Actes du Congrès
COLLÈGES CÉLÉBRATIONS 92
Conference Proceedings

COLLÈGES 92 CÉLÉBRATIONS

MONTRÉAL MAY 24 25 26 27 MAI 1992

Les éducateurs et le chemin de l'espoir: la célébration de l'avenir

Educators and Travelling-in-hope : Celebrating the Future

Un vide s'est créé dans nos vies et nous cherchons à le combler. Dans notre quête, la peur, mais aussi l'optimisme et l'espoir. Toffler a décrit la nature changeante du pouvoir: de la force à l'argent, de l'argent au savoir. Les éducateurs oeuvrent dans le domaine du savoir, donc du pouvoir. Un code d'éthique doit encadrer les éducateurs pour que leur pouvoir soit utilisé avec sagesse et bonté. Les étudiants ont besoin de faire leur chemin de l'espoir pour pouvoir ensuite célébrer l'avenir.

A space or even a void has opened in our individual and collective lives. We are searching for ways to fill this. Crisis — danger and opportunity — but also, optimism and hope are present. Toffler describes a «power shift» — from force, to money, to knowledge. Educators deal in knowledge and, therefore, power. Ethics must govern educators to ensure this power is wisely, humanely, fairly and compassionately used. Students need to travel-in-hope to celebrate the future.

MARGARET A. SOMERVILLE
professeure
Centre McGill de médecine, d'éthique et de droit
Montréal (Québec)

MARGARET A. SOMERVILLE
Professor
McGill Centre for Medicine, Ethics and Law
Montreal (Quebec)

Madame Somerville a été pharmacienne puis avocate en Australie avant d'entreprendre une carrière au Canada. En plus de son travail à l'Université McGill, elle agit comme consultante auprès de gouvernements et d'organismes non gouvernementaux, notamment l'Organisation mondiale de la santé; elle donne aussi fréquemment des conférences, tant au pays qu'à l'étranger, sur des questions relatives à la médecine, l'éthique et la loi.

Ses recherches portent, entre autres, sur les personnes âgées et le vieillissement, la génétique, les technologies de la reproduction et la recherche médicale.

Dr. Margaret A. Somerville AM, F.R.S.C. was both a practising pharmacist and lawyer in Australia, before beginning her academic career in Canada.
Dr. Somerville is very active in « presenting » medicine, ethics and law in all forms of media and undertakes a heavy schedule as a speaker and writer both nationally and internationally in wide-ranging subject areas. She acts as a consultant to governments and non-governmental bodies, in particular, the Global Program on AIDS of the World Health Organization. Her work also includes issues related to aged persons and aging, reproductive technology, genetics, medical malpractice, human medical research, etc.

Conférence 1B2

Collèges créateurs d'avenir

Colleges creators of the future

Association des collèges communautaires du Canada

Association québécoise de pédagogie collégiale

7000, rue Marie-Victorin, Montréal (Québec) H1G 2J6 • (514) 325-0150, poste 2210 • Télécopieur: (514) 328-3830

EDUCATORS AND TRAVELLING-IN-HOPE: CELEBRATING THE FUTURE

Thank you very much for that kind introduction and it is, indeed, a pleasure to be here. My comments today, concern a concept already referred to in the opening speech we heard this morning -this notion of ethics. We need to be careful what we or others mean in using the word ethics. It is one of those words that has an everyday meaning, that we have used for a long time, and of which we think we know the meaning; but it may also have new or technical meanings with which we are not familiar. Some of the special meanings of the word ethics, and how these are relevant to educators, is, in part, what I wish to explore today. I heard a story, recently, relevant to the area of AIDS education, that provides an insight in this respect - it also reassured us that our AIDS education is working. The story was that two five year olds were talking. One of them said to the other: "I found a condom under the veranda." The other said: "What's a veranda?". The word ethics is like the word veranda. We expect everybody to know what it means, but they may not, especially when it is used in a special or technical sense.

I would now like to address, briefly, five questions: First, "What is ethics?".   Second, "Why is there a perceived need for ethics right now?". (Everywhere we turn we find people are talking about ethics. For instance, I was recently on an Air Canada flight to Vancouver. I took out the EnRoute magazine and, on the front cover, it had a drawing of a businessman in a three-piece, grey, pinstripe suit with angel's wings, a halo and a briefcase. The article which related to this image, addressed the need for business ethics.) Third, "Why have new technologies given rise to a societal discussion of ethics?" - one of the issues already raised, here, this morning. Fourth, "Has our search for ethics caused change?". And, fifth, "What role do educators have in the search for ethics?".

I.   "What is ethics?"

Ethics as a sub-discipline of philosophy is very old. I was emphatically reminded of this, recently, by a group of French professors of philosophy whom I met in Paris. They told me that they did not want to hear about any of this "new North American nonsense" we call ethics. They said "they" had been studying ethics for centuries, in their universities, and were quite disdainful of persons who acted as though ethics had just been "discovered", in particular, by those persons, themselves. Why is it that, suddenly, we think that we have "found ethics", or, at least, discovered something new about ethics? The answer may be that we are involved in what can be called "applied ethics" and, to some extent, this _is_ new and different.

1

Applied ethics includes ethics in the sense in which philosophers use this term - the study and discussion of ethics - but it involves more than this, it takes ethics out into the world. In "applied ethics" we try to use ethics as a structured discipline (indeed, one verging on becoming a profession in some contexts, such as medicine), in order to help us to deal appropriately with very important and complex problems arising at both individual and societal levels.

This distinction between traditional approaches to ethics and "applied ethics", can also be made in another way. We can compare talking about ethics - which is one way to describe ethics as a sub-discipline of philosophy - with doing ethics - "applied ethics". We can understand this distinction if we consider the difference between talking about law, or talking about psychiatry, and doing law and doing psychiatry, respectively. Like "applied ethics", both law and psychiatry are disciplines which use words, not only, to talk about the discipline, but also, as their tools of trade. There is a great difference between talking about a statute and what a judge might decide or even has decided with respect to that statute, and being in court, in an adversarial process, and the court deciding in a case before it, which version or interpretation of that statute will rule. The latter is what I mean by "doing law", as compared with "talking about law". Similarly, psychoanalysis is a good example of "doing psychiatry" and can be compared to going to a conference and "talking about psychoanalysis". The same distinction is true of ethics; we can both talk about and do ethics.

There are no standard or universally accepted definitions of "applied ethics", but, as a working definition, I would propose the following: **the exercise of disciplined, informed discernment in order to identify and examine the decision options available in "real world" situations of conflict of moral values.** It is very important that we do not think of engaging in applied ethics as giving us a "right" answer to a problem. Rather, what it most often provides is a range of decision options, as a result of using "right" decision-making process. The values that can be applied to a situation include one's own, one's group's, one's school's, or our society's, but sometimes these will conflict. Applied ethics is a process which helps us to decide which of these values should be given priority in a particular case. It is also sometimes helpful to think of applied ethics as being fluid, in the sense that the process and the outcomes to which it gives rise, are subject to movement and change. One image that comes to mind in this respect is to regard applied ethics - doing ethics - as a continuum, along which we can move back and forth, and certainly not as a digital model that gives a black or white answer to an ethical problem.

Another feature of applied ethics, which has been insufficiently emphasized, is that there are different schools of

ethics, usually related to different value bases. Depending on which school of ethics you "come from" or use, you may have a very different perception of what are the ethics of and in a given situation. It is possible only to mention, briefly, here, some of these schools, each of which has a different "informing principle". Very simplistically stated, for instance, the **deontological** school of ethics is based on a concept of obligations. These obligations give rise to rules, which are applied to deal with ethical dilemmas. **Utilitarianism**, another school, as you no doubt know, is based on a principle of doing the greatest good for the greatest number of persons. **Consequentialism** can be compared with utilitarianism. One chooses the most desirable consequences from an ethical point of view (which can be, but is not necessarily, the greatest good for the greatest number), and finds and then takes the course of action that will give rise to those consequences. **Situational ethics** is, more or less, the opposite to deontological ethics. A situational ethics approach starts from a premise that there are no absolute rules determining what is ethical and what is not. Rather, every situation needs to be analyzed as it occurs and changes, to determine what is required in order to act ethically in that situation.

It is suggested - and we are starting to try to do this - that we may need "multi-variate" analysis of situations raising ethical dilemmas, including from the perspectives of different schools of ethics. What is meant here can be envisioned, by imagining placing the situation that is raising ethical issues, in the centre of a circle, and, ideally, persons from each school of ethics, persons from different disciplines, and persons from society, in general, would each shine "the light of their lenses" on that problem. Hopefully, this would result in ethical "white light", an integrated perspective on what we are dealing with and what is required ethically. In the past, we may, rather, have engaged in "battles" between different schools of ethics (which battles are also one way in which conflict of values can be manifested), without any concept that integration was needed or of the methodologies required for that integration. It should be pointed out, that this concept of integration is not the same as resolution of all conflict or, necessarily, of compromise. The former may not be possible and the latter, sometimes, undesirable or even unethical for some persons in some circumstances. Rather, the model envisaged would hold such conflicts in, hopefully, creative tension, while allowing the situation raising the conflicts to be dealt with in the "best" way possible, from an ethical perspective. Because applied ethics operates in the "real world", we, usually, do not have the luxury of postponing a decision. Like the judge who has a case before him or her, or the surgeon, who must decide whether or not to amputate a gangrenous limb, in situations involving applied ethics, a decision is unavoidable, it is simply a matter of what that decision will be. In such circumstances, even a decision not to decide, is, itself, an operative decision.

It is, also, necessary that we recognize, that in "doing ethics", individual conscience is essential, but it is not sufficient for good ethics. Less now, but, frequently, ten or more years ago, one would hear physicians say: "I and all my fellow physicians are persons of good conscience. There is no need for safeguard mechanisms such as research and clinical ethics committees." Most physicians are of good conscience, but this is not sufficient to ensure that ethics is always "done", even by these physicians.

In one respect, ethics may be like justice - that we tend to identify it more when it is not present, than when it is. We tend to identify what is unjust, rather than labelling everything else as just. Similarly, we have identified the lack of ethics, rather than its presence. We still need to be highly sensitive to failures of ethics, but we are now also developing a more positive and proactive stance with respect to ethics. We try to "do ethics", before the unethical has occurred, rather than using ethics simply as a reparative mechanism.

Ethics is concerned with morals and values. Ethics is, especially, concerned with ordering values. We need to identify values and, when they are in conflict, order them. If an ordering process is to be undertaken, the crucial questions are: Who decides what is ethical? On what basis do they decide? And, using which procedures? We could spend a great deal of time exploring these three questions. They are fundamental to determining what will be held to be ethical and what will not, because who decides, on what basis, using which procedures, determines which concept of ethics dominates, when not all can be fulfilled. We have to face the fact that when there is conflict of values, a certain view of ethics will need to dominate, and the issue is how this view will be chosen. This means that there is power involved in "doing ethics" - it is a new form of exercise of power. As is true for all exercises of power, power exercised through "doing ethics" must be handled very carefully, indeed, ethically.

II. Why is there a perceived need for ethics now?

Ethics is a reaction to fill a void. There has been a decline in adherence to organized religion and, concurrently, a rise in faith in technology, in particular, in modern miracle medicine. Whether or not the latter was caused by the former, is an interesting question. This faith in technology has been severely shaken - especially in the last five to ten years - and this has left a void: the "faith space" seems empty. One reason we are searching for ethics, is to fill this void.

Why was our faith in technology shaken? First, technology as we now realize (and tended not to realize, initially) can carry serious risks. It can, also, be used to effectuate non-natural

events - that is, events that could never occur in nature - which can be a frightening possibility, both in itself and with respect to unknown risks. Probably, the most striking non-natural event we could create with new technology, would be to use reproductive technology to allow men to have babies; it would be dangerous for the men, but it is theoretically possible. We have, however, used this same technology to achieve other non-natural outcomes that we now regard as more-or-less "normal". For instance, grandmothers have given birth to their grandchildren - as gestational mothers of babies created from their daughter's ova - and, likewise, sisters to their sister's babies. These outcomes are relatively easy to achieve with reproductive technology, or at least no more difficult than a woman giving birth to a baby which is not genetically related to her. It is also possible that a woman could give birth to her own identical twin. This would occur, if one were to create a female embryo through in vitro fertilization, at the eight cell stage of development, split it to form two identical embryos and implant one of these in a woman, who gives birth to a child. The other embryo would be frozen in liquid nitrogen at - 273°C. When the first child grows up, the frozen embryo could be transferred to her uterus and she could give birth to her genetically identical twin. This technology also means that there could be identical twins with a major difference between them in terms of chronological age - they could, indeed, belong to different generations, an until now, impossible situation.

Another reason, why we have lost faith in technology, and experienced fear as a result, falls on the other end of a scale on which technological miracles constitute one end point. Technology has failed to provide a magic bullet for some situations that are very frightening to most people from both individual and societal perspectives. For instance, AIDS shows that we are still subject to nature and that technology cannot cure all ills. Review of the public health literature of the 1970s, shows that it was confidently proclaimed that we would never see another infectious disease epidemic - a pandemic - that could wipe out a major part of the world's population. Within five years of those predictions being made, AIDS had been recognized. In short, we moved our faith from religion to medicine, and that faith is now being challenged by situations such as AIDS. An important insight to be gained from recognizing this change of focus of our faith, and the challenges to our new version of faith, is that we still have a phenomenon of faith operating in our secular societies. This recognition is important, because we need to examine how to handle that phenomenon, and we cannot do this, unless we first recognize it.

A second reason why technology causes us to search for ethics, is that it causes us to realize that there is no consensus on values in a pluralistic society. Modern communications technology is largely responsible for the widespread recognition of this lack of consensus, which includes lack of consensus with respect to the values which should govern development and use of the new

5

technologies, themselves. In some situations, the only value on which consensus may exist is that we must use a "right" decision-making process. The rules of "natural justice" are the bottom line of "right process": persons have a right to an impartial judge and the right to be heard.

Yet other changes that have caused us to search for ethics, include a loss of trust in politicians and political institutions, a rise in the level of education of the general public (for which educators are largely responsible), plus the effect of the media. These and other factors have given rise to a feeling that we, as the general population, are competent and entitled to judge our leaders. This has not been a widespread belief or feeling in past societies.

In summary, for the above reasons, among others, there may be a feeling among many people that in both our individual and collective lives, even in a secular world, there is a space that needs to be filled by what can be called, in a non-religious sense, faith, hope and charity. We may come to a new secular realization, that we still need the essence -the substance - that was represented by these old virtues. The absence of a façade of adherence to religion, which façade was true for many people in the past, may have caused us to realize, more acutely, that we have a "space for spirit", query, even for the spiritual. The search for ethics in the professions, in science and, more recently, in industry and business (in a sense, we may always have searched for ethics in the arts), is a major manifestation of our efforts to fill this space and to find the spirit that we need. If, indeed, this is a correct analysis of what is happening, it means that our search for ethics is a response to a major challenge.

Yet, another reason why we may be searching for ethics is as a reaction to reification of persons. Reification means regarding persons as nothing more than a thing, a cipher, a number. Transplant technology gives rise to what is called a modular theory of human identity. A person is no longer a unique whole, but simply a collection of disposable and interchangeable parts.

We may, also, be searching for ethics as a corrective mechanism to trends to increasing uniformity of treatment of persons, to de-personalization of them, and to disidentification from our world and the persons in it. To some extent this may be a self-defence or denial mechanism, when we are faced with global media personalizing the horrors of war and starvation and bringing these into our homes each night. Indeed, trying to detach from this horror may indicate a more humane reaction - and, therefore, some hope for remedying such situations in the future - than does cold indifference. Often, we regard trends towards recognition of individual rights, especially those of self-determination and autonomy, as corrective counter-trends to de-personalization and disidentification, but they may not be. These trends, too, can

have de-humanizing disconnecting effects. When taken to an extreme, they can cause the individual to be totally isolated as an individual, and can cause us to fail to recognize that in order to be fully human, we need to be respected both as an individual and a member of a family, group or community.

This leads to yet another possible reason why we might be searching for ethics. It may be a search for a means to affirm the value of the ultimate worth of every person, while, at the same time, striking an acceptable balance between conflicting claims of individuals and the community. On the one hand, giving priority to the interests of the community, can be seen as detracting from the worth of the individual. On the other hand, giving some priority to the collective, when this is clearly justified, has a different impact when this is done in order to have a community in which the individual can be most fully human - which is true of all of us, except dedicated hermits. Such analysis allows us to maintain respect for the individual and protection of the community on the same value track, rather than conflicting ones. Our search for ethics may be one way in which we are seeking to bring respect for the individual and protection of the community into line, and trying to resolve conflicts between them in the way that is least damaging to each.

We may, also, be searching for ethics, as a protective reaction. Our recognition of the space or void, of which I have spoken, is very likely to have positive and beneficial outcomes, when we seek to fill it in an ethical manner. But, this space could also be filled by wrong-doing and harm, it has even been suggested, in some contexts, by a new Hitler. Could it even be that the recent increase in "neo-nazi" activity is related to this same phenomenon of a feeling of a space or void? The search for ethics is a protective mechanism to the extent that it helps to ensure the space is filled by "good" and not by "evil".

A yet deeper reason for the search for ethics, is that this may be a search for trust. There has been a shift from "blind" trust to "earned" trust, from "blind" authority to "earned" authority. Earned trust is not based on status, power or authority, but on demonstrated trustworthiness. Trust will become increasingly important - especially in a "global community". Ethics has much to do with establishing and maintaining trust. In particular, breaches of ethics are antithetical to establishing trust, if trust has to be earned, but this is not true of "blind trust". In other words, ethics is an essential foundation of a society based on "earned trust", but not necessarily of one based on "blind trust".

We have many instances of breach of trust in our society, although not all may be directly identified as such. For instance, the situations that result in divorce and medical malpractice actions, and these actions, themselves, are both commonly

experienced as breaches of trust. In these situations a positive emotional content relationship, which both marriage and physician-patient relationships usually are at the beginning, are converted to negative emotional content relationships. Positive and negative emotions - love and hate - are not opposites of each other, rather, neutrality is the opposite of both. Breach of trust generates hostility, which is acted out as a divorce or malpractice action. If we could intervene or mediate in order to help to maintain a feeling that trust is still possible (even if only in persons other than the "transgressor"), we might do much to help people in these situations, especially children caught in the fall-out from them. So often, these persons experience the breach of trust to which they have been subject, as so overwhelming, that they generalize it widely beyond the situation and persons involved, and experience severe additional suffering as a result.

We often hear that society was based more on trust in previous times, than it is now. This may not be true. Comparing what people used to eat one or two hundred years ago and now, provides an example in this respect. Most families, or their immediate neighbours, grew or killed the food they ate. This meant that there did not need to be a great deal of trust, as to whether the food that was on the table was safe to eat. Compare this with the same situation today, with respect to almost everything that we eat. We need to have enormous trust regarding the food processing systems in other countries from which that food has come from - who has handled it, how it has been grown, transported, preserved, etcetera. I believe that we are in the process of establishing greater trust in society, in general, than in previous times, without necessarily having recognized that this is happening.

This new form of trust, "earned trust", is also linked with education. Both displacing systems based on "blind trust" and implementing systems founded on "earned trust" require information and understanding. Understanding means that we need to make our knowledge base accessible to everybody in our community, and that has much to do with educators.

III. <u>Why have new technologies given rise to a societal discussion of ethics?</u>

This question is addressed, in part, in considering "why is there a perceived need for ethics, now?", which is discussed above.

Medical technology, especially organ transplantation, had a major impact on our individual and societal psyches: transplantation was and is a dramatic and non-natural event, especially heart transplantation. The ancient symbol of life, the heart, while beating, was taken out of a dead person and transplanted into a person, who would live as a result. We cannot overestimate the impact that our ability to do this, had on us as

individuals and a society. One response to this impact, was to realize the need to ensure that ethics governed how we used such technologies.

Technology gave control; it meant that some outcomes which were "unthinkable", because we had not even imagined them, became not only "thinkable", but "doable". Technology means that there is more that we can do than we will do, or than we ought (have obligations) to do, and there are some things that we ought not (have obligations not) to do. Control gives rise to a greater sense of responsibility - it causes a shift from having no other option but to allow chance to operate, to being able to rely on choice, and choice carries greater responsibility.

Technology is not neutral in terms of its impact on values. We need only consider the impact on values of the debates surrounding "birth" and "death" technologies to understand this. The same is true for much other technology.

Technology increased our power, but also, paradoxically, our sense of uncertainty and the anxiety that accompanies this. This occurs, among other reasons, because:

- the more we know (and technology increases our knowledge), the more we know that we do not know, which increases anxiety;

- we can be controlled through the use of technology;

- our world can be destroyed by technology "run wild";

- our spirits can be annihilated by "technology as the new God": it could result in intense dehumanization, depersonalization, and disidentification from other persons and our world;

- we are increasingly aware that even our beneficial technologies carry harms and risks;

- the certainty of the information that technology can provide, may make us more anxious, consider, for example, genetic testing;

- information that technology provides regarding chances of harm (risks), can increase our sense of uncertainty and may not be able to be dealt with in comfort by our individual psyches or collective psyche; and

- the anxiety of choice that technology can provide, for example, the possibility of choosing the sex of our children, may be very difficult to deal with.

We may even have developed a "technophobia". We have, possibly, selected some technologies, not even the most harmful, as

9

the focus of, or vehicle for, this phobia. For example, we may remove asbestos from school walls, although to do this creates more risk for children in the school from asbestos, than if the asbestos were left untouched.

Ethics may help us deal with these anxieties, uncertainties, and fears in a constructive manner, because ethics can allow us to feel that we have some <u>value assessment mechanism</u> operating. In short, we may be less fearful of, and more comfortable with, risk-taking in situations which we see as being governed by ethics. As a result, ethics may encourage hope and realistic optimism, characteristics which are essential to us both as individuals and a society. If ethics does have such an effect, could ethics be viewed as a personal and societal anti-depression "medication"?

IV. <u>Has our search for ethics caused change?</u>

Our search for ethics has caused change. Some of these changes may be subtle and even appear insignificant, at first, but many of them have major impact. For instance, to take a somewhat technical example, we have changed from what can be described as analysis from law to ethics, to analyzing from ethics to law. In the past, we used to ask, in particular, in the professions - "is 'it' legal?". If 'it' was legal, we did not, often, even ask any another question, and simply assumed the conduct involved was acceptable. Then we started to ask, not only, "is 'it' legal?", but also, although secondarily, "is 'it' ethical?". Today, there are many professionals more concerned to ask, "is 'it' ethical?", than, "is 'it' legal?".

This new approach to analysis, means that when law and ethics conflict, we must try to bring the law into line with ethics, and not vice versa. It is possible that this change in the order of analysis, is the single most important change in both legal and ethical analysis, that has taken place in the last twenty years. It has been largely facilitated in Canada, by implementation of the <u>Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms</u>. One vision of the Charter is that it is a statement of ethics for a secular, pluralistic society. The ethics contained in the Charter are implemented through law and legal reasoning, but it is fundamentally an ethical statement and instrument. It is possible for the <u>Charter</u> to function as such, because of the broad discretionary powers enshrined in it, which operate through concepts such as the rules of fundamental justice; rights to life, liberty and security; determinations of what are acceptable and unacceptable intrusions of the state on individuals in a free and democratic society; and prohibitions on wrongful discrimination. This is why the <u>Charter</u> is important to our search for ethics in and as a Canadian society.

One question that can be raised here, is should the same reversal of analysis take place in examining what is required in

situations that involve the relationship between ethics and education? Have we been arguing from education to ethics, rather than from ethics to what is required in education? Could this conference in focusing on ethics in education, even be an example of a change in the basis of this analysis? Whether we start our analysis from education or from ethics - the choice of what we call initial presumption - is not neutral. Initial presumptions colour the entire discourse. They also establish the burden of proof. For instance, should we regard education, primarily, until proven otherwise, as a great research project - as experimentation on human subjects, in particular, those who are too young to consent for themselves or who are obligated by law to submit to the education experiment until they are above a certain age? Or should education be regarded, primarily, as "standard practice"? In the latter case, when do our educational interventions cross the line from being practice to research? How do we differentiate between them? What does ethics require in relation to education that is "practice", and in relation to that which is research? What does the law require? These will become increasingly important questions. The search for ethics raises sensitivity to the fact that we can do harm and create risks, even when our interventions are well-intentioned, as our education efforts almost invariably are. Indeed, we are, sometimes, most in danger of doing harm, when we are purporting to "do good".

V.   What role do educators have in the search for ethics?

Ethics is not just a fashion. The search for ethics represents A GENERATION'S REVOLUTION IN CONSCIOUSNESS and is a cause of fundamental change. A major part of this search is being carried out in the professions - which include education. Professions in a secular, end-of-the-twentieth-century Western world, are value forming, value carrying, value affirming, value destroying institutions. Our actions as professionals have these "value effects", not just for individuals or the professions, but for society as a whole. Moreover, what we do as professionals and professions has not only a conscious reality, but also, unconscious sources, and carries symbolism. Symbolism sets the ETHICAL AND LEGAL TONE OF SOCIETY. Another way to express this, is to propose that not only individuals, but also society has a psyche, an important component of which is values. If so, we must ask how do and should educators, and the profession of education, contribute to, affirm, or detract from such values and other contents of society's psyche? Ethics will be an important guide in addressing this question.

Educators, possibly uniquely, have a dual role in relation to the search for ethics. They need to develop the characteristics needed for the search, not only, in themselves, but also, in those others whom they have the privilege and responsibility of educating.

11

Characteristics of <u>the searcher</u> will include the need for "active tolerance", judgement, courage, wisdom and good humour (in the sense of seeing matters in perspective, in balance). Characteristics of <u>the search</u> include a need for intellectual integrity, honesty, information, insight, intuition - that is, a need to engage in all "ways of knowing", not just left brain, cognitive functioning - what DeBono has called "water logic", in comparison with "stone logic", is required.

An essential characteristic of the <u>search methodology</u> will be <u>transdisciplinarity</u>. This contemplates interaction at a level above disciplinary activity, in which we seek to develop integrated knowledge entities, with which to address complex and difficult societal issues. Fundamental to transdisciplinarity is that it includes a feedback loop to the community, which, in turn, must have substantial input into the process, particularly, when this process is being used to deal with ethical issues. It will be a crucial role of educators, to prepare all people to engage in transdisciplinary activity. In particular, to return to an earlier theme, transdisciplinary process will require "earned" trust on the part of all participants at all levels, and educators must also foster the development of such trust.

Conclusion

We live in an extraordinary world, the future of which is likely to be even more extraordinary. It is a world in which we can anticipate explorations of vast outer space - the universe - and vast inner space - our own human genetic blueprint - even more awe-inspiring than those of the very recent past. These possibilities and potentials are exciting and frightening, hopeful and threatening.

Paradoxically, our amazing new technological powers may mean that we will come to appreciate the incorporeal, undefinable, indomitable, human spirit even more than in the past. Some questions may hint at the nature of the challenges to that spirit, that we will certainly encounter. For example, can we both maintain our respect for the claims or rights of individuals and protect the collectivity, whether the family, the group or society, itself? Will our new knowledge take away our capacity for optimism, joy in life and hope for the future, or will we evolve new ways to maintain these? Can we no longer rely on the boundaries and barriers of the past, including artificial or symbolic ones, when we share a single world with modern travel and communications technology? But, do current counter-trends towards "tribalization" indicate that we will try to hold on to separation devices at the same time as our reality becomes, or is, a global one? It will be an enormous challenge, including, to our present forms of government and institutions, to decide how we should develop with the change we will encounter. Almost certainly, some

features of democracy will need deep consideration and, possibly, change. For instance, to take just two small examples, the use of sophisticated market survey techniques to "manipulate" an electorate may be inconsistent with the true spirit of democracy, as, indeed, may be "undue" pressure from special interest groups.

There will be many complex questions which persons of the future will need to handle calmly, openly, tolerantly, with honesty and integrity, and courageously. You, as educators, have a major challenge in opening-up the enormous excitement of the exploration that can be undertaken, without causing fear, anxiety and loss of hope. In particular, people need to be given a sense of "the light on the hill" - a sense that there are human values and ethical missions which can be the most important objectives to search for in one's life. Moreover, at the present time, we have a special obligation to help those who entrust their education to us, to realize that materialism is not the only, or the most important, value. In a world in which so many have so little, even from a selfish point of view, if any of us are to survive, we will need to share and to provide for others in imaginative new ways. Educators are the sherpas, the guides, and the transmitters of dreams and visions for the next generation. For these to be realized, we all need to be able to travel-in-hope and to celebrate, now, the legacy of the future that we will leave to others. As educators, both "doing ethics" and doing what we do, ethically, will help us to achieve this.