

In search of a ‘new morality’ for South African education – Part VII

Values Education: Objectives with possible national appeal

P.G. Schoeman
Department of Philosophy and Policy Studies in Education
Faculty of Education
University of the Free State
BLOEMFONTEIN
pietschoe@intekom.ca.za

Opsomming

Die doel van hierdie artikel is om enkele alles-omvattende doelstellings vir opvoeding in lewenswaardes in ons land te identifiseer. Dergelike doelstellings moet vanselfs prekend op die meerderheid van ons landsburgers appelleer. Sulke alles-insluitende doelstellings vorm die raamwerke waarbinne alle ander (korttermyn en onmiddellike) doelstellings hulle diepste fundering vind. As uiteindelijke en alles-insluitende doelstelling vir opvoeding in die meerderheid van moderne samelewings sal die ideaal van 'n regverdigde staatsbedeling waarin vrye, gelyke, gelykberegtigde, kritiesingestelde, verstandige, krities-denkende en ingeligte landsburgers in vrede saamleef waarskynlik 'n baie wye appel uitoefen. Hierdie aangeleentheid sal in die onderhawige dokument bespreek word.

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to identify some all-inclusive objectives for values education in our country. These should naturally appeal to the majority of our citizens. Such all-encompassing educational aims form the parameters within which all other (immediate and proximate) goals will ultimately receive their deepest meaning. As

final and all-encompassing objective for values education in any community, the ideal of a just state where free, equal, impartially treated, like-minded, critically disposed and sensible, well-informed citizens live in peace seems to have a universal appeal. This matter will be discussed in the following article.

1. Introductory Remarks¹

We have now reached that stage of our investigation where the closer identification and clarification of objectives for values education in this country is necessary. Suitable objectives, ranging from the *immediate* to the *ultimate*², will naturally have to appeal to the majority of our citizens, notwithstanding the differences regarding life values that may exist among the various population groups. *All-encompassing* educational aims form the parameters within which all other (immediate and proximate) goals will finally receive their deepest meaning. Although such *ultimate* aims are intended to be perpetuated, they should never turn out to be unyielding. They must possess the potential to be constantly adapted, upgraded and enhanced so that they can remain suitable, relevant and adequate objectives for future values education in South Africa.

A question of vital importance is the following: what is *prudent* and *achievable* to campaign for in such a *deeply polarized* society like that of present-day South Africa? Amid all the bad occurrences and episodes of the past, all the injustices suffered, all the prejudice, discrimination and insults perpetrated, all the mistrust that still divides our society we have to remain optimistic about the future of upcoming generations, the issue being the *normative* fibre of the latter. It is our task to identify educational objectives that will mollify

1 I wish to express my gratitude to Prof DFM Strauss for his astute suggestions relating to this paper (PGS).

2 Whereas *education* embraces distant, long-term and ultimate objectives, *teaching* relates to every-day classroom activities in the numerous subjects of the curriculum with their diverging *immediate/proximate* aims. As such, teaching provides opportunities where ultimate educational goals are *come across* (encountered), *pursued* and (with providence) eventually *realized*. In this theoretical study emphasis will be laid exclusively on *ultimate, all-inclusive objectives for education*.

and ease most of the hatred, suspicion and intolerance that still exist, and will be beneficial for everyone in our country.

As final and all-encompassing objective for values education in any community, the ideal of a *just state*³ consisting of *free, equal, impartially treated, like-minded, critically disposed and sensible, well-informed* citizens will probably have a universal appeal. The attainment of this all-inclusive goal is completely dependent on *values education at home*, in the *church* and in literally every subject of the *school curriculum*.

2. A just state with citizens united in hope and aspiration(s)

Where people live in peace and harmony, with *liberty, equity* and *equality* as guaranteed cornerstones of a *united* society and where true *wisdom* prevails, social friction and strife will certainly be limited to a minimum. Under such ideal circumstances natural allegiance to and national pride in a shared destiny among people is a distinct possibility. This alluring objective is certainly the most comprehensive and all-encompassing ideal for any society to aspire and struggle for.

In our day the guiding criterion for the South African community that – until recently – was torn asunder by severe racial strife that left people strangely alienated from one another is indubitably the ideal of complete social equity and harmony among all citizens in a genuinely *just state*. Regrettably, even now, under our so-called “democratic dispensation” with its established “majority rule” that is supposed to guarantee liberty, equality and equity for all, the ideal of peaceful co-existence for every section of our community, as well as national solidarity is still largely an illusion.

3 Cf. Strauss, 2009: 541 ff. He argues that the term “democratic” has a too limited scope to convey what is usually inferred by it, as it “solely captures the competence of the public-legal co-determination and co-responsibility of the citizenry”. He recommends the use of the term “just” as an alternative because it acknowledges not only the domain of *public legal freedoms*, but also that of *civil private law* (civil freedoms) and the *non-civil private law* (societal freedoms) (544-545). The idea of a “just state” also deals effectively with the controversies surrounding the concept of the so-called *sovereignty of the people/ masses* that is so easily transformed into *the tyranny of majority rule*.

At first glance the objective of achieving solidarity – especially *spiritual* solidarity – on a national scale among formerly severely estranged persons and communities like ours appears to pose a virtually insurmountable obstacle. In any multi-racial society, grounds for national trust and solidarity should be sought outside self-seeking group interests and ethnic confines. But where certain groups and communities suffered in the past and still entertain a belligerent mind-set against former perpetrators of injustice, eluding previous causes for strife and hatred must be purposefully circumvented. Indeed, unless the motivation for trust and national solidarity reach beyond racial borders, as well as beyond grounds for established and well-nurtured antagonism, hostile groups will never become united in their endeavour to achieve national unity and fraternity. Under such circumstances this commendable ideal will forever remain a pipe dream.

Moreover, collective (national) pride, unity, accord, solidarity and the like are not possible without the unifying influence that awareness of a national destination and a common loyalty towards the country and all its (disparate) peoples can achieve. Such a unifying force or ideal that rises above and reaches beyond all petty and malevolent dividing issues is simply indispensable.

It is clear that the ideal of *national solidarity*⁴, of a *united* society in a *just, honest* and *righteous* dispensation, should be sought for down the arduous road of resolving existing reasons for strife and suspicion among disparate people and of finding *reconciliation* and earning *trust*. When some of this has been accomplished we may probably start aspiring for genuine and sincere *social reconciliation* that is characterized by *solidarity* among all members of our society. And as genuine reconciliation implies much more than merely to “forgive and forget”, the road to understanding, compromise, partnership and eventual reunion of people, long alienated from one another, is lengthy, unremitting and gruelling. The disappointments will probably be numerous and the dividends (initially) very limited. Efforts in this regard may even be dismissed as a waste of time and energy by those who wish to remain forever wilful and non-

4 This ideal will certainly have different and diverging meanings. For the Christian this can denote only “solidarity in Christ”.

compliant. Nonetheless, this is the *only* route to follow, should we wish to bring divided people together in due course.

Only a society whose members have been imbued, through resolute and dedicated values education, with a spirit of *tolerance*, *compassion* and *acceptance* instead of *prejudice*, *suspicion* and *cynicism* may ultimately rise above the barriers and boundaries caused by particular desires of dissimilar societies, ethnic groups and the like. Those who are willing to elude their rigid mind-sets and to listen to and try to understand with sincere *openness of mind* the idiosyncrasies, beliefs, criticisms, the arguments, the grievances and the complaints of adversaries and critics can be said to be heading in the direction of reconciliation.

For this indispensable attitude a positive mind-set is mandatory. We need a frame of mind that is distinguished by sincere *trust* of and unconditional and benevolent *openness* to all. Such a constructive way of thinking will be beneficial for the development of (social) harmony, (social) inclusion, (social) understanding and (social) appeasement in our fragmented and alienated society.

Furthermore, the realization of peaceful co-existence and solidarity among the multitude of peoples and fractions that form part of our society and their fusion into one *free*, *socially responsible* and *just* unity is hardly possible without first eradicating those forces that traditionally caused – and even at this stage still cause – hostility, discord and conflict among people⁵.

Indeed, *reconciliation* between racial, cultural, social (“class”), religious etc. opposites is possible only when the manipulating impact of exaggerated exclusivist divisions based on presupposed and imaginary “barriers”⁶ are recognized, purposefully moderated and relativized. It is usually the devastating influence of ideology

5 For formerly disadvantaged citizens who did not participate personally in the important activities of and collective appeasement achieved by the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission* of some years ago, it is essential to come to terms with those who (as individuals or groups) perpetrated offences, injustices, violence and abuse against them.

6 The exclusivist misconception that the barriers which separate humans are insurmountable is inspired by the erroneous premise that people, as such, are irreconcilable.

that obstructs the normal functioning of persons and relationships (structures) in any society. Once afflicted by this self-induced tunnel-vision, all perceptions of reality and interpretations of people, structures and things lose their connection to the real world⁷. The ideologically afflicted also succumb wilfully to unscrupulous and callous mental states that plague and bedevil them until their (mis-) understanding and (mis-) interpretation of the real world and its appalling realities deteriorate to the level where their (self-righteous and narrow-minded) judgments are rated by outsiders as biased, non-representative, partisan and therefore irrelevant.

What is imperative to our ideal of achieving peaceful co-existence on national scale is the patronage and support of all societal institutions associated with education. However, as wielder of legitimate power in a specific juridical domain, the obligation to undertake and complete this process lies primarily with the state. Therefore, the manifestation and protection of a *juststate* that sincerely and openly attempts to transcend all obstructions and hindrances that cause disharmony, strife and discord among people is essential.

The elusive ideal of peaceful co-existence of liberated and equally privileged persons and societal forms all come together in the rise and establishment of a genuinely and openly *just state*. The central notion undergirding the concept of a *just state* is that of establishing a *control* (reign, rule, government) *of the state by a sovereign people, endowed with supreme authority*. It depicts a political dispensation where all members of a state have a direct say in political affairs on the basis of *co-authority* and *co-responsibility*.

On their part, these ideals echo some of the deepest and most profound desires of oppressed men and women through the ages and became adages for many and diverse attempts to deliver them from their servitude to nature and from the coercing might of unjust social customs, organizations and entities.

In the following paragraphs we will reflect on certain inescapable

7 The human mind becomes so contaminated by corrupt and decadent desires (greed, self-indulgence, self-gratification, etc.), that people debase themselves with ideological typecasting whereby others (especially the weak and indigent) are categorized, marginalized, humiliated, exploited and ostracized.

conditions for the peaceful co-existence – in solidarity, consensus and fairness – of diverse population groups in the safe and secure domain of a *just state* where solidarity on national scale is the ultimate objective of ordinary citizens of the state. These circumstances concern – among others – special human conditions like *liberty, equality, equity, a critical mind-set* and *wisdom*. They will also have to be “transformed” into values to strive for during values education across the board because where these conditions emerge in a community, the always present temptation and danger to categorize, segregate, marginalize and oppress people (cf. even cases of *statutory* inequity) will certainly be under better control.

A number of these special human conditions will be introduced in the following paragraphs. They are not off-shoots or products of solidarity but rather indispensable constituting elements thereof. They do not appear in any special (e.g. chronological, alphabetical) order because they usually all develop simultaneously and operate concurrently. They are by no means all-inclusive and may represent but a few of many possibilities in this regard. Yet, without the presence of these select few no national reconciliation, trust, unity, solidarity or whatever can be realized.

3. Human conditions indispensable for national solidarity and unity

3.1 Liberty

Freedom and peace for all has certainly been a common ideal for people since the dawn of time. Indeed, the human race has forever battled against the constraint that obscure natural forces, as well as the coercion of those in positions of power, exerted on them. To be “free” signifies the ability of humans to make their own decisions according to what is commonly referred to as a person’s “own free will”. It naturally also implies that such persons are not restricted in any way to express their personal opinions regarding current affairs and are allowed sufficient latitude and opportunities to believe, think, desire what they want, hope for whatever they fancy, reside where they choose, do what they wish, work where they prefer, etc.

This most profound desire of those – mostly the indigent, defenceless and marginalized – that were forced into involuntary submission to an unfriendly environment and compliance with the

whims and fancies of oppressors has always been a dominating force in human aspirations. Personal freedom, religious freedom, political freedom, constitutional freedom, civil freedom, economic freedom, freedom of speech, societal freedom, freedom of association and the like were (and still are) highly cherished and even battled for.

Nonetheless, we can safely say that notions of what “liberty” actually comprises are as many as there are different views of life and the world.⁸ Questions regarding the essence of human freedom corresponded with the various religious driving forces that impelled the development of Western culture since Greek antiquity. They range from a constrained pseudo-liberty to complete mayhem and anarchy.

However, as has transpired previously, nothing in created reality can ever be regarded as self-sufficient. Only the Creator of all things is absolute. His creation, in its entirety, is “qualified”. Even liberty is relative and relational. Hence, by its very nature, human freedom can be neither *unspecified*, nor *uncontrolled*. We do not experience “liberty” as such, but encounter various and unique “manifestations” of it. We may enjoy freedom of movement, freedom of speech, freedom of association, civil freedom, political freedom, religious freedom, and the like. Freedom always relates to, remains limited by and functions in obedience to the structural principles that either (as natural laws) *determine*, or (as cultural values) *regulate* the existence of all things as was laid down in the normative order of creation. It should always be perceived as restricted by its relative nature (relative to certain modal laws as were given in God’s creational decrees) and constrained and kept in check by the rights and privileges of fellow human beings.

Our deliberate and malevolent transgression of the Divine Will spawns wrongdoing and suspends the benign nature of the values that pertain to normatively correct human behaviour. For this reason true human freedom remains forever compliance with God’s primordial design for His creation. Troost (1983:153) aptly depicts this state of affairs that momentarily affects the human condition as

8 It is not our objective at this point to offer another detailed exposition on the subject of liberty.

our innate subordination to the “*law-of-freedom*”. Outside of this “liberating law” human life – ultimately – fades away into nothingness. The well-known adage (cf. above) that ineffectually qualifies liberty as fulfilling one’s *own free will* (cf., however, *infra.*, par. 3.5.2) is hereby suspended as it does not account satisfactorily for freedom in either *modal* or *typical* sense.

In the same way as sincere and genuine reconciliation on all fronts is a precondition for national unity, a *united* society can only emerge where true liberty for all its citizens is well-established and guaranteed at all times. Indeed, only really free people can strive for and experience solidarity with other similarly emancipated fellow citizens.

Additionally, *true* liberty always appeals to its counterpart, namely *dutiful responsibility* – a most important and entirely value-related facet of human existence – and sets the latter in motion. Where there is no tension between our claim to *freedom* and our acceptance of *responsibility*, we act in accordance with God-given values and display a *spiritual discipline* that annuls intervention by external authorities. In such cases we can maintain that freedom and responsibility have been reconciled.

3.2 Justice for all: equality and equity

From the Scriptures – especially the New Testament – it is patently clear that in the eyes of the Lord all people are equal. Complete obedience to the great *commandment of love*, the “golden rule” for good human relationships, obliges *justice for all*. This gives every person whose birth-right it is to be regarded as equal to the rest, the inalienable right to be treated correspondingly by counterparts, before the law, as well as by all non-political or non-state authorities. Everyone in any community, regardless of whatever differences may exist, must have equal civil, as well as all other rights. Equality among people, then, implies that all laws, regulations, decrees, rulings, conventions, etc. should be applied similarly, evenly and alike to all citizens of a state. Nobody should be denied particular privileges or selected opportunities that only an elite group may enjoy. Notwithstanding a person’s social status, everybody is entitled to the same standing and rank as everyone else and to be treated with deference and due respect.

Indeed, only where there is justice for all inhabitants of a state, regardless of whatever differences and disparities that may exist, we can safely say that such citizens are dealt with *equally* and *equitably*; that there is *parity* among them and that they are treated *fairly* (even-handedly) and *impartially*.

However, we live in a broken world and there are many human conditions that petition disparate (unequal) treatment of dissimilar, unique, uncommon or atypical people. And it is this demand for *just treatment* of those who are anomalous or live under singular circumstances that brings the issue of *equity*⁹ into focus. What is important to consider is that *equity* differs from and has to be carefully distinguished from *equality*. *Equity* is established only when all citizens of a state are treated impartially, fairly and even-handedly. Essentially, it relates to first-rate and quality “justice for all”; to unbiased treatment of everyone under all circumstances, despite individual differences that may exist. Visagie explains that, although the notion of equality is basic to every concept of justice, the idea of equity has, what he terms, a “relativising” or “contextualising” function regarding equality. In a particular situation, *equity* may require precisely that individual persons, even groups of persons, are treated *unequally* (1993:31, 32; cf. Ramphele, 1993:4-5). Whereas *equality* (*aequalis*) demands identical treatment for everyone, *equity* (*aequabilitas*) implies *fairness* that may entail – ironical as it may seem – *dissimilar* treatment (cf. NECC, 1992:2; cf. also 1993:41).

The demand for “justice for all” in any community is directly related to the objective of eventually realizing the much sought after unity and solidarity among all its members.

3.4 Fraternity

Inherent in the word *fraternity* is the notion of togetherness, of being bound into a community with others, of communality where freedom of association prevails. This mind-set implies deep-seated and long-term allegiance by all members of a specific community – despite differences that may exist among them – to some grand and binding ideal or power that transcends differences and connects all members into a powerful and cohering collectivity. The outcome of

9 Cf. Strauss, 2009:583-592.

such a staunch allegiance is that of diverse persons sharing a mutual purpose in life that elevates common interest to the status of veritable and enduring *kinship*.

Achieving *unity* and *solidarity* in any community is directly dependent on a binding feature such as a common brother- and sisterhood that actually transcends all social and non-social diversity. This is – especially – the case where the entirety exhibits pronounced divergent and disparate affiliations, loyalties and interests. In such cases, well-considered and purposeful steps should be taken towards establishing an encompassing *spiritual comradeship*; a devout *alliance*; a supra physical *unison* of like-minded persons. For instance, for the Christian, this can only amount to a genuine and authentic *brother-/sisterhood in Christ*.

3.5 Critical Acumen

3.5.1 Critical “Intelligence”

Essential to a truly *just state* is that free citizens are allowed to come to their personal (private) well-considered and well-evaluated interpretations of, and entertain their own well-founded opinions regarding current affairs. However, even in a truly *just state* where there is unity and solidarity among all free, equal and concurring citizens, the constant danger of ideologically founded bigotry and intolerance will forever remain a threat to the well-being of the community as a whole. The peril of prejudice and resulting discrimination and inequity will forever be a hazard that has to be confronted and resisted at all times and at all costs. The question is: how does one escape the pernicious influence of self-induced ideological obfuscation that permanently destroys good human relations? The only possible answer is by educating every future generation in acquiring what can be termed *critical intelligence* and *judgment* with *wisdom* as its subsequent outcome.

The unavoidable route to achieving *critical intelligence* is via *self-knowledge*. As we are called to live the truth in honesty and integrity and renounce the lie and all forms of duplicity and dishonesty, candid self-criticism demands un-bigoted and un-prejudiced *self-reflection* and ensuing *self-knowledge* that are both the outcome of knowledge of the *True Origin of the self*. Only those who realize how relative and relational, indeed, how trivial their own significance and

imagined “magnitude” actually is in respect of the Creator of all things, as well as of their fellow-humans and the world we live in, can ever procure the first and most indispensable condition on their way to *wisdom*, namely unrelenting and unremitting *self-critique*. The second step, emerging as consequence of authentic self-knowledge and -criticism is austere and realistic critique of culture and society. Especially for the sake of those who have been traditionally marginalized and exploited, *social justice* based on on-going *critique of culture* and *society* is obligatory for the realization of an equitable society that ensures solidarity, individual freedom, equality and consensus among people. A realistic perspective that exposes the *status quo* as deplorable in itself and introduces the need for value related change will benefit all human relations as it will reveal the joyful truth that the world we live in is certainly not the *final reality* we can imagine and experience.

3.5.2 All-inclusive Vision

From the above we have concluded that *liberated, equal, like-minded* and *critical* citizens continuously try to rise above all forms of spiritual servitude. Now, when we consider the nature of *wisdom*, we are confronted – in the light of the foregoing – with the issue of our inborn *normative freedom of choice*. In our search for wisdom we are, as never before, reminded of the profound impact that *values* have on our lives as well-intentioned human beings, because wisdom is *completely* associated with values. Everything we contemplate and eventually accomplish or execute will relate to this crucial and critical issue: “How *ought* we to *conduct* ourselves in practical life situations?”

To be able to live normatively¹⁰, that is in accordance with accepted values, it is vital that one is properly introduced to them, understand them and their function in human relationships, comprehend how they influence human relations and why they are pivotal for the regulation of human actions in practical life situations. When one understands the true impact that values have on human relations, it

10 At this stage we would like to reiterate that the word “normative” has a distinct advantage over others like “value”, “principle”, etc. One can say that a person’s actions are “normative” or “anti-normative”, an option that is not allowed by words like “value”, “principle”, “criterion”, “standard” and the like.

is possible that one will also wish to identify with these values, associate with them and to avail oneself of them as guidelines for all future actions. We should even visualize problematic situations in which we act according to values, that is, in either norm-conforming or anti-normative ways. Practice in this regard will surely enable us to achieve *insight* into particular situations, comprehension of *what has to be done*, and appropriate *action* (Van Riessen 1970: 14; cf. 12 - 20).

From our naive (i.e. unscientific) experience of reality we already know that every moment of our lives we are part of a greater “entirety” that is more than the sum of its constituent “elements”. No one lives in isolation from the rest of humanity but is encompassed in a grander, more profound and all-inclusive whole that constitutes the created reality we are part of. The risk will always be there that we may become content with focusing on, knowing and understanding *fragments* (portions) of this whole while a perspective, although only in faith, of the True Origin in whom everything finds its true meaning is wanting. This is especially true of our scientific endeavours: in our clamour for specialized knowledge about some theoretically isolated aspect of reality, we forfeit – to our own disadvantage – a perspective on the whole. To be truly wise is to gain a comprehensive outlook on how everything is woven together into one great and harmonious unity, because questions like these cannot be acquired from the restricted perspective of any one or even a number of the special sciences. Legitimate questions that may arise and demand answers (although the latter may never be adequate or sufficient in themselves) are those that surpass what is humanly comprehensible and belong to the realm of ideas.

First and foremost of these “boundary questions” are those relating to the *true* Origin (or a *supposed* origin) of all things. And this idea that we entertain regarding the Origin (origin) will directly determine the *direction* (*anastate* or *apostate*) in which we will deploy and apply the values that we have chosen to *regulate* our aspirations and actions, and reflect our most profound beliefs and where our Sure Ground (sure ground) lies. Answers to this vital question cannot be obtained from our endeavours to analyze and comprehend the reality of which we are part. It requires a revelation of some sort and relate, in essence, to our most profound convictions that are not, necessarily, substantiated by scientific verification. These

question include, *inter alia*, those regarding the meaning of human existence; the identity of human beings; human motivation; the ultimate objective of human life; our ultimate destiny; questions relating to human liberty; the nature of morality; of justice, etc. (cf. Van Riessen, 1970:11). These weighty and significant questions have engrossed the human mind since the dawn of time. The fact that they cannot be answered definitively by any of the special science due to the restricted perspectives of the latter does not detract from their poignant and persistent nature: these are *legitimate* questions that petition *convincing* answers, even though, in the final analysis, these answers may be *inconclusive* themselves.

What is important to consider is that all truth that may be revealed by either the special sciences or philosophy relate in some way or another to the replies given to these vital questions mentioned above, especially those pertaining to the *Origin (origin)* of all things. This does not mean that we have to opt for a speculative and sterile metaphysics. But, should we, in our quest to gain a truthful and all-inclusive perspective on the reality we experience every day, not also account properly for these *boundary questions*, we are in constant peril of focusing on fragments while we lose sight of the “whole”. Thus, we may easily succumb to the conjecture that solutions offered by the study of portions of a theoretically disintegrated and therefore impoverished reality sufficiently represent the sum-total¹¹ of what we need to know about the world we live in.

4. In Sum

With the foregoing we have concluded our theoretical investigation pertaining to values and values education in general. Where the main thrust of this study relates to the search of a so-called “*new morality*” for South African education, we can now conclude that *no “new” morality can ever come into being*. Precisely the same ontic, non-arbitrary *structure* as was given in creation to every normative sphere of human life still holds sway and will do so *ad infinitum*. Only the *direction* in which values are “deployed” differs to suit

11 This still holds true despite the staggering discoveries made by the special sciences in the pursuit of knowledge and truth.

different times, places and situations. This “direction of deployment” and the ultimate application of values in practical life situations correlate unequivocally with the fundamental rift in creation, namely that between *Light* and *darkness*.

For this obvious reason, clarity must be obtained constantly as to the ultimate objective of all our normative activities. The final question is the following: to the honour and glory of Whom (whom) do we live our lives? This state of affairs obliges that the ultimate *direction* in which values are to be deployed and eventually implemented is critically scrutinized and assessed at all times. Their final *bearing* or *orientation* should be constantly *re-aligned* and *re-directed* promptly by educational institutions should it prove necessary.

Furthermore, where there is talk of values, profound, deep-rooted and pre-scientific commitments and convictions are always implicated: values gain their validity in their reference to some greater authority than the human subjects (individual persons, as well as societal structures) subordinated to them. Such an Authority (authority) clearly correlates with one’s Source (source) of *final appeal* beyond which no higher authority is conceivable. Should we, then, reject the existence of the *true* supra-individual, trans-personal *Sure Ground* in which all our values are anchored, we unavoidably run the risk of succumbing to arbitrarily interpreted values that relate to spurious and illegitimate ideas and ideals pertaining to a *supposed* origin of all things. Finally, when contesting the validity of values and their application in practical life situations, each *religious persuasion*, each *life and world view* should be allowed to “bear its own fruit”. Thus the *consequences* of its acceptance by people, that is, the related *interpretation* and *application* of universal, non-arbitrary, pre-interpreted, pre-actuated and pre-functional values in real life situations, can come to light.

Every educational encounter presents the immediate points of contact for the identification of values that belong to the different “value domains” and to demonstrate their functioning in practical life situations. Thus it becomes the duty and mission of educators to introduce to their charges these desired values – so eagerly desired by religious denominations, cultural communities and the like – and to “convey” (suggest, advocate) them to new generations whenever the proper occasions present themselves.

In the next and final part (Part VIII) of this study we will attempt a theoretical demonstration of a few practical teaching situations as they may occur in educational institutions like *family, church* and *school*.

Bibliography

- HIGGS, P. (Ed.). 1995. *Metatheories in Philosophy of Education*. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
- NECC. 1993. *Education planning, systems, and structure*. National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI). Cape Town: Oxford University Press (*National Education Coordinating Committee*). Quoted by Schoeman, in Higgs, 1995.
- RAMPHELE, M.A. 1993. Reality factors and their implications for equity. Unpublished Paper read at *Colloquium on equity policies and practices*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town. Quoted by Schoeman, in Higgs, 1995.
- SCHOEMAN, P.G., 1995. The 'Open Society' and Educational Policy for Post-Apartheid Education. In: Higgs, *Metatheories in Philosophy of Education*.
- STRAUSS, D.F.M. 2009. *Philosophy. Discipline of the Disciplines*. Grand Rapids: Paideia.
- TROOST, A. 1983. *The Christian Ethos*. Bloemfontein: Patmos.
- VAN RIESSEN, H. 1970. *Wijsbegeerte*. Kampen: Kok.
- VISAGIE, P.J. 1993. The multiculturalist critique of domination. In: *A model for the development of critical perspectives in higher Education: The Metacontexts Project*. Bloemfontein: University of the Orange Free State.