

Full Length Research Paper

Explanation and critique of the principles of postmodern moral education

Seyed Mahdi Sajjadi

Department of Education, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran. E-mail:
sajjadism@modares.ac.ir, sajjadi@deakin.edu.au

Accepted 11 April, 2018

Moral education is an important and complicated issue facing the educational institutions, specifically in religious societies in the modern world. The existing flaws and shortcomings in moral education arise in the first place, from the lack of a precise definition for the concepts, processes, content, aims, principles and foundations of moral education and in the second place, is affected by changes and transformations that might induce in the elements enumerated above. In the modern world, be it in religious or irreligious societies, post-modern teachings, principles and foundations are in the process of development and spreading, bringing about contradictions with the specific religious teachings of a society. As a result, ambiguity in principles of moral education is one of the problems of moral education. This paper provides an explanation and critique of the principles of moral education from the post-modern point of view.

Key words: Moral education, moral principles, post-modernism, meta-narratives, critique.

INTRODUCTION

Taken as the continuation of modernity, post-modernism dates back to the middle of twentieth century. Thinkers and philosophers like Foucault (1980, 1989), Derrida (2004), Lyotard (1988) and Rorty (1982) are the originators of post-modernism in this sense. On the other hand, some consider post-modernism a knowledge crisis since all philosophers following Plato have claimed to be searching for, and to recognize, reality while postmodern thinkers consider reality neither achievable nor desirable. A constant, unique, and permanent reality is meaningless to them. According to post-modernists, all and everything that exist in our surrounding world is relative and conventional. Realities are diverse, multiple, divergent, and are the product of temporary conventions.

The post-modern era, as post-modernists have sketched it out for us, is the era of collapse of meta-narratives, denial of master-discourses, and general theories, the era of blurred and unsure entities, and the era of appreciation of differences. Similar to terms like 'post-structuralism', 'post-enlightenment' and 'post-analytic', which have had a rapid growth, and have been used in different ways, post-modernism has developed such that there are serious disagreements among post-modernists on the proper use of the term. The proponents of post-modernism have termed their own discourse and speech 'diver-

gent mini-discourse', and at the same time, assume some characteristics for themselves. By analyzing and presenting these characteristics, one can present a clearer picture of post-modernism. Now this paper present the main characteristics of the principles of post-modern moral education, in brief below.

Moral education lacks fixed and universal foundations

One of the most basic characteristics of post-modernism is its opposition against meta-narratives. Lyotard (1988) in his discussion of condition of post-modernism argues that he consider post-modernism as a kind of skepticism against the meta-narratives, though, he count this skepticism as the product of the development of science. We should not get absorbed in Newtonian anthropological ideas, (like structuralism); rather, we should move towards actions based on the linguistic analysis of expressions and words. (Lyotard, 1988).

By rejecting meta-narratives, Lyotard is trying to confirm pluralism in language. That is, we ourselves make up meanings. The interpretation of phenomena cannot be clear and transparent, and does not enjoy the status of

reality. Opposition against meta-narratives by post-modernists entails the rejection of any kind of metaphysical theory or ontology. According to Lyotard, one cannot talk of a grand scheme about the physical or social world which is confirmed by everyone, and which counts as a law. According to post-modernists, of course, rationality cannot offer a unique, universal model, rather it can only offer a specific, local one (Hirst and White, 1998). Rejecting meta-narratives, and rejecting a global and general rationality, the post-modern writers believe that moral thoughts cannot make sense in global and general background. Foucault claims that:

'We must resist endocentric trends of universalization of theories, and must replace it with research on one's specific, local and controlled science' (Foucault, 1980).

Rejection of universalism is a characteristic of post-modernism, which leads to diversity of cultures and thought. Rorty (1982) believed in multiculturalism, which in turn leads to pluralism.

The existence or non-existence of external realities is an important topic of discussion amongst post-modernists. According to post-modernists there are no valuable and valid norms, no valid and reliable external realities, which may help, guide our behaviors and deeds. In the other words, the post-modernistic approach towards the external world is a nihilistic one. Dostoyevsky said:

'If there were no god, then anything would be permissible. If we accept this view, then it would mean that there are no moral laws or norms, be it real or abstract, that we would want to, or (we) were able to, behave according to its principles. As a result, whatever one wants (to do) whatever satisfies one, and whatever are interests one can be accomplished (Feher and Heller, 1988). This is because there would be no clear picture about the responsibilities of the members of a society in the absence of general and accepted rules.

In modern philosophy, human being is recognizer subject, but the exit of the recognizing subject (human being) from the center of cognition, is a characteristic of post-modernism. In this approach, the recognizing subject, has decentralized, and has moved to the periphery. In this state of affairs, non-self-conscious subjects, or social problems take precedence. Freudian non-self-conscious problems are non-logical problems, which do not follow Aristotelian logic. There is a probability of contradiction and opposition in non-self-consciousness. The non-self-conscious conscience plays the first role. As a result, rationality and the power of cognition fade away. Accordingly, knowledge and self-consciousness have never been established on realistic aspects by post-modernists. Even by rejecting realities, post-modernists emphasize on the rejection of knowledge.

Knowledge based realities:

'Knowledge can never be based on realistic aspects, which lead to the improvement of the idea of "metaphy-

sics of presence" or the "myth of given". This is so, because knowledge is a non-representational phenomenon' (Hirst and White, 1998).

The rejection of metaphysics of presence and denial of the theory of 'representation' by post-modernists is in fact an attempt to present a non-realistic picture of the world. From their point of view, the world belongs to us, and we express it in our language and speech. Whatever we utter in our speech cannot match one-by-one with their external correlates. The world is multiple with contradictory and opposing aspects. That is to say:

'The picture we present of the reality is the product of the stories we tell. Since the stories we create are different and multiple, so is the world (multiple), as well. Accordingly, the realities that exist about the world will be incomplete, and non-shared, as well. The world is 'made' not 'found' (Parker, 1997).

According to post-modernists, the assumption the existence of fixed, universal, and generalize-able moral principles is due to a realistic view of the surrounding realities. This is so because realities are neither attainable nor desirable. There is no fixed, unique and universal reality or truth so that one can analyse and evaluate good or bad deeds, right and wrong, the good and the evil, ugly and beautiful by recourse to it. In other words, there exists no external moral reality that be attained through research. Nonetheless, humans tend to evaluate morals and moral imperatives by recourse to their own traditions and their own multiple and diverse conditions, because moral values originate from the very nature of human lives. In any case, there exists no external ought in general.

By rejecting the external and fixed foundations of morals, Rorty looks for its origins within the normal emotions and motivations of human. According to Rorty's view, by distinguishing morals from emotions, traditional Christianity commits a mistake. Values and morals are probable and accidental affairs. What we do substantiates values. Values and moral, in general, assume a historical aspects' (Kohly, 1995).

The post-modernistic approach to morals emphasises on the notion that reality is a historical matter, and thus, it changes in our plays and functions, and in the courses and processes constantly, and invariably. Accordingly, there occur continuity and constant changes in values and morals. Similarly, Dewey (1939) who is a pragmatist philosopher in education talks of "change in values and desires" (Dewey, 1939). In postmodernism, "frames and frameworks are temporary and tentative" (Taylor, 1991).

Post-modernism essentially holds the belief that morality is a local and special property and that there exist no universally moral norms or ought. Post-modernism essentially believes that realities are substantiated within discourses. Foucault's interpretation is interesting in this regard. He believes that realities are configured in the rel-

relationships of power. "There exists no world external to the circles of real powers" (Foucault, 1980). As a result, realities and values must be found within discourses. There is no such thing as a worldwide morality. According to Giroux (1988), moral education, founded on general abstracts, which, by itself, leads to the rejection of human life as a special property, and to negligence of special and local aspects, and to negligence of differences, conflicts and pluralities, arises from the universal groupings of foundations, which are by its very nature a totalitarian and terrorist event (Giroux, 1988).

Moral education is based on discourse and linguistic signs

Another characteristic principle of post-modern moral education is the emphasis on the linguistic aspects and discourse. The emphasis on discourse is based on a special philosophy of language, which is mostly affected by the ideas of Ferdinand de Saussure (2002) and Derrida (2004). These two philosophers have attempted to analyze linguistic constituents of a concept like 'signifier' and 'signified'. The concept of sound-image attains its importance in its relation to former concepts as well. Saussure associates the reality of language to the relations between concepts and sound-image. According to Saussure:

'A linguistic system is a series of differences of sound combined with a series of differences of ideas. A sign is the basic unit of language (a given language at a given time) . Every language is a complete system of signs. Parole (the speech of an individual) is an external manifestation of language' (Saussure, 2002).

This difference makes it possible to distinguish words from each other. Similar to Saussure, and in defiance of the system of signs, which in turn emphasises on differences, Derrida attempts to reject the "metaphysics of presence" (Derrida, 2004). For Derrida, attention to text and studying it count experiences by themselves. The important point is that re-interpretation and re-analysis of a text does not indicate the discovery of a new knowledge about our social, cultural or personal world. Rather, it indicates creating new meaning by means of new signifiers and signifieds (Derrida, 2004).

Rorty (1982) does not believe in a separate, independent external world either. He pays attention to the significance of metaphors, language plays, and imaginative poetic conception as ordinary affairs in changing the human world (Rorty, 1982). In this view, the assumption that there exists an external world independent of human being accrues from the linguistic frameworks of the former philosophers (Hirst and White, 1998). Derrida puts more emphasis on writing than on speech as well. By

emphasising on text and writing, he intends to reject structure, since structure is concomitant with borders and limits, and enjoys universalism and wholeness. For Derrida to believe in metaphysics means to believe in "structure" (Derrida, 2004).

In contrast with Wittgenstein's language games, and "realistic forms of life" (Mc Ginn, 1997), Lyotard (1988) believes that one must further develop them, and talks of "phrase regimes" as opposed to language games. In phrase regimes, speeches are diverse, and exist side-by-side each other. There are no superior speeches or meta-stories. Human sciences are all stories made-up by humans. "There are no meta-stories to take charge of other stories" (Lyotard, 1988).

In any case, by emphasising linguistic texts and discourse, and by attending to significations derived from the emphasis on discourses, texts, and writing, post-modernists intend to reject metaphysics of presence, to oppose realism, on the one hand, and to deny the existence of meta-stories on the other hand.

Given the emphasis lay on 'language' as the most important characteristic of post-modernism, discourse stands in the center of attention for post-modernists. According to them, instead of paying attention to some approaches of moral education which attempt to impose moral principles and concepts on children, it would be preferable to use language plays, local and situational discourse in order to help moral learning. This is so because any action apart from the act of discourse, e.g. the application of behavioral approach in moral education, is an immoral one:

'...behaviorism enhances the role of teacher as the controller of behavior, class interaction is endangered, and the system of reinforcement and punishment ensues. The interaction of students with students and with teachers is deteriorated. Behaviorism attempt to make morals, universal and general, not local and special. This is not favored by post-modernists' (Beyerland and Liston, 1998).

On the other hand, post-modernists look dubiously at systematic moral actions, or on strategies based on means-ends, and consider it a kind of mechanistic thinking. Insistence on mechanistic and rationalistic thinking indicates reversion to the era of modernism. Such an idea is excluded for post-modernists. Confirming the ideas of Rorty, and emphasising the role of discourse, dialogue and conversation (Kohly, 1995) in moral education, Thomas McCarthy (1984) believed that:

'Derrida's conception of the meaning of difference and diverse functions of language interactions assists us attain democracy and democratic morality and one of the key methods of this assistance is the non-authoritative "dialogue" or "discourse" (McCarthy, 1984).

In post-modernist's point of view, if discourse is taken as the base of moral deeds, then moral education will spread widely in public; because all humans can get involved in discourse. As a result, every human being is capable of being morally educated. On the other hand, emphasising on discourse in moral education, means emphasizing, on non-systematicity of moral education, on non-constancy and non- antecedence of the principles of moral education, and on negligence of the role of theories in reconstruction of principles of moral education. For post-modernists, emphasising on theories indicates referral of morals to the pre-determined theoretical, general, and proved principles. The role of theories is to impose structured principles and regulations on any subject including morals, and this is discarding for post-modernists.

Moral education is pluralistic

Influenced by the emphasis on the rejection of universalism (as a modernistic characteristic), and by emphasizing the rejection of monism or centralism, the subject of 'others' moves to the center of attention of post-modernists. Concomitant with their emphasis on otherness, other cultures and civilizations, diverse human groups and cultures, and the plurality existent within the societies, post-modernists defend the oppressed, the subdued, women, ethnic minorities, color-skinned, prisoners and children. They pay special attention to children living in poverty. Carol Nicholson says:

'We have to listen to those who stand in social positions different from the governors. We need a rainbow coalition. That is to say, we have to listen to all voices, and attention has to be made, in our educational curricula, to diverse and plural voices' (Nicholson, 1989).

Emphasis on otherness means attention to differences, disagreements and divergences. A key word for post-modernists is the word 'difference', which is used in order to call attention to plurality and diversity in all aspects. Post-modernists consider themselves pioneers in accepting variation, diversity, differences, and pluralism because they believe that there is no ultimate, final goal in life. Awareness and knowledge are contingent upon changing interests, and traditions. Different societies find values and morals proportionate to their special needs and cultures. In any case, fixed, uniform, and analogous moral foundations, principles, and procedures are meaningless for the post-modernists. Traditions, local customs and deeds, cultures, interests and needs of local societies are the criteria for the differences in values and morals. In other words, moral education, from the perspective of principles, procedures and foundations, will be local, specific, different and plural.

Moral education is anti-authoritative

All kinds of knowledge and awareness, including the

knowledge about morals and moral education, are reflections of the interest and values of their originators so that Michael Foucault believes that, "the concept of sexuality involves the interests of Elites" (Kohly, 1998). For post-modernists, moral education is principally based on democratic, non-authoritative procedures so that the interests of members and multiple parts are, as much as possible, taken into account. Moral values are not to be directed by one group (that is, parents, teachers), and should not be easily transferred to other groups, including students. Every person ought to create and direct his or her own moral behavior.

Paternalism in morals is blameworthy since parents, or those who grant themselves the right of being role models, attempt to consider their own interests superior to the interests of those whom they protect. In order to confront these desires and trends, moral education should take place in a democratic and non-authoritative method. Lyotard's emphasis on smaller social groups, and not on larger ones, his attack against grand narratives are signs of his attention in reducing the role of authoritarian groups. Rorty, too, has paid attention to a radical, non-authoritative approach in order to reduce the role of the intellectuals. In his view, a non-authoritative method of moral education is dialogue and discourse (Nicholson, 1989).

In any case, children ought not to be educated based on some fixed, authoritative, and authentic moral principles and methods. Moral studies in schools must encompass vast domains. The approach to values ought to be an open and widespread one. Teachers and moral educators should pay attention to the existing differences in methods of living, interests and needs of their students. More classroom time ought to be allocated to study subjects like history, literature, daily problems, the lives of students and teachers, the differences in morals and differences in family models, and the behavior of children and parents (Beck, 1998). Teachers should behave as directors, facilitators, and educators. A non-authoritative approach to moral education emphasises the types of relations in school, on the relationship between teachers and students and on relationship among students themselves, etc... and on Deleuze's view (1994), this is a "rhizomatic lines" (Deleuze, 1994).

Now, after the explanation of principles of postmodern moral education (such as lacks fixed and universal foundations, discourse and linguistic signs, pluralism and finally anti-authoritative), the critique of above principles from various theoretical viewpoints, present in brief below.

A brief critical study on the principles of post-modern moral education

The current discussion critically deals with the post-modern moral education principles through various theoretical viewpoints:

1. With reference to meaning and definition, 'morality' fundamentally leads to deeds (actions) and quality, which essentially is collective, prescriptive and normative and such as without collective consideration, the word 'moral' is meaningless. Moral education is also a process, which aims to transfer and understand principles, definitions and moral norms and values. Lyotard has defined same norms, values and principles as grand narratives. In actuality, with due attention to the postmodern principles like pluralism, individualism and relativism, moral principles, rules and concepts are not transferable to the students alone but also to the teachers and those who have their presence in the process of moral education who would be non defensive and disarm against post-modern relativism, individualism and pluralism, to the extent that according to Feyerabend it will be like "anything goes" (Feyerabend, 1975).

To this, Taylor (1991) believes that, all kinds of inquiries for the access to "authentic identity" and, to achieve fundamental aims of moral education through postmodern relativism are unrealized because:

'Post-modern moral relativism denies the validity of our 'horizon of significance' and which underlies an instrumental attitude towards human relationship' (Taylor. 1991).

Moral education (with due attention to the meaning of the word education, which, leads to the given ends and as well as with due attention to the meaning of the word moral, which, is a normative and social concept) would be as a commitment for teachers and students and in a way there can be unanimity and oneness among teachers on principles, methods and definition of morality as well as moral education but the encounter of relativistic and individualistic with moral principles result non-existence of belief, trust and guarantee in comparison to principles and as a result conversation on common moral rules seems to be impossible. Further, morality is declined more on individualistic level and in that, situation phrase 'character education' should be applied at the place of 'moral education'. Because, character education more related to personal and individual domain of life, but moral education is related to common, normative and social domain of life.

2. In order to negate every kind of meta-narrative foundations and principles, "postmodernist draws a distinction between a metaphysical realm of intransitive objects, process and events - those which exist independently of our formulation- and an epistemological realm of transitive knowledge-constitutive interests-in whose construction we are implicated" (Bhaskar, 1998).

With the creation of this distinction, they would limit the moral principle to the realm of epistemology and would disconnect their bond with metaphysical realm. With the limitation of moral issue to epistemological realm, the possibilities of relativism, individualism and moral plurali-

sm are brought in because 'pluralism' and 'relativism' are more an epistemological current. At the time, elimination of metaphysical moral foundation and reducing metaphysical realm to epistemological realm is one of the mistakes of postmodernist in the moral domain. With this reason, each of the above two domains, meantime possess their own characteristics, which are related to each other, as well. Thus, most of the moral principles essentially have metaphysical aspects and have independent presence away from human mind and by this reason, the human mind identifies it. A principle thus is:

'Goodness or rightness, the principle of justice or fairness, the principle of truth telling or freedom' (Thiroux, 1998).

Therefore, reducing metaphysical realm to epistemological realm means to ignore the moral principle, which essentially is metaphysical, whether 'theological metaphysics' or 'philosophical metaphysics'. Although postmodernists attempt to figure out moral principle as a constructed domain, some postmodernists like Derrida (2004) focus on the some principles of morality, which alone are not made or constructed; rather they could not be deconstructed. As such, Derrida believes "justice" as one of the principles of morality, which cannot be deconstructed (Cornell and Carlson, 1992).

In Bauman's view, "modern ethics towards the goal of foundationalism, and focused on absolutism, ignores postmodernism's celebration of the other and of difference, postmodern ethics towards the ambit of the local. But the specific and immediate risking the cruelties associated with strong relativism (postmodern relativism) in its denial of commitment to a foundational principle" (Bauman, 1993).

According to postmodern morality, and negation of meta-narrative moral foundation, the process of post-modern moral education does not have directional and transcendental aspects, which is always expected from this educational process. Again, the process of moral education based on transcendental - metaphysical) principles possess more directional aspects.

3. Belief on the absence of pattern in moral education and accepted method of 'non-paternalism' through post-modernist itself, was an exciting and challenging topic during the contemporary period and majority of the educational thinkers have paid their attention to this debate. With the negation of authoritative resources in moral education and uncertainty in comparison to validity of them, the post modernists, in reality, deny the positive effects of patterns on moral education process. No respect between teachers and students, which is being frequently seen in the social relationship day to day, resulted from postmodern doubt and uncertainty in all walks of life in terms of doubt in comparison to moral foundation and confidence of authoritative resources in terms of parents, teachers, pious, mystics etc. Of course,

this doubt can also result from other agents such as conflicts and paradoxes between pattern's behavior; but, these conflicts or paradoxes between pattern's behaviors are normal cases, and should not be a context for negation of rule of modeling in moral education. Fundamentally, in postmodern moral education, the teachers or parents cannot teach the moral rules and principles and expect the same from them. At the time, this right does not exist for teachers or parents, which would expect to propose or recommend a moral action to the students. Here the question arises as to how we could expect that the students should not be involved in all kinds of actions. With the negation of authoritative pattern and doubt in comparison to confidence of parents, teachers etc., postmodernist in reality help the students to "do your own thing" (Ozmon and Craver, 2003), and these things are the part of chaos and egoism in the social arena.

Although some of the postmodernists believe that "doubt is not the denial" (Burbules, 1995) and are convinced that postmodern philosophical search, which is opposite to transcendentalism, necessarily would not mean against transcendental philosophical search, however the differences which White had created between the doubts of postmodernists and Descartes (White, 1973) and the attachment that has been shown by postmodernists to three kinds of doubts i.e. ironic, tragic and parodic, it seems that negative outcome of these doubts are clearly visible in the arena of morality (principle, definition, method and moral patterns) because, in ironic doubt:

'An ironist is aware that all believing and knowing take place within quite restricted spatial and temporal parameters, and aware that in thinking and speaking he/she remarks assertions and argues within limited contexts over what's true and false, over what is the case' (Kundera, 1991).

However, against the principle of morality this situation causes a kind of non-confidence and non-obligation in a person. Thus, the biggest danger threatens an ironist is that he or she is drawn in nihilism. The same danger is phenomenal for the tragic doubt where a person sinks in the pessimistic situation. Rorty has defined this situation as "unjustifiable hope" (Rorty, 1982). Parodic doubt, however, is also an acute threat that endangers teacher and student in the process of moral education, is to become cynic, to adopt any or all positions without regard to responsibility of integrity.

In the domain of moral education, postmodernists focus on this point that with due attention to the fact that morality is relative, situational and contextual, there must be taught particular moral truths instead of universal, general and transcendental principles because universal and constant moral principles are totalitarian and hegemonic.

In order to define with exactitude the nature of postmodern approach to morality, Oser (1999) in his article, "*Narrating Epraim Lessing*", tells the story of a wise Jew

called Nathan who, lived in the Court of the Muslim ruler Saladin. Nathan is called to Sultan Saladin who asks him which of the three religions, Christianity, Judaism, or Islam, are the right and good one? Saladin gives Nathan some time to think about this question and Nathan uses it to develop the following tale:

'A man had a ring, which was decorated with a precious stone. ... This man had three sons. ... In addition, he ordered a jeweler to make two other copies of the ring. ... After his death the three sons quarreled about who possessed the genuine, authentic ring. ... Therefore, the brothers went to court where the judge could not take a decision. Listening to this tale, Saladin was convinced by Nathan that truth must have many faces and all these rings are great, just great. You cannot say that one ring is better than another one, there are no criteria for such a comparison ... indeed, and you like them all. ... Just pick one, it's up to you!' (Oser, 1999).

According to the above tale, Oser concludes that moral concepts are relative. In anyway, what is inferred from the above tale is that, when faced with moral education principles, tolerance towards the diversities and varieties in the principles, concepts, and methods of moral education is considered as a necessity. However, critics of postmodern moral education believe that if there are particular, situational and contextual moral truths, there must be universal moral principles, which explain that why they are true. Because, in order to entrance to a moral education process, we necessarily need to a criterion for judgment about our acts and behavior, and this transcendental principles help us to identification what behavior is right or wrong and why some things are OK and accepted and why the some things are not OK. Reichenbach (1999) says:

'Pluralistic tolerance does not imply that anything is OK and that everything has to be accepted – such a concept is rather unethical and undemocratic. Pluralistic tolerance is nourished by the insight into the heterogeneity of discourse types and language games. ... In other words, to learn to live with more or less permanent disagreement and dissent' (Reichenbach. 1999).

The other problem being confronted here is that "Postmodernism criticize the ways that modern liberal democracies constructs political identity on the basis of a series of binary oppositions (e.g. we and them, citizen and non-citizen, responsible and irresponsible, legitimate and illegitimate), which has the effects of excluding or 'otherness' some groups of people". The deconstruction of political hierarchies of value comprising binary oppositions and philosophies of difference are seen as highly

highly significant for current debates on multiculturalism and feminism, and consensus” (Peters. 1996).

With the negation of binary systems, postmodernists do not believe only the moral definition that is a priori and given matter, rather do not accept the distinction such as between good and bad, good and evil, ugly and beauty, virtue and villainy (wicked behavior) which were usually accepted by modern and classical moral philosophy. The present problem is that how come the conversation can be initiated in the classroom from on of the moral education programs? At present, any postmodern views on the definition and principles of morality do not exist nor there exists any clear line between moral definitions (such as good or bad etc.) and further they do not accept the act of ‘definition’, which is a priori matter. Therefore, conversation on the control and direction of behaviors of students according to a priori definition are also meaningless. Foucault has also denied and discarded “the government on children” (Foucault. 1989), which, really aims to moral education.

4. Postmodern moral education is firm on discourse and linguistic consideration and practically do not give importance to non- linguistic moral principles and methods. Conversation and social interactions between people is a means to highlight meaning and moral actuality. However, it must be said that conversation and discourse are possible if there exist any commonality between people or if there does not exist any, at least there should be the motive to reach to moral common point. Postmodern pluralism in this way- necessarily do not attend to reach to any common point (Crotty and Wurst, 1998), and therefore the possibility of conversation was taken away because of the fact that for entering to a moral conversation, common views about the moral domains are necessary.

5. Postmodern pluralist believes the logical approach in the moral education is present different moral views and approves all of them as different ways to reach to the happiness. However, the point is that when people of a society come to know that no differences exist between the proposed moral viewpoints with respect to confidence and legitimacy and there exist any merit(all of them are the same and equal), their internal milestone and research parameters of their moral viewpoints decrease because everybody would seem relieved and agreed upon their own moral doctrine because, “they would not believe that there exist any reality in the rest of moralities, which they were intended to take on” (Bagheri, 2006). Therefore, basically, the presentation of moral education programs or curriculum on the basis of different moral viewpoints in a classroom or a multicultural program, did not consider important and necessary. In the other word, this postmodern view finally leads to an exclusive, or mono- moral program. Because, practically, every one prefer to act according to a program that is more fit to their custom, habits, values (Bagheri, 2006). Of course, I believe that the cultural and moral differences in a classroom are in-

evitable and they should be respected, but reach to an accurate pluralistic moral education curriculum in a classroom, practically is difficult and problematic.

Conclusion

Considering to discussion of moral education principles in postmodern view, and view of critics, the postmodern moral education principles are not completely deniable and not completely useable. Some of its principles are useable in all educational systems, be it religious or irreligious; such as conversation, tolerance, and respect to diversities and varieties. Also some of them not useable; such as negation of meta – narratives, rejecting metaphysics of presence, deny of modeling rule, and emphasize language and linguistic signs as base of moral education. Therefore postmodern moral education like the other moral education paradigms (as transcendentalism, idealism) has some useful and some negative aspects that should be considered to moral education planning and curriculum development.

REFERENCES

- Bagheri Kh (2006) Moral Education in Twentieth Century. Iranian Journal of Education.No.15:49-54.
- Bauman Z (1993) Postmodern Ethics .Blackwell. Oxford.
- Beck C (1998) Postmodernism, Ethics and Moral Education. New York.
- Beyerand L (1998) Discourse or Moral Action? Routledge .New York.
- Bhaskar R (1986) Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation Verso. London.
- Burbules NC (1995)” Postmodern Doubt and Philosophy of Education”.Philosophy of Education.University of Illinois Press: 118.
- Carlson M, Cornell D (1992) Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice. Routledge. New York.
- Crotty R, Wurst S (1998) Religious Education in a Religiously Pluralist Society. Australian Association for Research in Education. Annual Conference. Adelaide.
- Deleuze Gilles (1994) Difference and Repetition. Trans by P. Patton. Columbia University Press. New York.
- Derrida J (2004) Writing and Difference. Trans.Alan Bass.Routledge.London and New York.
- Dewey J (1938) Freedom and Culture. New York.
- Feyerabend P (1975) Against Method. New Left Books. London.
- Foucault M (1980) Power / Knowledge. Colin Gordan. New York.
- Foucault M (1989) “How Much Does it Cost to Tell Truth?” In Foucault Live: Interviews 1966-84.Edited by S. Lotringer. Trans. J. Johnson. New York: pp. 48-53.
- Giroux, H (1988) Postmodernism and Discourse of Educational Criticism. Journal of Education. No. 3. Routledge .New York: 92-93.
- Feher F, Heller A (1988) Postmodern Political Condition. London
- Hirst P, White P (1998) Philosophy of Education (discourse or moral action?). Routledge. London: 111: 85-87.
- Kohly W (1995)” Postmodernism, Ethics and Moral Education”. Critical Conversation in Philosophy of Education. Routledge. New York: 143-148.
- Kundera M (1991) the Art of the Novel, Quoted in Alven Neiman:” Ironic Schooling: Socrates, Pragmatism, and the Higher Learning”. Educational Theory.Vol.41.no.4:112-115.
- Lyotard JF (1988) the Postmodern Condition. A Report on Knowledge. University of Minusota Press. New York.
- McCarthy T (1984) the Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas. Blackwell. London.
- Mc Ginn M (1997) Ludwig Wittgenstein and the Philosophical Investigation. London.

Nicholson C (1989) Postmodernism, Feminism and Education. New York.

Oser F (1999) "Can a Curriculum of Moral Education Be Postmodern?" Educational Philosophy and Theory. Vol.31.No.2:62-69.

Craver S, Ozmon H (2003) Philosophical Foundations of Education. Merrill Prentice Hall. New Jersey.

Parker, S (1997) Reflective Teaching in the Postmodern World. Open University Press. New York

Peters M (1996) Post structuralism, Politics and Education. Bergin and Garvey. London

Reichenbach, R (1999) "Postmodern Knowledge, Modern Beliefs, and the curriculum". Educational Philosophy and Theory.Vol.31.No.2:34-35.

Rorty, R (1982)"Method, Social Science and Social Hope", in Consequence of Pragmatism. University of Minnesota Press

Saussure, Ferdinand de (2002) Writtings in General Linguistic.Oxford University Press.

Taylor CH (1991) the Ethics of Authenticity. Cambridge University Press

Thiroux J (1986) Ethics: Theory and Practice. Macmillan. New York.

White H (1973) Meta History: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth century Europe: Baltimore. John Hopkins University Press.