

Quiddity and possibility of moral education

A friendly meeting with respected professor, Ahad Faramarz¹ Qaramaleki PhD, gave us the opportunity to discuss the issue of «moral education» and related subjects, allowing us to benefit from his brilliant ideas. What follows is the outcome of this meeting and the summary of its most relevant topics. We hope this abstract can ignite our readers to ponder over the issue of moral education with the correct frame of mind.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: First of all I would like to thank Professor Qaramaleki who in spite of his busy schedule gave us the honor of his presence and the opportunity to discuss such important issues as «moral education» with him today. This topic has not received enough attention in our era and we have not succeeded to fully comprehend its nature and reality. Therefore I start this interview from the point that what can one say concerning the quiddity of moral education and how can its reality be illustrated? Please state your perception in this regard.

Mr. Qaramaleki: In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful.

It is an honor and a pleasure for me to discuss such a highly important and urgent issue in our society. In answering your question, there is a lot that can be said regarding the nature of moral education. Basically when the topic of moral education is

1. PhD in philosophy and Islamic theology from Tehran University, counselor of the Philosophy and Islamic theology group in Tehran University.

brought up, the first step is for us to have a concept of the idea of education. The second step of morality, is for us to initially divide this combined concept into two separate ideas, and then to see what kind of an image of moral education can be created within our understanding.

Let's start with defining morality. What is «morality»? Traditionally it's been defined in various forms, for instance, «Morality is a type of interiorized behavior that naturally emerges». According to this definition there is no positive or negative pretension in morality, that means, someone who is used to lying, possesses this innate feature, and someone whose personality is formed based on being truthful, enjoys a truthful morality. However we should correct this definition in order to obtain a more accurate understanding of morality. Today we can say «morality is an intrapersonal and extra personal communicative behavioral model based on observing oneself and others' rights». It is not an appropriate time to interpret this definition and explain why I chose this one, however the point to be considered here is that by «model» I don't mean «role model», but rather a «behavior» that is interiorized in our personality and naturally emerges. In psychology it is called a «behavioral pattern».

Morality is an intrapersonal an extra personal communicative behavioral model based on observing oneself and others' rights.

Up to now we interpreted morality as communicative behavior that includes both intrapersonal and extra personal communication. Intrapersonal can be defined as the relationship between me and myself, while extra personal is defined as the relationship between

me and others. Now, we come to this point to see how we can add value to morality and attribute value-based direction to it. One way is to say that this communication is based upon observing the rights oneself and of others. Considering the fact that observing these rights is of extreme significance in our religious teachings, we can steer morality from theory to practice and prove that morality is not something theoretical, but rather a practical matter that is related to our life in this world.

Now we focus on the concept of «education». Here we need to initially define terms that have similar meanings. Sometimes it is said that we should “change” behavior – this refers to the need to bring about change in our behavioral models, whereas sometimes it is said to «correct» our behavior – this refers to the concept of correcting our behavioral models. The term «education» can be interpreted as the changing of communicative behavioral models. If we are able to change our communicative behavioral models which in actuality are the same as our moral behavioral models, and at the same time alter our immoral models into moral ones, then we can claim that «moral education» has occurred. Thus I present my definition of «moral education» in this way: «changing the extra personal and intrapersonal communicative behavioral models so that they are based on observing oneself and others’ rights.» In this definition we have a hidden concept of transcendence, according to which we are always trying to sublimate the level of our behavioral model.

Moral education means: changing the extra personal and intrapersonal communicative behavioral models so that they are based on observing oneself and others’ rights.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: Professor, what is this sublimity which determines the axiological aspect of moral education based on? And how is it determined? And also how can we make sure whether or not we are moving toward sublimity?

Mr. Qaramaleki: We must initially determine a criterion for a desirable and sublime communicative behavioral model. By using this practical criterion we are going to define the objective criterion which is capable of being measured and judged. That criteria can be defined as simply «the rights of yourself and others».

Let me rephrase it this way, a behavior which violates my rights and those of others is immoral. A behavior that includes commitment and observance of people's rights is considered to be moral and sublime. This is the criterion we are talking about.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: It seems like there are some ambiguous points in defining this concept of rights. Defining one's own rights and the rights of others is not so obvious sometimes. This becomes very relevant especially since this definition is directly linked to your behavioral models. In addition, the definition of rights varies based on different cultures and societies.

Mr. Qaramaleki: Before answering this ambiguity, I'd better make it clear that at this point we are discussing criterion not purpose. Of course the purpose of morality is human perfection and the improvement of humane features along with the occurrence of a continuous existential evolution. This purpose, if met, will eventually lead to prosperity and ultimate perfection.

And now about the criterion and whether the issue of rights can give us this criterion or not while it enjoys a relative and flowing meaning itself. This is a significant question that should be taken

into account. In this case I should say the term «right» in Persian carries a multitude of meanings. The first point is, sometimes we use this word to refer to «Legislated law» that means the law enacted by legislators and differs from one country to another, and as you can see in this meaning the correct word is «law» not «right». But sometimes this word conveys the meaning of natural rights that is different from the word «law». Regarding the second point, let's consider the science of chemistry in which we have Mandaliiov's periodic table of elements. In this table, Mandaliiov has made a distinction among the different elements. Some of the elements are metals, and some of them are not, and some of them are gases and so on, while there is still another group of elements that are in suspension. The same is also true about rights. We have some universally accepted natural rights in which there is no argument. But there are some disputable points as well. They are not clear but they are accepted, however there still exists within them argument.

The purpose of morality is human perfection that means the improvement of humane features and the occurrence of a continuous existential evolution. This purpose, if met, will eventually lead to prosperity and ultimate perfection.

Let me give you an example. Take the «right of respect» as an instance.

This is a globally accepted right regardless of color, skin, religion, and tendencies. Everybody views it as a natural right. In this case, there is no need for legislation or of canonization. There is no need for an assembly to gather and agree on this matter. Another example is when you become a professor and begin your

career a natural right for your student emerges. The student has the right to benefit from you and ask you questions. When we talk about the right to ask questions it does not make sense to say in Iran it is considered to be a right but not in other countries.

This is a universal right that is accepted by all. To sum up, because I have a practical orientation, instead of making myself stuck in theoretical discussions and saying for example goodness and foulness are innate, rational, lawful, imaginary, relative absolute, and so on, I believe it is possible to have universal morality, the one that is based on accepted universal rights. This criterion which is based on universal morality, is a highly important practical criterion. In 1991 and 1993 both Swindler and Hans Kong proposed universal ethics respectively. Hans Kong's proposal was presented at the Department for World Religions and was approved. If you study this proposal, you will agree that except for one or two items, the rest is universally accepted. So we come to this conclusion that the criterion to sublimate behavioral models depends on the extent of our behavior and can be in accordance with observing and securing our rights and those of others.

It is possible to have universal morality based on accepted universal rights. The criterion is observing people's natural rights according to universal morality.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: In the definition you presented about morality it seems like in your viewpoint morality from the very beginning is mixed with mysticism. I mean when you talk about intrapersonal relationship as one of the true dimensions of morality, you add a mystic identity to morality. Is that right?

Mr. Qaramaleki: It is absolutely right. Basically there is a meaningful relationship between morality and mysticism and also between morality and psychology. But I'd better answer your question in this way that morality refers to communicative behavior and this kind of behavior has two sides. Intrapersonal communicative behavior refers to the interaction that one has with himself and extra personal communicative behavior refers to the interaction that one has with others. The base principle in mysticism is the intrapersonal communicative behavior which has been correctly defined as morality.

Let me explain it further to remove any ambiguity. In moral education, we cannot convoke people to morality and encourage it. For instance, substantially if a person does not respect himself, we can not order him to respect others. We can not command him to be affectionate with others, while he doesn't have the slightest interest in himself. It is impossible to invite him to love others whereas he has no love for himself. How can a person be truthful with others, while he does not enjoy honesty within his own nature? Our mystics have taken the relationship between a person and himself as a rule and emphasized it, and they have definitely been successful in doing so. Just think, in the Holy Quran we have «Account for your deeds before they are accounted for you.» What is the ayat referring to? It means your intrapersonal communicative behavior is of high importance. Self-reckoning, self-correction, self-knowledge and in contrast self-forgetfulness, self alienation are all aspects of intrapersonal communicative behaviors.

What we believe is that, scientifically, moral education is based on prioritizing the intrapersonal communicative behavior and this is what our mystics have also believed and principled. Now if we



ignore this point and plan to encourage morality in organizations, institutions and society, but focus on extra personal communicative behavior for instance, we have placed the cart before the horse, and it is obvious that no results will be obtained.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: We have been advised in our narrations to keep ourselves safe from those who do not praise themselves and feel no respect for themselves and this question has also been posed that how can we expect these people to do any good? In Confucius's teachings it has been mentioned that the best percept for a person is not to lie to himself and this becomes the basis of all ethics and moral behaviors. Thus this combination of morality and mysticism is fundamentally significant and without it is impossible to attach an independent existence and meaning to morality. Now let us shift from the concept of semantics which is extremely important to another section of our discussion which is the understanding of the features of moral education. Basically what features exist within moral education? If detected within someone can this be a sign that they are undergoing the process of moral education and the manifestation of morality within their nature?

Mr. Qaramaleki: In the definition presented regarding morality, we have a formula in the name of «R then D» that stands for «rights then duties».

According to this formula, we cannot evaluate somebody in an abstract environment regardless of the rights. In this process, his communicative behavior should be observed and we can judge him to see for example does he uphold the rights that his wife has over him or not? We can not judge his commitment to his duties unless we know his wife's rights. First of all, the rights should be

considered on the basis that we can detect one's duties and who performs them. Because of this, it is not possible to present these features in an abstract environment.

In one's personal life, to determine a criteria the first point to see is if a person fulfils his duties towards his family, members of society and neighbors? Accordingly, we should be aware of these people's rights in advance and accept them. As I mentioned before we ought to have a chart in which we identify each person's rights according to which we know for example that my wife has the right to be respected, so I have good morals if only I am able to uphold this right in every circumstance. As another example, let's look at the rights of our neighbors. I have to respect his rights and keep his secrets or not violate his right for privacy. By doing this, we have identified criterion and can now make a distinction between those who behave in accordance with morality and those who do not. If I don't spy in my neighbor's house and treat them with honesty, I can claim to be committed to morality.

We do not have just one criterion, rather there are a number of moral criteria that can be identified and determined on the basis of natural rights. These criteria are not just for people, rather we can determine the same criteria for organizations to see whether or not they function within the accordance of morality. It is important to identify that one organization functions immorally while another morally. Every organization or office that performs their duties towards the environment's rights is considered to be a moral organization. By environment we mean both internal and external. An internal environment refers to the staff, managers, and shareholders while an external environment refers to clients, customers, rival companies, and the like. Every organization

includes an environment which is made up of a number of elements each of which enjoys some rights for themselves. These are the same body of rights that we are referring to. There is a duty related to each of these rights and the same duty can be a criterion to judge the moral behavior within an organization.

Rah – e Tarbiyat: If we assume that morality is a function then there are numerous variables that can determine the result of this function. In other words there are various factors that are effective in the contraction and expansion of a moral environment and models of value and can at times make morality and living a moral – based life impossible. Usually people who plan to steer morality from the realm of theory to the heart of their lives and give it a practical manifestation, get stuck in these variables and other elements. What do you think in this regard?

Mr. Qaramaleki: Yes, it is absolutely this way and it needs to be thought about seriously. Basically the discussion on moral education addresses the «historic human» the human that is in reality, not the abstract human that is defined as a «talking animal». These two are separate. However, the «historic human» is linked to thousands of elements and every aspect of man is in direct interaction with these elements. Out of these elements, morality can be declared as the most important. Thus many factors can influence morality. Among these factors, we can point out the most basic and important ones. Let's take a child for example. How is he morally educated? I mean how does he identify his models for moral behavior? Through advice? Through preaching? Logic? Reason? Undoubtedly all of these are effective. But the most important model is the one his parents' create within the home that will influence the child. Therefore, if within a family

for example the communicative model of behavior is aggression, no one can expect the child to find an appropriate model for his own behavior. Take another family as an example in which the dominating communicative model of behavior is submission that means the mother has a submissive approach while the father is dominant. In such a family, it is terribly difficult for the child to distinguish the proper model for his own behavior.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: It is concluded from your explanation that in these families the immoral raising of children is common with some exceptions of course.

Mr. Qaramaleki: Yes, that is right. These are the factors that may threaten morality or even make it impossible to form within a society. The example we gave about the child, can emerge at the society level or even within organizations and offices. For instance, research has suggested that a competitive environment in business causes the organizations to be more committed to morality, in contrast exclusive and certifying a market drives an organization away from morality. These are proven research results with scientific basis. I am about to publish a book with Bushra publication. In this book obstacles for moral growth in Iranian organizations have been analyzed.

I have pointed out thirty two reasons that make moral growth impossible in our organizations. Morality is related to at least thirty two factors which can also threaten the existence and establishing of morality. The way people view matters, is one of the most essential reasons that influence morality and behavior. This view and mentality is really decisive. For instance, those who have a one-dimensional view or in scientific terms are reductionists and identify only one reason for all problems, are usually not successful

in the case of morality and will always fail in education. Morality requires a sanction which is highly dependent on cultural, political, social, and economical conditions.

Paying attention to these variables and other factors which are influential to morality is very significance. There is a good book which discusses this topic, titled «Moral man in an immoral society». This book is in English and has fully analyzed the answer to your question.

Those who have a one-dimensional view or in scientific terms are reductionists and identify only one reason for all problems, are usually not successful in the case of morality and will always fail in education.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: So, as I understand morality is not something void or irrelevant to one's situation. It is impossible for us to make decisions and behave according to moral values in our personal and private lives. How can a person live while not paying attention to culture and void himself of the affects of the environment around him? Professor, isn't it true that the moral texts and references we have available now, have not paid enough attention to these conditions and have not viewed a moral human as a historic human who is involved in real day to day struggles in his life? By moral texts and references I do not mean such religious books as the Quran, Nahjul Balagha and Sahifeh. On the contrary, in these texts man has been delved into the heart of life and the realities of life have been addressed in a very beautiful way.

Mr. Qaramaleki: In the case of spiritual texts, it is enough for you to study the Treaties of Rights by Imam Sajjad (peace be upon

him). You are right, in these original texts, morality is in the center of life and not isolated from that, and this is the main point. It is counterproductive to place people in caves and try to teach them about morality while they are cut off from others. Unfortunately, the current methods of teaching and spreading morality do not regard these points and neither do they consider the reality of the struggles of life.

But what do we do if we try to raise some one according to moral values? Do we advise him? Preach to him? Reprimand him? Let me give you an example. Trying to convince all smokers to stop is an ineffective method to bring about moral change. Initially, we should consider the conditions the person we are dealing with has been in, which forced him to make these immoral choices. After this, we can then try to remedy his situation. This is a crucial point. Your question triggers a discussion on how to figure out circumstances and situations where morality is being abandoned. This point is extremely important and if paid attention to, obliges us to initially understand the situation and then apply a specific model of morality designed to meet the conditions that exist, otherwise we will fail.

Rah-e-Tarbiyat: Surprisingly not many people identify this possible failure and think very highly of the importance of perceiving that. Usually, if somebody opens his mouth and preaches to others, he is simply labeled a preacher and advisor, and very few people listen to what he is saying. All this advising and preaching that is done regardless of understanding the reality of the situation, has separated man from the real world and its environmental conditions.



As Hafez states:

“I will escape to the wine - house from this assembly, since the counsel of those who evade their deeds is mandatory not to obey.”

Mr. Qaramaleki: The obligation that Hafez discusses is formative not canonical. Some specific moral commands naturally and permanently exist and need not be preached to the masses.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: Professor, now that the talk about «effective variables on morality» is brought up and you mentioned the necessity to inspect and observe these conditions and in this regard we came up with some details about the duties and responsibilities of a moral educator and it was clarified that he ought to know these variables and factors and avoid presenting worthless advice, we wish to know what other principle attributes does a moral educator need to have to refrain from engaging in ineffective counseling?

Mr. Qaramaleki: Whether we are talking about a moral educator or an educator in another field, an educator needs to have 4 main qualities within him. Now in regards to an educator who is specific to morality, we should add a fifth quality to his list. The first requirement is that he should be knowledgeable. This is very vital. A moral educator should have good knowledge of morality. He is expected to constantly improve himself in this field. In today’s world we have different types of morality – associated majors within the PhD level, such as «Morality in genetic engineering», «Morality in city management», and so on. This however is preceded by the idea that morality is required to be practical and emerging in every field. We need these majors and sciences as well. For instance an army instructor who is asked to instill morality in his guardian corps, needs to possess the know

how of military ethics within him. Someone who is spreading ethics within the police core requires that he be familiar with the knowledge of ethics himself. No matter what field he is working in, every body is expected to be well-informed in his own field. Thus the very first expectation of an educator is to enjoy sufficient conversance. Unfortunately, we do not have the time right now to go into what sufficient conversance means, even though it is extremely important.

«Skill» is the second quality that an educator needs to have. Education is made up of a number of sub skills, techniques and tricks. We should be able to apply them. Why do we say that thinking logically requires skills? Why do you say that driving entails possessing some skills? The same is also true about education. A capable educator ought to know how to utilize these skills.

Briefly when we discuss the topic of skill set, we are referring to those techniques and tricks that can pave the way for changing one's behavior. For instance, how would you help a person who is drowning in negativity and because of this they have become an aggressive person? You would agree that initially you require some skills, and being merely familiar with the situation is not enough. You should have the ability to drive him out of his negative state and into a positive one. You can never educate him nor make any changes in his behavior unless you bestow in him a positive mode. Guiding such a person requires a number of skills and tricks that should be practically known.

The third quality we will call «ability». Ability can be defined as the instilling of practical knowledge and skill within oneself. This ability, once recognized and applied will begin to emerge as

needed.

The fourth quality is known as «vision». An educator is required to create a vision. Visions are incredibly effective particularly in the field of morality. In this field, it is better to be systematic than disorganized. Undoubtedly an educator with a systematic view is more successful. Let me explain further. If you can delve into and comprehend Mowlavi's Masnavi Ma'navi, you will come to this conclusion that he had a systematic view. That is why he has been both effective and respected. In addition to this, someone with a strategic and calculated vision is absolutely more successful than the person who lacks such a view.

In the field of morality, it is better to be systematic than disorganized. Undoubtedly an educator with a systematic view is more successful.

Now let's talk about the fifth quality. This quality is specific to only those who spread and teach morality. A moral educator must be endowed with morality himself. Imam Javad (peace be upon him) has stressed this point in a number of traditions. He has said if an impious person teaches Divine Unity, he will never be successful. Educating others on morality is similar. A moral educator should be principled in two aspects.

- 1) He is expected to instill morality within his intrapersonal communicative behavior.
- 2) He is supposed to organize his own extra personal behavior appropriately.

So, if you want to teach morality, you should possess the

following qualities: knowledge, skill, ability and view. You must be endowed with morality as well.

Let me answer your question in a different manner. In the school of management there is a course named «Techniques and principles of negotiation». Please pay attention to this part. Negotiation exists in all types of business. In a business negotiation, two sides participate and begin to talk and agree on an amount of money. The smarter and more skillful each side is in negotiation, the more benefit they will gain.

If you want to teach morality, you should possess the following qualities: knowledge, skill, ability and view. You must be endowed with morality as well.

In line with the same purpose, the management field has introduced a course named «Techniques and principles of business negotiation». Now my question is why haven't we established any techniques and principles to encourage religion and morality? Why haven't we written any books? Meanwhile we assume we know everything and acting on that is enough for us. We should honestly admit that principles, techniques, and essentials for fostering ethics need to be reviewed, revised, and compiled. A moral educator should have the ability to convert these principles into ability and skill. Unfortunately, despite the need for it, this process has not yet taken place.

We should honestly admit that principles, techniques, and essentials for fostering ethics need to be reviewed, revised, and compiled.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: You have a point here. In other fields, for instance in jurisprudence, years ago we acknowledged the need for the revision and compilation of essentials and principles and have taken comprehensive steps in this regard. These principles centered around the concept that when deriving a Shariah ruling one should not personally refer to traditions, verses, and jurisprudential books and references, rather Ijtihad (interpreting reasoning). However when we discuss ethics, we never feel this necessity and believe that all of the answers are already present and we do not need interpretive reasoning.

Mr. Qaramaleki: The point you just mentioned, reminds me of an injustice that has occurred. After the Islamic Revolution, three fundamental Islamic concepts were born: Jurisprudence, Theology, and Ethics. We started to worry about the dynamism of jurisprudence and we did a lot to address this issue. The other problem was the modernity of theology, and we developed modern theology and improved that. However, we did not address the third concept namely ethics. It is not incorrect to say that we did not take any steps to address the dynamism, modernity and usefulness of ethics. While the interesting point is that in today's society and in the fields of business, industry, management, and so on, we are in dire need of an effective understanding of morality.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: I want to ask you about the methods and approaches in the field of moral education. Unfortunately some heady and taste-based methods are seen in some cases. We do not usually pay attention to indirect methods, and have forgotten many proper approaches for moral education. Please comment on this.

Mr. Qaramaleki: There exists three learning methods that are

considered effective. One of them is “direct learning”, the other one is “scientific and active learning”, and the third one is “social learning”. Nowadays the “direct learning” method is the most ineffective in the field of moral education. I would not say that it has no effect at all. That is why in order to encourage morality we need to apply either the scientific method or the social approach. But there is a point here that needs to be made. Social learning per se is an outstanding process of encouraging behavioral models that will overtake you unless applied actively and eagerly. If in a society, for example, dishonesty is a wide-spread problem. This problem itself becomes a form of social education and will generally defeat us when we want to encourage truthfulness within society. In other words, you should not think that there exists no opposition in the field of morality. Social education is such that opposition in the path of social progress can exist. Let me give you a simple example. If a manager plans to motivate his employees to be better at what they do, he should keep in mind that in essence he is encouraging a form of social education. The manager will only be successful when he has achieved a level where both behavior and practical education are applied in the workforce.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: Basically, this is the criterion according to which both the irrelevance and usefulness of moral commands can be identified. I mean whenever a moral command is issued directly in contrast with social education and teachings of society, it has proven to be of no value. It is not congruent with social and practical grounds and conditions.

Mr. Qaramaleki: This is correct. If you do not associate moral commands with practical approaches, those commands become

ineffective. Thus far, I have explained that fundamentally we have two approaches when encouraging morality: scientific and social. But I have not explicated them yet to see what they truly mean. This topic requires a lot of time to discuss.

I will only discuss the essential points in your speech and emphasize on those. The point is that in moral education we have faltered a lot thus creating damage. Suppose we face a moral dilemma and as educators we plan to solve this dilemma. For example, in our work place jealousy, backbiting, embezzlement or bribery is rampant. All of these are immoral in their definition. It is very possible that we may fail in solving such a problem and thus showing our inexperience. This failure has some aspects that I wish to clarify. One aspect is that the majority of people simply are unaware that these problems exist.

Even if they are told such problems exist in their organization, they are in denial. Another aspect is that they may identify the problem, but do not take it seriously. They simply do not think of it as an issue, and thus do not seek ways to remove it. There is a distinction that needs to be made here between problems and issues. Bribery is a problem not an issue. While facing issues, we should initially discover the troublesome point. We will not succeed unless we detect that initial point of difficulty. Nearly all our moral predicaments can be labeled as societal problems.

Whenever a moral command is issued directly in contrast with social education and teachings of society, it has proven to be of no value. It is not congruent with social and practical grounds and conditions.

If we do not convert our problems into issues in our society, not only will it not be solved but also develop into a crisis. There are some who succeed to alter a problem into an issue but in their methodology they use their own methods. Since they are not familiar with the correct ways to resolve the issue, they invent their own procedures based on their own limited knowledge. This method results in the multiplying of our problems and brings about more issues within society. Let me tell you a story by Mowlavi and then bring the discussion to an end.

Mowlavi says: "If a thorn goes into somebody's foot, he will place his foot on his knee."

In Masnavi, the "thorn" symbolizes damage and/or injury, and "a thorn in the foot" refers to physical injuries. For instance when we catch a cold, we have a thorn in our foot, or in organizational affairs, when we have production problems, sales problems, investment problems, judicial problems, and so on all of these are thorns in the foot of the organization. Mowlavi says what do you do when you have a thorn in your foot? We rest the foot on our knee and remove the thorn.

"He tries to find it with the tip of a needle, and if he does not succeed, he will moisten it with his lips."

We make the effort to find the thorn and pull it out, Mowlavi goes on:

"A thorn in the foot is so hard to find, let alone a thorn in the heart. How can one find it?"

If it is so difficult to find a thorn in a part of the body, why don't you take the thorns in the human soul, that are moral predicaments, seriously and why do you think you are able to detect and remove

them so easily?

Then Mowlavi presents a formula which is a great asset in the concept of moral education.

He states: "If every unskilled person could detect the thorn in the heart, sorrow would never dominate man."

This verse is the abstract of Downlow's short-term psychoanalysis. Professor Downlow has established a school of psychoanalysis that has captured the whole world. It is called "short-term psychoanalysis". This school is summarized in this verse. Short-term psychoanalysis says if you can detect your spiritual predicaments, this in itself is the remedy. The entire system revolves around detecting the issue. Mowlavi says if every unskilled person were able to detect the thorn in his heart, then no one would suffer from sorrow and sadness in this world because:

"Every grief stricken issue that you face is because of being fearless and impudent."

Do you know why? Because:

"Every one who suffers, suffers as a result of something he did or ate."

This is morality. If a moral thorn is pricked in the heart, it has such repercussions. The art of an educator is to be able to detect this thorn and to possess the necessary skill to remove it. In my opinion, the most serious problem in the field of moral education is this. We lack the knowledge and the skill to be able to identify the moral problems that exist. Mowlavi makes use of the Quran that says: "ARABIC" and gives an example for those organizations that try to solve their problems themselves. "If someone places a

thorn under a donkey's tail, the donkey does not know the cure, so it jumps up and down, when it jumps the thorn goes in deeper, a wise man should remove the thorn. The donkey jumps in order to remove the pain, but it in actuality hurts itself in the process". It seems like Mowlavi is telling us if a moral educator is not skillful enough, when he tries to solve a problem, he will simply add to the problem instead of solving it. The most dangerous thing in the field of moral education is the lack of detecting skills. This refers to not being able to detect moral problems on time and accurately and also a lack of skills to solve the moral problems effectively.

In the field of moral education we lack the knowledge and skill to identify the moral problems and afterwards to solve them.

Rah – e – Tarbiyat: Thank you very much professor, I appreciate the opportunity you gave us.

Mr. Qaramaleki: Thank you too.

پروفیسر گاہ علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرہنگی
رتال جامع علوم انسانی



پروہشکاه علوم انسانی ومطالعات فرہنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی