You can't teach ethics in school

Ancient philosophy & modern education

Jeremy Bendik-Keymer Beamer-Schneider Professor in Ethics Associate Professor of Philosophy Case Western Reserve University bendik-keymer@case.edu

- 1. Ethics. Character keyed to the good (the good = how one ought to live)
 - Not behavior < That's not ethics, but conformity.>
 - Not *policy* < That's not ethics, but ways of shaping groups from the outside.>
 - x An <u>inner</u> component: motivation > **disposition**

temper(ing) /

x An <u>outer</u> component: behavior > **realization** consequence / = ethics

- 2. Modern preoccupations.
 - x Political liberty < The inner is only my business.>
 - * Main source: anti-authoritarianism (Enlightenment critique of authority)
 - x Bureaucracy < Codes rule the < social> world.>
 - * Main source: mass society (<industrial> economies of scale)
 - Though of different origins, <industrial> bureaucracy and <anti-authoritarian> political liberty compliment each other: for both, to teach ethics is to teach code (the outer).
 - The inner world drops out.
 - We teach the right < rights > and not the good < personal life-style >. < The good subject to the right >
- 3. Ancient philosophy. <ethike / work on ethos>
 - $x \varphi < philosophy > is a way of life < an ethos (i) > .$
 - x Ethike is work on a whole way of life (incl. a whole character <an ethos (ii)>)
 - + Inner + outer
 - + Disposition + realization
 - Moral psychology formation & behavioral habituation are crucial.
 - cf. Plato's *Politike* (*Republic*)
 - < The right part of the good.>
- 4. Problems. <as propositions & a question>
 - + Without work on the inner world, we don't have ethics, only conformity (robots).
 - + If we determine the inner world of others, we violate their liberty (brain-washing).
 - ? How can we teach ethics without violating liberty?
- 5. False answers.
 - 1: "Teach code." (The professionalism route (i)) This is not ethics.
 - 2: "Teach consequences." (The professional route (ii)) This is not ethics, either.
 - 3: "Inculcate *the* vision of the good life." (The <authoritarian> religious route) *This is illiberal –it is unethical.*
 - 4: "Don't do anything." (The secular route) This is, ironically, also illiberal—for the school's form of life does include its own vision of the good life, at least partially.

- 6. Why political liberty? <a response to the <authoritarian> religious route>
 - + Piety demands conscience (personal exercise of moral discernment).
 - + Conscience demands judgment.
 - + Good judgment demands autonomy.
 - + Autonomy is best cultivated under political liberty as opposed to its lack (and tends to be undermined by its lack.)
 - + In any religion where *interpretation* is part of piety, a similar argument applies.
- 7. What did the ancients do? <school as an entirely ethical experience>
 - Contrary to the secular route, ancient schools of φ –e.g., the Platonists, Aristotelians, Stoics, Epicureans, Skeptics, Cynics, or neo-Platonists- understood that *<the structure of school and its activities express a vision of the good life, at least partially>*.
 - The ancient schools of φ likewise understood that the heart of ethics is *disposition*.
 - Further, they understood that disposition is *shaped* and that shaping is *largely indirect* -a *matter of environmental osmosis and routine habituation into ways of doing and experiencing things.*
 - While some of their exercises were theoretical, just as many were *practical* or *relational*, concerned with developing a whole, human life, not just an intellectualized view of the world.
 - Accordingly, the *manner* of teaching and the *design* of the school were just as important as the *content* of theoretical discussions —and so were the activities students and teachers did together (such as cooking together, tending the garden, or fixing the commune) as well as the way the teachers lived.
 - Yes, then, < schools were communal>.
- 8. Liberty is a partial ethics. < How can we teach ethics at school without violating liberty? -part 1>
 - First, we need to accept that liberty is a part of the good life, understood as a necessary condition, and that this is reflected in the modern priority of the right over the good. What that priority shows is that no account of the good life can be good if it is illiberal, and this is a substantive decision about what counts as good –i.e., it is a partial vision of the good life already, contrary to what many liberals claim.
 - Second, we need to focus on the fact that *ethically* speaking, liberty has a *dispositional* component. Indeed, this is something modern psychotherapy has considered since its inception over a century ago. *<Souls can be more or less illiberal.>* But this means that *in addition to political liberty, we must consider* **ethical liberty** –the ethical component of living with political liberty.
 - + < A soul disposed to liberty **has no problem** letting other people make up their own minds.>
 - + < A soul disposed to liberty wants to do things because they make personal sense.>
 - + <A soul disposed to liberty shuns being rushed, pressed, or forced into things that make no personal sense.>
 - + <A soul disposed to liberty takes affront at the oppression, subjection, coercion or even peer-pressuring of others.>
 - + < A soul disposed to liberty takes affront at claims or conditions that assault or inhibit truth-finding and rational, emotionally open discussion.>
 - + < A school disposing students to liberty is designed with the dispositions of liberty in mind.>
 - φ: <It gives **space for people** to make up their own minds.>
 - ϕ : <It develops people's personal and interpersonal sense; it is the opposite of impersonal.>
 - φ : $\langle It \, gives \, people \, time. \rangle$
 - φ: < It blocks oppression, subjection, or coercion, validates individuality, and finds ways to give students release from peer pressure.>
 - $\phi: \le \mathit{It}$ reliably defends the space of truth-finding and of rational, emotionally open discussion.>

- 9. Teaching a "grip of the good" is consistent with liberty. <How can we teach ethics at school without violating liberty? -part 2>
 - ϕ : The "grip of the good" is a person's ability to comes to terms with and to find in rational and emotionally open ways what is good.
 - φ: Teaching it involves teaching the category of the good and its place and manner of use in a human life with judgment. It involves teaching how to think about the judgment "good" and how to live with whatever is judged good. It also involves teaching how to relate to a world with good in it.
 - φ : It involves being exposed to the *art of living*.
 - φ : It involves being exposed to many ways of living (many grips of the good).
- 10. Where many schools actually fail to teach ethics.
 - Clearly, schools that think they teach ethics when they instruct people about codes or provide reasoning about consequences are failing to teach ethics.
 - Clearly, schools that teach one vision of the good life, dogmatically, are failing to be ethical and so to teach ethics.
 - But also schools which

do not give people space are impersonal rush people fail to block oppression, subjection or coercion (e.g., rape, harassment, racism) do not validate individuality encourage or do not vent peer pressure (e.g., in unreflective 'Greek life') do not defend or encourage rational discussion do not defend or encourage emotionally open discussion do not teach students how to get a grip on the good by coming to terms with what makes personal sense as good learning how to look for reasons and to reason learning how to be emotionally open learning how to judge learning how to live with what one judges as good relating to a world with good in it seeing living as an art, and experiencing that art

encountering many ways of living artfully with a grip of the good

are (at least partially) failing to teach ethics, too.

+ But the reason for the failure is not because you can't teach ethics in school. That belief is a modern, optical illusion –produced by the foundational role of liberty- perhaps helping educators not try hard enough to be ethical, i.e., serving as a cover for moral corruption, failure of imagination, or for weakness of will.