflection* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1974).

6. Coles, pp. 30-35, the quotation is at p. 35.

7. Kant, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

8. Hauerwas, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECOMMENDED WORKS

Erikson, Erik H. (ed.). *Youth: Change and Challenge*. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Gustafson, James M., *Theology and Christian Ethics*. Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1974.

Knowles, Richard, ed. *Psychological Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development: An Integrated Theory of Moral Development*. Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1992.

Lynch, William F. *Images of Hope: Imagination as Healer of the Hopeless*. Baltimore: Helicon, 1965.

McLean, George, *et al.* (eds), *Act and Agent. Philosophical Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development*. Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1992. See esp. "Affectivity: the Power Base of Moral Behavior" by Sebastian A. Samay, pp. 71-114.

McLean, George and F. Ellrod, eds. *Philosophical Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development: Act and Agent*. Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1992.

Meyer, John R. (ed.). *Reflections on Value Education*. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1976.

Murdoch, Iris. *The Sovereignty of the Good*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

"The Sublime and the Good." *Chicago Review*, 13 (1959), pp. 37-58.

"Against Dryness: A Polemical Sketch." *Encounter*, 16 (1961)

"The Sublime and the Beautiful Revisited." *Yale Review*, 49 (1959).

Niebuhr, Helmut Richard. *The Responsible Self; An Essay in Christian Moral Philosophy*. James M. Gustafson (ed). New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Pears, David Francis (ed.). *The Nature of Metaphysics*. New York: St. Martins Press, 1957.

Ramsey, Ian T. (ed). *Christian Ethics and Contemporary Philosophy*. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Ryan, Kevin and Thomas Lickona, ed. *Character Development in Schools and Beyond*. Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1992.

Warnock, Mary. *Imagination*. London: Faber and Faber, 1976.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT