Primary Programme B (8-10)

Year 4 (Age 7-8)

General Theme: Justice and Virtues

Module 1 (1st Term): Aspects of Justice

Introduction

This module explores and cultivates an important sentiment/issue/consideration which affects everyone at different times and in different circumstances of their lives, including young children on a daily basis, and which is very complex, which is justice. The exploration of this notion will be an illustration of the complexity of an ethical notion, and of the importance of examining our moral language in use to ensure there is a clear and common understanding of what the words and the expressions we use mean, and that we share these meanings when we discuss ethical issues together. The first connection of justice made is with fairness. This is the criterion of justice which will probably be the most familiar with children of this age who will probably have experienced or encountered feeling of injustice as unfairness in their daily lives. The feeling of having received an injustice committed against oneself is commonly followed, nearly intuitively, by a desire for revenge or retribution. The wish for retribution is mainly how justice becomes an issue, and an important one, for them. The discussion of fairness is also commonly tied, however, with that of preferential treatment, and an important issue that is taken up is whether preferential treatment is justified. The question brings in the consideration of disability and disadvantage (and indeed ability and advantage) that people may encounter in their lives through none of their fault; through genetic or social reasons. Disadvantage and/or disability call into play the notion of needs and dependency and the suggestion that it is just to show preference with those whose disadvantage and/or disability creates special needs for them. The notion of a need, in particular, is discussed in some detail – this is where the point about the importance of examining our moral language is made explicit to the pupils. The other kind of justice as fairness discussed in the module defines fairness in terms of merit or desert; on the principle that it is just to give one or to receive what one deserves. Evidently this definition can contrast in some ways with that which connects justice with the satisfaction of needs, and the two first discussed separately are then discussed together. Justice is also commonly related with the recognition of **rights**, but though the expression has been used the notion of a right has so far been explored, and is deferred to a future module. [find] The final part of this module examines the notion of punishment as it is linked with justice and deterrence in the light of the discussion of a just punishment in distinction from revenge.

Objectives

- To introduce the pupils to the notion of justice in its different and complex forms.

- To introduce the pupils to the notion of a need and to explore it in depth in connection, particularly, with justice as fairness.

- To introduce the pupils to the distinction between personal and role relationships with others.

- To discuss the issues of disadvantage and preferential treatment as issues of justice.

- To take the discussion of the notions of retribution, or getting one's own back, and of forgiveness, already explored in a previous module [find] to more depth.

- To explore the issues of merit and punishment separately and together, to examine the latter, already taken up in previous modules [find] more closely.

- To introduce the pupils to the idea and the necessity of having working definitions of the notions we use in the interest of meaningful discussion.

- To illustrate how, through what process of thinking, such working definitions are arrived at.

Teaching strategy

Tools: Narrative, exposition, discussion, exploration of ideas, comparison and contrast, and, especially concept analysis.

Resources: This module is conducted nearly entirely by discussion and analysis using narrative, stories, and anecdotes.

Method:

(a) Through two or three short stories or anecdotes the pupils are introduced to examples of **unequal treatment**, incidents where people in similar situation or with similar justified claims to something, are treated or preferred differently. They are asked to react to these incidents, to express their views about them. The idea is to raise the way people are treated as an issue of **justice**, to introduce them to the word and concept. This is ordinarily the first issue of justice that children experience in their daily lives where it represents itself to them as one about **fairness**, about **t**he way one is treated in situations of this sort. The association between justice and fairness, the idea of justice as treating people fairly, is made by the teacher. The children are asked to describe experiences of their own or that they know of where somebody in their view was unfairly treated. They are asked to identify the unfairness in their story or anecdote they tell, to explain what they see as unfair in the incidents or situations they describe. The examples given and their explanation are discussed with the class. One example of unfairness that will probably be common in the stories and, in any case is highlighted by the teacher, is that of **preferential treatment** they feel that they or others will have experienced in some situation**.** The teacher proposes discussing this issue in depth.

(b) The first question s/he asks to set the discussion going is why they think preferential treatment is unfair, fielding the answers only. The second question is how treatment can be fair. One probable answer is that it means **treating everyone the same**, or **equally**. The teacher asks the class to discuss this definition of fairness/justice (s/he uses the terms interchangeably to establish the connection). S/he asks them whether,

in particular, it is always fair in general to treat people the same, whether preferential treatment is always wrong. After some free discussion s/he makes the point that in fact we are all the time showing preference in the way we treat others, depending who they are; in how we deal with relatives, for example, or friends, class mates, etc. Is this wrong? The teacher points out that though it may be normal for us to act in certain ways, something we do all the time, **that does not mean that what we do is right or fair** – **normal** and **fair**, s/he points out, do not mean the same thing; **what is normal is not always fair**. This is an important point about the meaning of moral behaviour that needs to be understood by the children. Its discussion is focussed on the classroom as an example by the teacher. The pupils are asked whether they think their teachers should treat them all the same. What if amongst them there are relatives, or the children of friends, should they treat them differently because of who they are? Should teachers show preference towards them? Why not? The children will probably find this last question difficult to answer beyond reiterating their intuition that it is unfair. The teacher uses the discussion to distinguish **personal** from **role** relationships illustrating the difference with examples to clarify the distinction (like that between being one's family friend and one's teacher), where the latter relationships where one **acts** in a role, as a teacher, a policeman, a judge, a parent, and so on, requires the equal and impartial treatment (the setting aside of personal sympathies) of those one deals with.

(c) The teacher next points out that fairness requires treating everyone the same when everyone **is** the same or equal, but this is often not true in daily life; people **are not always and in everything** equal or the same; some have **needs** that stem from their circumstances in life that render them different from others. Should we deal with people who have needs of this kind the same as others who don't? The teacher gives examples to exhibit this point; disability, poverty or social deprivation, etc. Maybe, s/he suggests it is fairer sometimes to treat people not as equal but according to their **needs**? The question is discussed with the class. Through the discussion the notion of a **need** is examined. When, s/he asks the class, is something a need and when is it not a need? S/he closes the discussion by proposing a **working definition** of a need, pointing out that working definitions are often required in discussions, especially in ethics, to know **that** we are all using a word the same way, to **mean the same thing**– in this sense we **need** working definitions to make progress with a discussion. This is because lack of progress may be the result of people using **the same word to mean different things**. This is an important pedagogical point and needs to be well explained by the teacher

(d) As a working definition of need the teacher suggests: **something required for some purpose**. S/he invites the children to identify needs they encounter in daily life from when we wake up in the morning until they retire at night – to ensure that the word is understood. The needs are itemised and discussed – the teacher makes the point that **not all needs** are equal in terms of **importance** and **urgency**. The pupils are asked each on their own to classify the itemized needs under the two headings of important

or urgent – the classifications are compared. The teacher makes the point that not everybody classifies the same but suggests that our most urgent needs are the ones **we need in order to live**; adequate healthy, uncontaminated, food, clean, unpolluted, air and water, adequate clothing and sanitation, medicine when we are seriously sick, safe shelter, and so on (further examples are invited from the pupils). These needs are **universal**, they apply to everyone no matter who or where. The teacher suggests calling them **basic human needs** for this reason (the word 'basic' is explained). Less basic but still urgent are those needs that affect the **quality of human life**, that are required to live successfully and well in our world; for example enjoying good health, being literate and educated, informed, able to work, participating in the life of the community and in the general society, respecting oneself, enjoying civic and political rights – these also are universal human needs though less urgent, but their form varies between societies and cultures. A third category of needs corresponds with our **individual purposes** and personal ambitions in life, and these vary not just between societies and cultures but between individuals also. [An important distinction between **needs** and **wants** or **desires** with which needs are often confused is postponed for later as part of the ethics programme dealing with rights [check]]

(e) The point that needs vary in a different ways (beside for the fulfilment of individual purposes and ambitions) with who one is is elaborated by the teacher. A distinction is made between children's needs and adults', between the needs of those who are able physically and intellectually and those who are elderly and infirm, or in some way disabled. The point is made that the existence of different needs of this kind sets up different kinds of **relationships of dependence** on others for their satisfaction – this follows on the more basic point that **everyone has needs that make them in some way dependent on others** that the dependence or independence that people have **varies with their condition**. This point is illustrated with examples. The teacher reminds the class of the point made earlier that needs vary with one's **circumstances**; that people may be **disabled** by birth or accident but they may also be disabled by poverty, social exclusion, or prejudices of different kinds. That disability is a factor of social **disadvantage** suffered by people often through no fault of their own, and over which they may have little or no control. These conditions of disadvantage, s/he reminds them, create **needs** that are special to them; the teacher gives examples. S/he reminds them of the conclusion reached in an earlier discussion **[check]** that being disadvantaged through disability demands that we treat them differently. The teacher now suggests that it could be fairer, more just, to give them **preferential treatment** in certain cases, even **discriminating** favourably, rather than treating them equally, or the same as others who are not so disadvantaged. The suggestion is discussed with examples and the point made that in our society such **positive discrimination** (which is distinguished from **negative or unjust discrimination** – the distinction must be carefully made and discussed) is often justified **to obtain equality** for those otherwise disadvantaged.

(f) The teacher passes on to another kind of preferential treatment that is commonly justified as fair or just, that based on individual or collective **merit** or **desert** – when someone is treated differently because s/he is considered **to merit or deserve** such treatment; eg. as a reward for talent, for contribution, or performance. S/he points out that this kind of preference is commonly recognised as just or fair in everyday life, numerous examples can be cited or elicited from the pupils themselves from the world of sports, work, etc., wherever competition exists and people are rewarded on merit. The basis of merit which is **reward** for success, for something achieved, or for qualification is very different from that of **need** which arises from some lack or disadvantage. The two criteria, the teacher points out, are however reconciled when merit is not tied just to success and qualification but to **effort** also. Sometimes, the teacher points out, we even think it just to reward effort above success when those making the effort are disadvantaged from competing equally for the reward at stake with others. Examples from life that illustrate this point are discussed. The teacher makes the point that we sometimes want to reward **effort** over **achievement** because achievement may be tied to natural **talent** which is not itself an achievement but a **gift** of nature or with social advantage which is a gift of fortune or of unfair conditions in the society – and opens it for discussion.

(g) The teacher summarizes the different aspects of justice as fairness covered so far in the module, i.e. as treating equals equally and un-equals unequally according to their needs or merits (their achievements or efforts). S/he then moves to a third kind of justification for unequal treatment where positive discrimination is aimed to redress past injustices that may have been suffered by some group or category of people in the society; because of their sex, their beliefs, ethnicity, and so on, and discusses this with the pupils using examples. S/he then returns the pupils to a different account of justice met with in Module 2 of the Year 2 programme; **retributive justice** which is based on the general principle of **paying back** or **redressing** a real or perceived original injustice suffered at someone's hands. The examples used for discussion should be from the world of the children themselves, their everyday life. The teacher makes the point that retributive justice is often motivated by the sentiment of revenge, by the wish to **repay** a wrong or injustice in kind. The pupils are asked to discuss this kind of justice, the principle that we should repay harm with harm, pain suffered with the same or some other pain inflicted on the offender. The discussion is an open one around examples that will be familiar with the children; when someone tells on you or betrays your trust, for instance, or speaks disparagingly or offensively about you with your friends, or teases or makes fun of you, or breaks some unwritten pact of friendship or agreement between you that hurts you. The teacher, however, inserts the notion/sentiment of **forgiveness** into it and asks that it be discussed with that of **revenge**.

(h) S/he brings into consideration the fact that the sentiment or **revenge**, or getting one's own back, is always negative and makes the point through using appropriate stories and examples that it can be dangerous and harmful not just for the offender but for the

offended also. S/he introduces the notion of an **apology** as a tool with which to heal a hurt inflicted on someone, and this is taken up and discussed. The teacher intervenes to argue that apologising is not a sign of weakness but of strength, and that the same is true with forgiveness, whether it follows on an apology or not. These are difficult arguments because they may be counter-intuitive for the pupils, and they are probably better made by pursuing the motive/sentiment of revenge and its consequences and its effects on people's lives further using. The teacher distinguishes revenge, which is entirely negative, from punishment which may be deserved and just, just as reward may be deserved and just. S/he asks the pupils to discuss this distinction, in particular the notion of a **just punishment.** S/he uses the discussion, possibly around some narrative, to make the point that contrary to **reward** (which is intended to encourage and render the recipient happy) **punishment** is intended **to deter and to inflict pain**. Hence that unnecessary punishment is unjust, that just punishment is **proportional to the offence** committed, otherwise there is not justice but mere revenge, and that used positively punishment does not merely **deter** offence, it **reforms** the offender. These points are brought together systematically by the teacher to conclude the discussion.

Module 2 (2nd Term): Honesty, Respect, and Trust

Introduction

The object of this module is again two-fold, as was the previous one; to explore the important qualities of character and values of honesty and respect and to cultivate them in the children. Tying honesty with trust, it begins by distinguishing occasional acts of honesty that nearly everyone performs now and then when dealing with oneself and others from the consistent disposition to act in honest ways which proceeds from the internalisation of these values as qualities of character (or virtues). The distinction is intended to further sophisticate the pupils' moral thinking and to sensitizes them to the importance of consistent moral behaviour; for this purpose the module also introduces the notion of a moral principle as the guiding factor in moral behaviour and an important motive for acting in some ways and not acting in others – acting on principle is represented as the right thing to do generally. Honesty is shown partly to mean acting on one's principles but it is also examined in its more ordinary sense as honesty in one's dealing with oneself and with others – an examination which is best made by comparing and contrasting it with dishonesty. It is shown to be related with truth, as a matter of truth-telling and of being candid in one's behaviour and one's relationships with others. In the latter sense it is related with trust, which is discussed extensively as a concept and a value. The idea is to show relations of trust to lie at the heart of all human social relationships, something to be assumed in all human dealings but not to be taken for granted. Trust is also shown to be the basis of respect in the sense that there is no respect without trust, and no trust without respect. The question is raised whether one should always be honest and trustful in one's relations with others and the point made that trust needs sometimes to be earned and that trusting others, or indeed being honest with them, is not always the best or safest thing one can do. Where truth is concerned the important distinction is made between deliberate, active, lying and deliberately withholding the truth leading to discussing the question whether either is ever justified and, if so, in what circumstances.

Objectives

- Understanding and promoting the values of honesty, trust, and respect.

- Promoting these same qualities as virtues or desirable qualities of character.

- Exploring honesty as a relationship with oneself and with others – with regards to the latter the relationship on which trust is based.

- Exploring the social value of trust.

- Examining the notions of lying and deceit with their differences in detail and raising moral questions about them.

- Continuing to consolidate the idea by illustration that to be fruitfully discussed notions need to be explored and analysed for their meaning.

- Introducing the notion and the importance of moral principles with which to guide one's life and give it consistency.

Teaching strategy

<u>Tools:</u> Narrative, exposition, discussion, exploration of ideas, comparison and contrast.

<u>Resources:</u> This module is conducted nearly entirely by discussion with supporting narratives and stories.

<u>Method</u>

(a) The teacher introduces the important difference between good or right acts (like helping others, intervening to prevent some injustice, etc.) that one may perform **occasionally** and at certain times and the same acts that are performed **consistently** and correspond not with a decision of the moment but with **habitual** qualities that are **ingrained in one's character (virtues)** and that are part of one's **disposition** to be helpful, fair, respectful, and so on, and that colour one's **way of life**, the way one lives one's life, one's ethical outlook. The students are invited to discuss this difference in order to ensure that it is well understood and to make the point that the latter, consistent, behaviour is preferable to the former, occasional one. Through narratives the teacher then introduces the important qualities of character, or virtues, that are the subject of this module; namely those of **honesty**, **respect**, and **trust**. The pupils are asked what they think the two words mean**.** The second, respect, was, in fact, already introduced in Year 2 Module 3 but left unexplored then since it was too early to take it further at that stage. In this present module the first quality to be discussed and taken deeper is that of honesty to be followed with respect, then trust.

(b) The teacher summarizes what the children said about honesty in the open discussion and ensures the concept is well-grasped as one having to do with telling the **truth** and

being **sincere**, the contrary of honesty being **dishonesty.** S/he then distinguishes two general sorts of honesty; **with oneself** and/or **with others** with their contraries being dishonesty with oneself and/or with others. Returning to the narrative/s already told in (a) and/or introducing new ones, s/he asks the children to discuss the similarity and difference between these two kinds of honesty, the object being to ensure especially that they can grasp the idea of being honest with oneself, which is the more difficult notion of the two. The narratives used or others specifically related with being honest or dishonest with oneself are discussed at greater depth. The latter, being dishonest with oneself, is equated by the teacher with **self-deception**, with **lying to**, or with not being **completely honest** with, oneself – the difference between the two is explained**.** The narratives used illustrate the hurtful or harmful consequences of this practice of self-deception, especially if it becomes habitual. The children are then invited to relate instances in their own lives, or stories they have heard, where being dishonest with themselves gave them cause for regret.

(c) Next the teacher turns the discussion to being honest with others. In this case also dishonesty is represented as a kind of deception, of **cheating** and **lying,** this time not to oneself but to others. Using an appropriate narrative as the basis for discussion S/he elicits the fact that deception of this kind undermines **trust**, and this is true also of self-deception where one finishes up not trusting oneself. The teacher makes the point that when cheating or lying to others becomes habitual it becomes ingrained in one's character, is **identified** with who one is, and one loses the trust of others, and that trust lost is hard to win back. Stories of the boy who cried wolf and/or a similar ones are told to and discussed with the class to illustrate this point The teacher makes and emphasises the point that getting a reputation as a dishonest person or liar means that one is not believed or trusted and that a reputation of this sort makes it hard to have friends since **friendship** is based upon trust – this point is discussed extensively with the class. Next s/he shows, using various examples that any kind of meaningful social relationship or cooperation between persons requires trust.

(d)   S/he asks the children to imagine a situation where people living together in the same house, a family for instance, distrust or lack trust in one another. S/he asks them to discuss what kind of life such a family would live. Would they themselves wish to live in such a family? Why not? Could one even call such people **a family** because they are related and live in the same house? Or would such a house be better described as a house of strangers? The next question extends the discussion wider to ask whether a society, this time, whose members live in distrust of each other could live together as a proper **community** – which is a kind of extended family? The teacher uses the historical cases of societies ruled by dictatorships as examples of such societies ruled by mutual distrust which produces mutual **fear** between the members, often not just between strangers and neighbours but even between members of one's own family, because of the fear of betrayal. A good, true, story that could be used for discussion is that of Anne Frank but there are several others the teacher can also use. The general point the teacher drives the class towards is **the value of mutual trust** for

social living, for living with others, that healthy human relationships require trust between people who live together in a community or society, that without such trust there is no meaningful social life, and that without honesty there is no trust.

(e) The teacher summarizes; where there is no honesty there is no trust, and there can be no harmony or stability in a society where there is no mutual trust between its members. S/he points out (1) that trust is **earned** and it is earned through honesty, and (2) that honesty is something decent people respect in others. S/he asks whether where there is no trust there can be any **respect,** using the discussion to make the point that you cannot respect someone you do not trust. The children are asked to name other qualities of character they think people value in other people besides their honesty (eg. bravery, generosity, consistency, reliability, and so on). These are listed on the white-board. The teacher then discusses a classification of the contents of the list in terms of their importance as social values. The pupils are asked where they would place honesty in that list. S/he returns them to the link of honesty with **truthfulness** and with **sincerity** − summarizing that the honest person is truthful and sincere in his/her dealings with others. This is why s/he is **trusted.** The teacher points out that honesty, truthfulness and sincerity, are the qualities we expect in our friends and others we know; qualities that draw our trust and respect. But should we be honest always? Should we **always** be truthful and open, and with **everyone,** or only with people we know and can trust? The question is next discussed with the class.

(f) The teacher leads the discussion to a conclusion that, **as a general rule or principle**, we should be honest with everyone but that there are exceptions. Sometimes we should be careful about whom we trust with our honesty especially where strangers or people we do not know well are concerned. The pupils are returned to the point that trust is ordinarily assumed, that we usually go about the day trusting others all the time, our parents, teachers, friends, and other people we meet or deal with; the doctor, the baker, the policeman, and so on. But that there are occasions when trusting others can be dangerous or harmful to oneself or others. The point is made with the help of narratives of misplaced trust in others and the cost one can be made to pay for it that are discussed with the class, that **trust cannot be blind**. But does the fact that we may be justified not to trust someone mean that we are justified to lie to or deceive them deliberately? The teacher allows an open discussion of this question leading the pupils to recognize the difference between **deliberate lying** and **withholding the truth** in the process [the distinction will be properly explored in a later module find]. S/he makes the point that there are situations where we are justified to lie or withhold the truth from others − occasions when telling the truth will bring harm on ourselves or others − in the Anne Frank story, for instance, one would have been justified to withhold the truth, even to lie to the authorities, about her and her family.

(g) The teacher asks the children whether they can think of other situations where lying or withholding the truth (which amounts to the same thing) is justified in daily life. Then raises the question: why shouldn't I lie or cheat, or withhold the truth when it pays me and I can get away with it? S/he makes the point that 'getting away with' something

doesn't make it **right** and that what it is not **right** to do we shouldn't do – this is the general **principle** with which to live our lives. S/he then returns the class to the conclusion of the earlier discussion; that lying, dishonesty, undermines trust and is therefore **socially harmful** even if it can appear immediately profitable for the liar, and presents this as a **principle** that must generally be assumed to be right. Besides, there is a recognised **moral right to be told the truth** that each person has, especially over matters that affects his or her life and existence. Sometimes it can be **right** to lie or to withhold the truth from others, then it is justified, otherwise it is not. On the other hand it is **never** right to lie to oneself. The teacher draws the children's attention to the well-known saying that honesty is the best policy because the liar lives a short life since s/he is always caught at the end, and because one lie usually leads to another, and another, and so on.

Module 3 (3rd Term): Truth, Courage and Moderation

Introduction

This module introduces three other important virtues to the ones in Module 2 all also connected with just behaviour. In this module the virtues of truth and moderation are discussed in relation to courage, which is itself a virtue and which plays a central role in how these other virtues are examined and explored in the module, and which is therefore explored and discussed in some depth. Moderation is introduced as a virtue corresponding with the Aristotelian notion of a mean, a personal mean, a middle point between extremes that should ordinarily be avoided; rashness or recklessness on the one hand and unreasonable caution or cowardice on the other with respect to courage – the latter, cowardice, is represented as always negative unlike the former, rashness, which we sometimes praise when it is impulsive. The discussion of moderation will thus also introduce the pupils to the difference between impulsive and reflective or considered action and to further discussion into the morality of both. Representing cowardice as an entirely negative motive emanating from egoism it introduces them to the idea of caring for justice and the truth, and for others, as commendable motives of moral behaviour that should not be occasional but should be ingrained in one's character. In this respect the pupils are introduced to the idea of moral courage, to the figure of the moral hero prepared to sacrifice personal safety, even one's life, for justice, the truth or what one believes in more unusual circumstances, before addressing the issue of moral courage in day-to-day situations that could be met with in their own lives where it may require significant sacrifice on one's part; of one personal popularity, friendship, even punishment. The point is made that while rashness can be the result of impulsive courage fear can make us cowards – a distinction is drawn here between fear (which unlike cowardice should not be regarded as a completely negative sentiment) that is reasonable and important and fear which is not. Fear and cowardice are complementary in that cowardice proceeds from fear, but fear is not negative in itself, it is a natural and important sentiment that prevents us from the excess of rashness. The complex relationship of fear with courage is the final matter addressed in the module. Through its discussion the pupils are introduced to the idea of moral complexity and to the idea/reality of the moral dilemma, to an understanding that choosing what is the right thing to do is difficult in some circumstances.

Objectives:

- To examine and explore the notions of truth, courage, and moderation separately and together.

- To promote these qualities as qualities of character that should be encouraged and cultivated personally.

- To introduce the idea of a virtuous act as one that avoids extremes which tend to be harmful, and of a virtuous character as one disposed to moderation.

- To consolidate the distinction between impulsive and reflective acts.

- To introduce caring for truth and justice and for others as motives for moral action.

- To introduce the notion of moral courage as a willingness to do what is right in difficult circumstances – thereby consolidating the notion of a moral principle introduced in Module 2 above.

- To introduce moral cowardice as a form of egoism and moral blindness.

- To introduce and sensitize the pupils to situations of moral complexity which can take the form of dilemmas.

- To provide more exercises into the skills of analytical and reflective thinking and discussing.

Teaching strategy

Tools: Narrative, exposition, discussion, exploration of ideas, comparison and contrast.

Resources: This module is conducted nearly entirely by discussion with some anecdote and stories and used to consolidate the last objective of the previous module.

Method:

(a) The teacher, picking up on the previous module, begins with the observation that we are sometimes honest or tell the truth at a cost to ourselves when it would be safer for us, or less troublesome, **to lie**, or to say nothing, **to be silent**. S/he reminds the pupils of the difference between lying and being silent about the truth or a part of it, and points out that often both have the same result – that someone is deceived through the act, and one is not being honest in the process. And that truth, honesty, and sincerity are personal qualities in our relations with ourselves and with others that are generally approved of and that we should uphold and respect. S/he then points out that often the truth is not told because of fear of what can result for oneself or for others, or from **prudence** (not to take risks or create possible trouble for oneself or others), or simply because one does not want the trouble of being involved. In sum, because it is safer or less troublesome to be silent (like, for instance, not reporting something bad one has seen or witnessed). Examples of each of these motives are given preferably through stories, and discussed. The point the teacher is after is that telling the truth, or of not

staying silent, as the case may be, before some incident or circumstance that is wrong or unjust for someone, often requires a kind of **care** or **courage** because it is done at a cost for oneself.

(b) The teacher puts the notion of courage up for discussion to lead to an understanding of **moral courage** which is the interest of this module. The pupils are asked to say what they think courage is in general, what kind of behaviour it implies, and to tell stories of courageous acts they know or can think of – predictably their examples will be of **physical** courage. S/he then distinguishes acts of **physical** courage from those of **moral** courage which s/he explains as the courage to tell the truth and to do what is right when it is safer, more prudent, or more convenient for oneself to do otherwise – moral courage will be more difficult for the pupils to understand than physical and needs careful explanation. In either case courage is a willingness to **take risks**, to put oneself in a situation of danger. In the case of physical courage what one risks is one's life and/or limb since one puts oneself in physical danger. The teacher goes over the examples provided by the stories and/or others to illustrate this kind of courage once more. S/he discusses these stories and the behaviour they involve with the pupils seeking to establish a distinction between courage which is good and commendable and **rashness** which can be bad in that it often does more harm than good – rashness is **impulsive**, unthinking, behaviour. By providing examples s/he points out that acts of courage **can** be impulsive because they can occur in circumstances or conditions where immediate action is required, when there is no time to think before acting, one must act at once. The examples, that involve the risk of harming oneself in trying to help others, to save a life or prevent injury to someone in danger, are discussed and the point made that we tend to approve of and admire such actions although they may be described as rash.

(c) The teacher distinguishes these situations where courageous action must be immediate and **impulsive**, and others which are remote and permit **reflection** or consideration. Moral courage, like physical, can be of **both** kinds; impulsive or reflective. It requires moral not just physical courage to put oneself at risk through impulsive action **to help others** – it requires that one **cares** for others more than for one's safety. It requires a willingness to sacrifice oneself for others which we usually praise and which is the highest form of care. Reflective courage, on the other hand, is the willingness to do what is right **because it is right**, because one **cares for the truth** or **for justice,** or acts on one's **principles** even at a cost for oneself. In either case, whether impulsive or reflective, moral courage is a quality of character. Like physical courage it involves risk; even sometimes to one's life. Stories and narratives of this sort of courage, real and fictional, are told to illustrate this point; stories of **moral heroes** willing to die or suffer harm for others, **or** for the truth or for justice, for their beliefs or principles, or the cause they believe in. Exceptional figures (religious and secular) historical or otherwise are discussed with the children who are asked to say why they think these individuals were prepared to pay such a high price for their actions – the answer

sought is **because** they valued the truth, justice, their beliefs or principles, their cause, above their own lives or well-being.

(d) The teacher points out that while these examples discussed are indeed **exceptional** or dramatic examples of **the highest moral character** and self-sacrifice, there are more ordinary, less unusual and less dramatic examples one meets with in everyday life when one may be called upon to show moral courage, the courage to do what is right (to tell the truth, etc.) in the face of risk for oneself – where what one risks is, say, **unpopularity**, or the **disapproval** of one's friends, where courage involves resisting peer-pressure in order to do or to defend what is right, where one risks getting into trouble with one's teacher or parents, even being **punished** for one's courage, where the truth one reveals also harms oneself. The teacher focuses on and discusses these and/or other examples using stories, narratives and anecdotes that are relevant to the children's own lives and experiences where doing the right thing requires the courage to risk unpopularity, disapproval, rejection, punishment, and so on. S/he then specifically targets **bullying** by introducing a narrative to make the point that bullying is a kind of cowardly behaviour against which we need to show moral courage; to resist being bullies ourselves, to resist pressure to participate or support it when it is practiced by others, and to report it when it presents itself to our knowledge.

(e) The teacher introduces the importance of **moderation** in what we do; moderation is described in negative Aristotelian terms as **the avoidance of extremes**. Courage is once more the example used, in order to connect this with the earlier part of the module. The discussion of courage is returned to; courage is now represented as the middle point between the extremes of **cowardice**, which is a kind of conduct related to fear (bullies are really cowards), and **rashness** the other extreme kind referred to earlier. Both concepts are discussed more specifically at this point. The teacher points out that rashness can be dangerous in situations that require us to think, to work things out carefully, before acting because it can lead to **moral blindness** preventing us from seeing the situation clearly and thereby preventing one from seeing what is the right thing to do in it. The relationship of cowardice with fear is discussed next; the teacher makes the point that just as there is physical and moral courage and the two can be related, there is physical and **moral cowardice** also. The moral coward like the physical will risk or do nothing that may endanger him/herself or put him/herself at risk in any way – fear will hold him/her back from taking action from which s/he may suffer. His/her own safety is always his/her first consideration. Cowardice is therefore a species of **egoism**, of disinterest in, or lack of care for, others. The teacher gives examples and provides narratives of moral cowardice which are discussed with the class and makes the point that lying, bullying, and not doing the right thing is often a sign of moral cowardice.

(f) S/he is careful in the discussion, however, to make the point that not every situation in which one avoids or seeks to avoid taking risks necessarily renders one a coward, or is an act of cowardice. This is the point of distinguishing courage from rashness (which is the suspension of fear); courage is rashness tempered with prudence or moderation,

i.e. with a **justifiable** regard for one's own safety and well-being in the face of danger. The teacher also makes the point that not everybody is equally courageous, that some will take risks or expose themselves to dangers where others won't; that some are inclined by their nature or character to be more prudent, less willing to take risks, than others. The easiest route into it is through examples from acts of physical courage that have not (obviously) morally relevant; sky- or bungi-diving, for instance, absailing, swimming with sharks, diving from cliffs and high places, driving dangerously, and so on. These, and possibly other, examples are discussed briefly with the class before the teacher focuses a detailed discussion on an example [**there are plenty of stories of this kind that can be used**] which brings the issue of moral responsibility into play: supposing you are walking by the sea and you see someone who has fallen in and is in distress, someone who can't swim or is a poor swimmer, crying for help, and in danger of losing his/her life, what should you do? The teacher puts different refinements on the scene/story; including one's own swimming ability, the distance from shore, the state of the sea (its calmness/roughness, coldness/warmth, etc.) the possibility of fetching help, and so on, as the discussion becomes more complex. The object is to illustrate the complexity of situations where one feels the duty to help others who may be in some danger of whatever kind but which involves risk to oneself, but where this feeling conflicts with fear for one's own life and/or. Which should take priority in such situations? The point to make is that there are no rules that will provide an answer for everyone, the decision must be **personal** and will depend on the **circumstances**.

(g) The example enables the teacher to introduce the idea of a **moral dilemma** without using the expression – to introduce the pupils to a new level of moral complexity. The **moral coward** like the physical will not even consider any action which involves **any** sort of risk to him/herself or to his/her interests, s/he will play it safe always, no matter what, with little if any consideration for what is right to do in the circumstance, even when the innocent or vulnerable will pay for his/her silence or non-intervention. In the case in discussion s/he would probably seek help but not even consider putting his/her own safety at risk. Its contrary, moral rashness is diving into the water without considering anything possibly complicating the situation and rendering it more risky or dangerous. The decision though personal must avoid either extreme alternative. The teacher concludes the discussion by making the point that whereas situations like this where life and death decisions must be made and heroic qualities may be required are usually exceptional (in our context) and one may never meet with them in one's life they are not impossible and they show how difficult moral decisions can be.

(h) In the final part of the module the teacher returns the pupils to the more usual circumstances of ordinary daily life where playing safe can mean lying or keeping silent about the truth, or feigning ignorance, or not intervening to prevent or rectify a wrong or injustice that has or may occur, whatever the case, or being indifferent to the plight of the person struggling to stay alive in the sea – in other words, the teacher points out, the moral coward lacks any sense of morality, any sensitivity to the value

of the truth or to the value of other people's lives, safety, or needs. The teacher gives examples and/or narrates stories of moral cowardice which s/he will discuss with the children and contrast with other stories of moral courage.