ETHICAL EDUCATION ACCORDING TO MICHEL FOUCAULT'S IDEAS

HAERI YOSRA[a1], ZARGHAMI HAMRAH SAEED[b], MEHDI ZADEH AMIR HOSSAIN[c] AND NADERI EZATOLAH[d]

Doctoral student of Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
Associate professor of Kharazmi University & Invited Professor Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
Associate Professor of Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
Professor of Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to examine ethical education drawing on the ideas of Michel Foucault. Foucault, as one of the post-structuralist philosophers against totality and universality, believed that human being as we know today is the product of modern era. The ethical education that he had in mind involves a specific native education devoid of permanent universal foundations. He suggested that the ethical education seeks to raise free human beings and this goal could be achieved through applying aesthetic ethics in society. In addition, he explained that the complex and multiple subjects at schools make students introvert. And the teachers could reduce these negative outcomes through proving the opportunities for productive critical education. Hence, ethical education could equip the society members with critical standpoints.

KEYWORDS: Foucault, Education, Ethical, Ethical Education

During the history of philosophy, several ideas and schools of thought have been proposed regarding ethics and philosophy of ethics by the western as well as eastern thinkers and philosophers. Many philosophers, from the ancient Greece up to the present time, attempted and are attempting to define a moral system according to their ideational and philosophical beliefs.

Three main branches of philosophy include metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology and axiology itself involves ethics and aesthetics as the subdivisions. And finally ethics is followed through two branches: 1. meta-ethics and 2. normative ethics.

The questions that normative ethics addresses, such as "what is good?", "what should I do?" and etc., distinguish between the correct and incorrect ethical criteria. In fact, normative ethics aims to attain a set of rules and criteria which conduct the individuals in identifying good and bad. But meta-ethics seeks to explain the concepts and words used in ethics and to analyze the nature of moral propositions.

Normative ethics involves two subdivisions as "teleological" and "deontological" ethics. The deontological theories include "virtue ethics" and "consequentialism".

In the teleological theories the final causes exist in the nature of actions; that is the ethicality of the action depends on the natural essence of that given action or the adaptation of the action to a rule or principle, and the motivation for obeying the rule. On the other hand, in the deontological theories, the ethicality of the action, the "evil or good" of the action, is determined by the consequences of that action (David, 1996, p. 70).

The views and ideas of classic philosophers, specifically Plato, largely emerged from virtue ethics. As mentioned above, this type of ethics is deontological and normative and is associated with the concepts such as vice and virtue, good and goodness, ethical obligations, voluntary actions, voluntary agents, bliss and perfection. The virtue ethics theories are characterized by being demonological, highlighting the decent agents instead of merely emphasizing the action, emphasizing the natural and rational values, appreciating intentions and the motivations of the doer, prioritizing wisdom to necessary rules, and focusing on the ethical patterns and role models (Mesbah Yazdi, 1998, p. 30).

Immanuel Kant is another philosopher, among others, who addressed the subject of ethics. There have been several comments for and against the ideas Kant proposed which could be divided into two groups: 1- deontology, that was formed by the supporters of Kant's ideas and was accepted and followed by several theoreticians such as David Ross, John Rawls, and H. A. Prichard. In this ethical theory the actions are necessary for the human beings to do regardless of the outcomes and consequences and this necessity is in the action itself. 2-

---

[1]Corresponding author

Utilitarianism that was against Kant's ideas and could be traced back to Aristotle. John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham are among the thinkers that supported the utilitarianism theory. According to this theory the results and consequences of the action are emphasized over the duties (Thomson, 1999, p. 22).

Kant believed that each ethical imperative is characterized by totality or universality. He stated that if someone has duties toward himself from others point of view, he should fulfill the same duties for all others who are in the same circumstances (Kant, 1972, p. 55).

But the post-structuralism maintains a different philosophical approach toward the same issue. In fact, post-structuralism emerged as a reaction of the philosophers of this school of thought toward the structuralism ideas.

Inspired by Nietzsche, the post-structuralist thinkers question and criticize the totality of ethical statement. They believe that setting universal rules and regulations for behaviors would lead to overlooking and hence eliminating the individual differences among the human beings. Considering all human beings as comparable and identical is erroneous, since what make someone healthy might make other sick. Therefore, everybody should discover the specific rules for their health. The post-structuralist thinkers claim that applying absolute and universal rules and regulations for all human being could be considered as a type of despotism and tyranny which violates freedom and self-esteem (Back, 2004, p. 3). Michel Foucault is one of the most prominent philosophers of post-structuralism school of thought.

Michel Foucault created many works which could be categorized into three basic phases: the one inspired by the Heideggerian hermeneutics which is clearly revealed in The History of Madness; the archaeology works which includes the books such as The Order of Things: an Archeology of the Human Sciences; and the genealogy works that are Discipline and Punishment and History of Sexuality.

"Foucault opened totally novel perspectives in philosophy, history, and sociology; his views and discussions have profound significance in sociology, history, and political sciences" (Dreyfus and Rainbow, 2000, p. 13). Foucault's ideas have a distinctive and outstanding variety, scope, and depth among the contemporary social theories; hence he is largely regarded as an interdisciplinary and inter-paradigmatic thinker whose ideas are applicable to a range of disciplines and approaches. He was inspired by several thinkers before him and he has had marked and major effects on several other contemporary thinkers since then (Wallace and Ruth, 2005; Allen, 2006).

Nevertheless, he brought about indirect effects on some fields including education. "The educators are still at the preface of discovering the implications of the Foucault's ideas in their field" (Palmer, 2001, p. 174). In his book Response to the Circle of Epistemology, Foucault indicated to the significance of education and stated that the discourse theory relies on ethics above other things and undoubtedly ethics depends on the individual sublimation and development and consequently individual development results from educational system. Therefore, according to his ideas, the ethical virtues such as intellectualism, openness, and cooperation are acquired in the appropriate educational settings and the discourse logic, and specifically the cultures and civilizations discourses are affected by the educational system of each civilization (Nimroozi, 2001, p. 40). Foucault challenged and criticized different aspects of structuralism. He mentioned education and ethics as two aspects of structuralism in his sharp critiques toward this school of thought and in this manner he questioned the whole educational system.

Therefore, applying the post-modernist views of Foucault in the field of education necessitates addressing some questions including: "what are the characteristics of ethical education from in his view?" and "what is the goal of ethical education that Foucault had in mind?"

On the other hand, the ultimate goal of education aims to develop human being in different aspects including ethics. Moreover, since the development of ethical dimension of human being is supported and promoted by education, lack of understanding and investigating ethics from Foucault's point of view could lead to incomplete understanding of his philosophical ideas and educational worldview. This partial understating might create limitations for introducing and applying his ideas regarding the ethical issues, because effective application of any idea requires complete understanding of that given idea by the practitioners. Therefore, and according to the increasing effects of post-structuralism in political, social, cultural, religious, educational, and ethical fields, Foucault's views, investigating and

identifying Foucault's ideas precisely seem to gain growing necessary and importance. This could be achieved through organized and structured research and the present study was an attempt to fulfill this research need.

RESEARCH QUESTION

What are the applications of ethical education from Foucault's point of view?

METHODOLOGY

The main goal of the present study was to examine ethical education from Foucault's point of view. The method used for this study included qualitative content analysis and the corpus targeted for analysis involved all Iranian and non-Iranian works (books) written about Foucault's ideas and thoughts. In this study, the relevant data were collected through note taking. Afterward, the obtained data were analyzed through. The data analysis was conducted in 6 steps:

1. Extensive studies were done in order to identify the related literature and theoretical frameworks.

2. The main concepts, elements, and issues were defined according to the data gathered in the preceding step.

3. The theoretical frameworks were formulated with the aim of achieving the relevant data and general instructions.

4. The target corpus was analyzed and the issues and concepts associated with the major subjects defined in the preceding steps were extracted.

5. The obtained issues and concepts were categorized according to their contents.

6. The final concepts were defined according to the new subjects obtained (Alaeie, 2012).

FOUCAULT'S PHILOSOPHICAL AND ETHICAL IDEAS

Discourse

Discourse is at the heart of Foucault's works. Foucault defined discourse as the intersection of power and knowledge. Each specific branch of knowledge follows a specific set of encouraging and deterrent rules and regulations that determine and define the orientations and subjects in that field. These rules and regulations form the discourse within that given discipline. The set of discourses, the system of discourse, and the particular composition of discourse system create the episteme or the knowledge system in each era (Hook, 2001, p. 522). Foucault approached and investigated the discourses of each era through his archeology method. The archives, records, documents, or written materials of discourses are specific to each era and archeology and genealogy seeks to examine and evaluate these data with the aim of revealing the discourse system of that era.

As the studies suggest, the term "discourse" is not synonymous with language and there is no simple relationship between discourse and truth. In fact, discourse does not merely translate truth into language; rather it is a system that frames our ways of understanding the truth (Parker, 1992, p. 120).

Foucault claimed that there is no dependent and absolute truth and everything is affected by discourse. The process of knowledge production follows the rules and norms of a discourse. In this fashion, the truth is formed and developed within the framework of a discourse and considering truth formed beyond and independent from the discourse is sheer fantasy. Foucault addressed these concerns in his book The Order of Discourse. He explained that when Gregor Mendel talked about heredity laws for the first time although he was right, his statements were rejected since there were not in line with the biological discourses of his time and his claims received wide acceptance after the rules and concepts of the biology changed. This was what exactly happened; his statements gained great acceptance after the new discourse emerged (Davidson, 2005, p. 140).

Foucault rejected the intelligent and conscious subject introduced by modernity and believed that it is the product of modern discourse. He added that this is the discourse conditions that define intellectualism and human being is not a subject; rather he takes on meaning in a discourse context. He defined human existence as ethical and claimed that human being is nothing beyond the product of the discourse in his era.

He approached the wisdom and rationality historically and argued that wisdom is rooted in the historical circumstances and is merged with power. As a result, the evaluating criterion for wisdom differs according to the historical conditions. Whereas Habermas place great emphasis on the dichotomy of wisdom (instrumental and communicative rationalities), Foucault believed in plurality of rationality (Hook, 2001, p. 530).

Various discourse and discourse actions originate from a general framework that Foucault called knowledge system. As Foucault states:

Knowledge system involves a set of relations which could be found among the sciences in a specific period of time. Analyzing the sciences at the discourse level [episteme] could reveal the coherent power of a subject, a soul, and an era, which is the relations among the sciences in that given era (Foucault, 1973).

Foucault explained the human nature according to the specific knowledge system and the knowledge foundations of each era. For instance, in the classic era, human being was not considered as the main creator or the God, rather he was regarded as a subject to be explained or a simple maker. The role of human being was describing the order of the universe. He created neither the universe nor its indications; hence, Foucault suggested that there were no theory regarding meaning assignment in that time since human being was merely the descriptor of the existing conditions. In this period, the human nature and essence were related. The representation of the universe was unified through the discourse which did not allow and accept any scientific conflict about human being (Wallace and Wolf, 2005, p. 150).

Foucault believed that the existence of western human has undergone basic alterations. The most important change occurred in late eighteenth century when the horizons of phenomenology broadened so that it recreated itself as a subject for knowledge in a new fashion. The novelty of the self-creation was associated with the unique and exceptional totality of the world of western human. From Foucault's point of view, human being as we know today is the result of modern time, when human being was re-identified through medicine and it was the medicine which represented the existing image of human; a creature who is at the same time subject and object of his own thoughts and knowledge. Foucault maintained that human being is imaged as a set of indications and signs in humanities; modern human is the real product of a historical and cultural reality (Paul, 2013, p. 85).

Genealogy of Power

Foucault defines genealogy as a kind of analysis revolving around three orientations:

First, the historical ontology of ourselves in relation to the truth in which we consider ourselves as the findings of knowledge. Second, the historical ontology of the field in which we consider ourselves as the subjects imposing authority on others. Third, the historical ontology of ourselves in relation to morality though which we change ourselves to moral agents. (Foucault, cited in Owen, 1997, p. 152)

Genealogy does not seek to follow the past in the present, investigate the evolutionary process of species, or follow the human generations (Foucault, 1977, p. 146). Genealogy requires patience as well as deep awareness toward details, and it largely depends on an extensive mass of data and essential skills. One of the presuppositions of genealogy is that there is nothing as permanent nature and fundamental or metaphysic rules. It highlights irregularity and inconsistency instead of progress and development. Although it does not reject investigation in depth, it mainly seeks to describe the superficial and seemingly trivial details. The popular slogan they come up with recommends: "oppose the depth, destination, and insights; do not trust the uniformity and continuity throughout the history, since they are merely masks and desires for conformity" (Dreyfus, 2008, p. 206).

Genealogy studies show that the self-understandings that seem universal, eternal and indispensable have production and possibly expiration dates. Therefore, genealogy reveals that the self-understandings are a set of interpretations which question the image we have from ourselves. In this way, genealogy opens up the possibility for the human to find out how they could be someone different from what they are. Consequently, in genealogy the politics and philosophy are connected to a certain extent and they reinforce each other in an interactive manner (Hoy, 1998, p. 31). Genealogy opposes the holistic approaches – that determine course of the societies – toward history. It records the potential history: "the historians search the evidence for ancestor beyond the time and claim that their judgments are based on oracular and divinatory objectivity" (Wallace and Wolf, 2005, p. 200).

Foucault disputed metaphysic and traditional methods in genealogy; that is he opposed the source, origin, and depth and challenges historical essentialism. In fact, he suspected the truth. Genealogy questions the intentions of truth and aspires to reveal the intentions of

power. One of the most prominent goals that Foucault followed in genealogy involved proposing a method through which the human beings become the subject as well as the object of knowledge. Genealogy exposes the uniqueness of several factors affecting the realities by discovering these factors.

Genealogy aims to draw the lines between "origins" and the contemporary goals in addition to discriminating critique from prescription (Brown, 1998, p. 46). Genealogy analyses show that the concept of freedom means "discovering the dominant classes" and it is not a part of human nature or the origin of his existence and truth (Foucault, 1997, p. 143). Genealogy needs history for abandoning the "origin" fantasies. It should be able to identify the historical events, movements, wonders, impermanent victories and crushing defeats. Foucault considered truth as one of the subjects in the universe created by different forms of domination and pressure and recommended that any attempt for developing knowledge or truth might result in domination. Hence, searching the truth is nothing beyond authoritarianism. Truth has obtained an exclusive privilege and place in the modern time and generated the concepts such as lack of intellectualism and madness. In agreement with Nietzsche, Foucault identified truth as a dynamic force of metaphors, metonyms, and human being created assumptions. Referring to the order of the things, he showed how the structure of "truth" has undergone changes throughout the history. He applied the concept of knowledge formation in order to describe a rule system that determines whether a given predicate could deserve maintaining a value or truth in a specific time (Foucault, 1982, p. 780).

In his last works, Foucault reasons that religion forms part of technology as a game of truth (Carrette, 2000, p. 148). Indeed, Foucault weakened the foundations of truth pretension through his genealogy method. This method reveals that simply some layers of interpretations and explanations take on the form of reality. Human beings dominate and rule themselves and others by means of producing truth and necessity, while there is no universality for the truth.

In his latter works, including Discipline and Punish and History of Sexuality, Foucault addressed the relationship among power, knowledge, and ethics. He talks about "disciplinary technology" in Discipline and Punish and sought to explain the subject of power through

a "panopticism": "the main effect of a panopticism involves creating a static state in the captive that makes his aware of his visibility; a state which warrants the automatic function of power". This system results in automatic subjugation and discipline, so that every individual acts as his own supervisor which consequently facilitates exercising higher levels of power at the lowest costs (Paul, 2013, p. 95).

Foucault argued that knowledge does not involve a pure search for the truth, and the power plays a significant role in the process of information and ultimately determines what should carry the label of truth. In order for something to be labeled as truth, it should be completely approved and authorized by those in power. For instance, the pictures pass through a complex and long process of edition and censorship in the news reports on television that is typically hidden from our sights. The governments and other agents control and limit the information that we receive; the information that we take as true (Milz, 2010, p, 121).

Foucauldian Ethics

In the arguments regarding ethics, Foucault was largely concerned with the relationship between the individuals and themselves. He called this relationship as ethics and believed that the ethical identity is developed in the light of this relationship (Marsico, 2010, p. 5).

Foucault's concerns with the concept of human identify development according to the power and the various relevant mechanisms directed him toward studying and investigating the documents and texts from ancient Greece. He declared the devoted pietism of Christianity to be deviant due to suppressing the natural human desires, and in addition he suggested that Descartes's well-known statement: "I think, therefore I am", is a narrative that fails to describe the process of identity development in a whole manner because the thoughts and ideas in any given time are smeared with the presuppositions in that era and the human being does not recognize the contradictions; rather he aspires to justifying what makes the basics of his ideas (Menihan, 2012, p. 10).

He rejected the approach that modern psychologists, such as Freud, adopted for analyzing the human being by referring to the sexuality because he suggested that human subconscious is affected by his historical time to a large extent which emerges in the

language of that time. Foucault found and examined the footsteps of power in the approach of modern psychology which takes on the form of knowledge and is summarized in the psychologist who is a human being and does not necessarily take a free approach toward the human issues (Foucault, 1999).

The critiques Foucault made about the presuppositions of modern time are not due to the power since he considered power, a motivator for discipline, as the essence which helps the human being to order and activate his internal potentials and take a beneficial role in the society by applying his power (Menihan, 2012, p. 12). Foucault mentioned the static definition of the humanities for the human being that condemns him to a lifestyle which limits him as the result of modern time flaws rather than the discipline and power exercise. According to him, the modern humanities knowledge looks for a kind of uniformity to offer a framework for explaining all the human beings regardless of cultural differences. Therefore, he tried to challenge the relationship between knowledge and knowing "oneself" as the morality:

For centuries we have been convinced that there are analytical relationships between individual morality and socioeconomic and macro political structures which we are not able to change. For instance, the family life lasts only if the economics, democracy and etc. get ahead well. I think that we must abandon the analytical idea or the necessary relationship between morality and other political, economical, and social structures. (Foucault, 1983, p. 236)

This does not imply that Foucault overlooked the social contexts and relationships in explaining the human behaviors; conversely, he suggested that the mental and cognitive processes of human mind mainly depend on his biological environment. But the significant point that he raised is that the relationship between human being and himself develops around the ethical aspect of his identity; hence he based ethics on experimental knowledge (the memories and the personal interpretations generalized from them) that leads to knowledge of self. From his perspective, a person without knowledge cannot treat himself ethically and take care of his self. These are the same ethical rules and guidelines that Socrates searched for as discovering the truth through dialectics (Davidson, 2005, p. 125).

The modern reality of human being is constructed through the knowledge of humanities that provides a narrow and restricted definition highly affected by the relationship between power and knowledge. Foucault examined the documents from ancient Greece in a search for a definition for human being that does not emerge from the power-knowledge relationships. As a result he found a definition that played a considerable role in developing the human being at that time (Foucault, 1986, p, 90).

Foucault introduced the ethical subjects in his book History of Sexuality for the first time. He published this book in three volumes. In the first volume titled The Will to Knowledge, he addressed the genealogy of the concept of sexuality and how it relates to the power. He reasoned that sexuality has been employed as a tool and method for extending the domination and subjugating the individuals. He explains that sexuality, the same as knowledge and truth, is a historical product originated from the discourse with various definitions in different historical periods. As an example for the discourse nature of sexuality, Foucault mentioned that while free sexuality was considered as a value in some periods, it is dominated by the rationality in the modern time. In the other volumes of this book titled The Use of Pleasure and The Care of the Self, he probed and analyzed sexuality in Greece and Rome and he started the discussions regarding ethics (Paul, 2013, p. 105).

Foucault wrote that the development of human personality in the field of ethical criteria occurred in a particular manner and based on specific principles. In ancient Greece, the deepest concern and question was the development and self-creation of the self and governing and controlling the self took on an organized process as well as an ethical nature at that time (Foucault, 1986).

Governing the self refers to the relationship that the individual establishes with himself and in this way gains the control of his self which was presumed as an ethical action by the ancient Greeks. In fact, Foucault tried to identify and understand the process of change that the healthiness of the self underwent from its Greece-Roman roots to the Christian goal of self-abnegation.

The approach that Foucault adopted toward ethics was largely inspired by Nietzsche. He argued that the components of ethics include the thinking, conscious actions, and explaining the ambiguity and the language to describe it. According to his ideas, no ethics could be imagined for the modern thinking because modern thinking is a particular type of action. Thinking has

released itself in its existence from nineteenth century (Foucault, 1966, p. 328).

Following Nietzsche, Foucault rejected the universality of ethics and explains that: "finding a form of ethics acceptable to all and followed by all could be catastrophic" (Menihan, 2012, p. 15). In general he identified two kinds of ethics among others: first aesthetic ethics that deals with the ethical goals of ancient Greece and is characterized with emphasizing on the bliss and healthiness of the self. The ancient Greeks did not suppress the sexual pleasure; rather they integrated sexual actions with self-disciplin:

Self-discipline originated from the individual culture regarding the art of living that involved philosophical, pedagogical, as well as medical aspects. This was the time when the concept of ethical essence was proposed. Foucault reminds that the relationship between sexual desire and for long individual health had been the subject of ethics in ancient Greece (Roger, 2005, p. 90).

The ancient Greeks disapproved the indulgence in sexual behaviors, because it damages the internal innocence and purity of human being and endangers his healthiness. This type of ethics underlines the individuals' relationships and experience with themselves; in fact, individual experience involves the internal relationship of the individual with himself. That is how the individual is able to take care of himself, to control his self, and to be his own master in order to reach the healthiness and bliss. In addition, Greeks believed that the individuals who could attain this significant achievement, draw the most precious picture of life for themselves and reach ethical essence and the art of "living better". This last step was the ultimate and most idealized ethical value for them (Foucault, 1990).

Foucault called the second type of ethics as "regulatory ethics" He argued that the aesthetic ethics was replaced by general ethical rules and regulation after the Christianity emerged; the orders that Christians followed merely because they were sent from God. Foucault did not prove this kind of action as valuable and resists considering it as ethics. In fact, Foucault distinguished between ethical regulations and ethical actions and categorized the schools which seek to set and prescribe general instructions and absolute regulations under the regulatory ethics which he disproved; he supported the ethical action instead. He considered Greek ethics as the

true representation of aesthetic ethics and added that the modern rational ethics should be regarded as regulatory ethics due to following the instructions. He wrote that: "the current histories of ethics mainly highlight those ethical systems that include a set of ethical instructions and values and the first type of ethics, Greek ethics, is relatively forgotten" (Foucault, 1997, p. 136). Foucault believed that regulatory ethics is obligatory and compulsory, since the individual has to follow the rules and regulations which are set and imposed on him by external forces with not involvement from his side. In contrary, in aesthetic ethics the individual takes action to control his self freely through an internal relationship and he refuses to surrender to his desires. In this way, he is not dominated and enslaved by his desires; that is the true meaning of freedom in Foucault's perspective. He explained that:

Taking care of oneself enables the individual to take the right position toward others. Establishing relationship with others is facilitated through taking care of oneself and the goal of managing oneself is the delight and healthiness of others. Governing oneself is related to others and there would be no ethics without such a domination over oneself (Foucault, 1986).

In addition, Foucault made clear that the ethical actions and regulations should be discriminated in discussions regarding history. The human behaviors are the same as their conducts, while ethical regulations are imposed on the people from external agents. In Foucault's perspective, ethics produces action, existence, and the manner of relating to others. Generally speaking, taking care of oneself takes ethical priority over taking care of others (Smart, 1995, p. 101). Consequently, Foucault disclaimed public and universal ethics.

Foucault's Educational Perspectives

Foucault asserted that basically there is no general and public scheme to direct the universal actions; hence he rejected the image of absolute, universal, and generalizable foundations for education. From his standpoint, truths emerge from the power relations and there is no absolute truth to create the foundation of education. Popkewitz and Brenan are among the several practitioner who aim to employ the Foucault's ideas and views in education. They appreciate the approach that Foucault took toward studying power-knowledge relations because it leads to criticizing the several functions of schools regarding the power. They claim that the criticism

that Foucault raised differ from other critics in that Foucault penetrated the phenomena and did not remain at the surface. Foucault defined knowledge as an attempt for understanding the social conditions (Hoy, 1998, p. 44).

Foucault indicated that all types of knowledge are political by nature. The textbooks and the production of subject materials reflect various political approaches and largely support those who assisted the powers politically as well as economically. "Power produces the knowledge and power and knowledge affect each other directly and interactively. No power persists without the cooperation from different fields of knowledge. No knowledge could be imagined without supporting the power" (Foucault, 1995, p. 113).

Foucault introduced schools as normalizing institutes where the students are categorized and classified precisely to establish a hierarchical system. The traditional approaches employed by the teachers could not lead to true learning; but the teachers are able to motivate the students for movement even in the worst conditions possible. The variety and complexity of the subjects subjugate the students and after passing several years in the classrooms with absolute control, the students submit to the authority.

By proving the grounds for critical education, as Foucault and others had in mind, the teachers could partially lessen and neutralize the negative effects. In Discipline and Punish, Foucault revealed that the goal of discipline and punishment is nothing except normalizing the behaviors and eliminating the social and mental chaos and disorders and ultimately educating submissive individuals who provide benefits for the society. He thought that the disciplinary and corrective techniques employed in schools, prisons, hospitals, mental institutions, and presidios seek to evaluate, analyze, and measure the behaviors in order to prepare a report accordingly. After drawing a framework the acceptable and normative behaviors would be encouraged and appreciated and the abnormal and disapproved behaviors are punished by legal actions (Foucault, 1995, p. 222).

The ideas and statements of Foucault, particularly in the field of ethics, indicate that generally he opposed any theorizing and systematizing and considered theorizing as issuing sentences which produces domination and exclusion. Therefore, he basically rejected educational forms of ethics offered through curricula and believed that the individual takes

the ethical action in free and non-exclusive conditions and according to his interests and ideals and educate his self in an internal and intellectual relationship. In the next part, some of the implications of the ideas of this great philosopher are discussed for ethical education.

Implications of Foucault Ideas for Ethical Education

1. The ethical education of Foucault is against modern humanism and intellectualism. Foucault rejected the conscious subject and the intellect as the modernity defines as the invention of modern discourse. He argued that the discourse condition attributes meaning to intellectualism and human being is not a subject but it takes on meaning in a discourse setting. He declared human existence as mortal and claimed that human being is nothing beyond the product of discourse of his time (Hook, 2001, p. 530).

Foucault pointed out that the existence of western human being has undergone basic changes and the most considerable change occurred in late eighteenth century. The phenomenology horizons broadened so that it was recreated as a novel subject of knowledge through a new approach. The novelty of this self-creation was related to the unprecedented totality of the world of western human being. In Foucault's opinions, the human being as we know today is produced by the modern time.

Foucault explained the nature of human according to the specific knowledge system of each period and the framework of that foundation. For instance, in the classis period human was not supposed as the main creator or the God, rather he was considered as a subject to be explained or a simple maker. Human being assumed the role of explaining the order of the universe. The human being creates neither the universe nor the signs and indications; therefore Foucault held that there were no theory about the meaning since human was the descriptor of the existing conditions. In this period, the human nature and essence were attached. The representations of the existence were uniformed through the discourse and this integration did not allow any science about human (Wallace and Wolf, 2005, p. 150).

Foucault did not accept something as the human nature. The behaviors, ethics, discourses, and societies could undergo changes throughout the time. The history reveals no pattern and we are not supposed to constantly develop and progress.

The view that Foucault adopted toward humankind highlights the common elements rather than the differences and he continued defending the marginalized groups such as homosexuals, prisoners, the racial minorities and etc (Stuart, 2010, p. 97).

2. Foucault's ethical education had a local and specific nature. Foucault challenged the modernity foundations regarding truth and ethics. He rejected the existence of external, permanent, and universal truth that serves as the main criterion for the field of ethics. According to him, the truth and ethics that modernity introduces as universal resulted from the modern historical conditions which aimed to exercise power and maintain domination (Foucault, 1997, p. 136).

He indicated how the structure of "truth" has been modified throughout the history by referring to the order of the things. He employed the concept of knowledge formation for describing the regulation system that determines if a predicate deserves marinating a value-reality in each specific period (Paul, 2013, p. 104). Foucault argued that each society maintains particular regime of truth and general course of truth that serves as the subject of conflicts and struggles about reality and the role that reality plays in socio-economic, political, and educational order and the efforts and struggles of the thinkers acquire meaning at this level which defines the orientation for society's structure and functions.

Discrediting and inhibiting the local forms of wisdom was not attained through employing legal power of censorship; rather it arose from regulatory system that differentiates the correct from incorrect, and right from wrong and grants the power privileges to the truth. Briefly, the political-economical systems producing truth allow and facilitate challenging and suppressing the local wisdom (Brown, 1998, p. 55).

As Foucault suggested, the idea of enduing, universal, and generalizeable foundations for education originated from a realist image regarding the truth and since there is no enduring reality or truth, the post-structuralist education could not be established based on such a reality. As a result, education is presumed as a local-bound and regional issue. Post-structuralists basically disapprove the huge schema for guiding the universal action. Regarding the same point, Foucault argued that the realities are born from the power relations, therefore no persistent and unchanging truth exists and the truths and values should be found within the discourses

(ibid., p. 140). Furthermore, Foucault rejected the universality of ethics following Nietzsche and adds that: "finding a form of ethics acceptable to all and followed by all could be catastrophic" (Roger, 2008, p. 85).

3. Ethical education is equivalent to critical education. Foucault mentioned warning against the risks of power as the most imperative function of philosophy and he believed that philosophy should challenge and question domination in all aspects including political, economical, and etc. He required that the philosophers should fulfill the prophecy of revealing the deceptions and aimed to encourage the human being to adopt a deep and critical standpoint. Those who identify the discourse of their time would not be entangled and constrained by the discourse waves. Such individuals achieve high levels of awareness and manage to criticize and uncover the deceptions. In fact, this is an open-minded who consciously criticizes avoiding dogmatism (Foucault, 1986, p. 85).

On the other hand, Foucault claimed that schools are indeed the normalizing and unifying institutes. The students are categorized and classified precisely into classes in order to establish a hierarchical system. The traditional approaches used by the teachers could not lead to true learning. Nevertheless the teachers could encourage the students for movement by taking particular actions. The variety and complexity of the subjects subjugate the students and after passing several years in the classrooms with absolute control, the students submit to the authority. By proving the grounds for critical education, as Foucault and others have in mind, the teachers could partially lessen and neutralize the negative effects (Hoy, 1998, p. 50).

In Discipline and Punish, Foucault revealed that the goal of discipline and punishment is nothing except normalizing the behaviors and eliminating the social and mental chaos and disorders and ultimately educating submissive individuals who provide benefits for the society. He thought that the disciplinary and corrective techniques employed in schools, prisons, hospitals, mental institutions, and presidios seek to evaluate, analyze, and measure the behaviors in order to prepare a report accordingly. After drawing a framework the acceptable and normative behaviors would be encouraged and appreciated and the abnormal and disapproved behaviors are punished by legal actions (Foucault, 1995, p. 222).

According to Foucault's reasoning, the infra-penalty, or extrajudicial punishment is latent in the heart

of power discipline system which is implemented and imposed on several behaviors. Therefore, a scrupulous set of punishments are strictly imposed for time (delay, absence, interruption in the work), activities (inattentiveness, indifference, idleness), behaviors (discourtesy, disobedience), speaking (loquacity, rudeness) body (unacceptable postures, inappropriate expressions, uncleanliness) and sexuality (offensiveness, indecency) in the workshops, schools, and armies (Smart, 2006, p. 113).

In reality, it is the non-conformity discipline that is punished through imposing the disciplinary power. Nonetheless, discipline is enforced not only through punishment but also reinforcement by the rewards and benefits for appropriate behaviors. One of the major outcomes of this punishment and reward system could be observed in the process of education; the students are ranked and classified. In other words, punishment in the disciplinary power does not seek to penalize or suppress; rather it aims to normalize and conform which is the most principal and critical instrument of exercising power along with hierarchical supervision originated from the classic era (ibid., p. 115).

3. The ethical education intends to develop active human beings. Foucault mentioned thinking, conscious action, explaining the ambiguity and the language used for this purpose as the major components of ethics. He explained that no ethics is relevant for modern thinking, since it is considered as a specific type of action. From the beginning of nineteenth century, thinking has freed. (Foucault, 1996, p. 328).

He distinguished between two kinds of ethics. First, aesthetic ethics in which the human being creates his life the same as an art work. Foucault referred to Greek ethics as an example of aesthetic ethics which emphasized the relationship between the individuals with themselves. Second, the regulatory ethics in which the individuals follow a set of rules and regulations. He mentioned the Christian ethics as an example of this ethics and believed that the contemporary ethics in the society should be categorized under the second type of ethics. In his later works he sought to revive the aesthetic ethics (Foucault, 1997, p. 140).

In addition, he recommended that the ethical actions and regulations should be differentiated in the discussions regarding the history of ethics. While human behaviors are their conducts, ethical regulations are imposed on them by external forces. Foucault believed that ethics leads to the actions, existence, and the relationship with oneself as well as others. On the whole, care of the self takes priority to care of others (Smart, 1995, 101).

Foucault differentiated between ethical regulations and ethical actions and he was against the institutions that produce and prescribe public instructions and absolute regulations. He approved the ethical actions and believed that human behaviors are his conducts, while ethical regulations are instructions imposed from outside (Friberg, 2010, p. 5).

In his book The History of Sexuality, he stated that we should distinguish between ethical regulations and behaviors in the history of ethics. The actions or behaviors are the real conducts, while the ethical regulations are implemented and enforced on people. He suggested that we must differentiate between the regulations that determine the actions that are allowed and forbidden and the regulations that determine the positive or negative content of the behaviors. As an example he referred to an ethical regulation that forbids people from having sexual relationship out of the marriage. He stated that the other aspect of ethics which gains higher significance that is the relationship between human being and himself, the relation to oneself, and he called this relationship as ethics that determines how the individual should construct himself as the subject of his actions (Foucault, 1983).

CONCLUSION

Michel Foucault was one of the prominent thinkers who raised sharp criticism against modernity. He claimed that true ethics adopts meaning in the context of aesthetic ethics. His influential works left profound and widespread effects including invalidation of the broadly accepted concept of subject. Foucault shattered and violated the powerful taboo that modernity created for intellectualism. His writings revealed several realities about the power-knowledge relations and challenged modern humanism vigorously and he declared "end of man" in The Order of the Things. In his perspective, no independent subject could be defined as the heart of the universe and human subject was in fact invented by the modernity. Generally speaking, the subject is the product of the existing circumstances.

He approached modernity from a negative and pessimistic standpoint so that he totally ignored the achievements of intellectualism in western civilizations. In contrast, "the goal of progress, equality, and human perfection are results of intellectualism and modern philosophy, the philosophy of Kant, Hegel, and Marx, believes in progress and advancement".

Foucault stated that the existence of western human being has undergone fundamental changes and the most important change occurred in late eighteenth century. He explained the human nature according to the particular knowledge system and the knowledge base framework of each era.

On the other side, he disagreed with totality and universality in any form or dimension and rejected the coherent and unified systems. He suggested that: "we must resist the centralized tendencies for globalizing the theories and focus on investigating in subjugated, local, and specific knowledge." Foucault criticized all wholeness including absolute intellectualism, popular culture, and universal ethics and he reminded that modern ethics is not the exclusive and single pattern of ethics and other patterns could exist. In his words, "no one single form of ethical life could respond to everybody. Now we have to turn to the local, limited and partial forms" (Foucault, 1983).

Moreover, he stated that the ethical actions and regulations must be differentiated in discussions regarding the history of ethics. The human behaviors are the same as his conducts, while ethical regulations are imposed by external forces. Foucault believed that ethics could lead to a kind of action, existence, and relationship with oneself and others. In general, he ethically prioritized the care of the self over care of others. He advocated the critical education and claimed that the traditional approaches could not lead to true learning. But the teachers are able to relatively lessen the negative effect by providing the essential grounds for critical education. In Discipline and Punish, Foucault wrote that the major goal of discipline and punishment is normalizing the behaviors and eliminating the social and mental disorders and raising obedient and profit-making individuals for the society.

REFERENCES

Aalaeie, Gh. (2012). Analysis of intellectual cognition proposed in Quran verses based on Tafsirolmizan and its implication on religion education curriculum goals. Journal of Research in curriculum planning, 9 (2).

Allen, K. (2006): Contemporary Social and Sociological Theory: Visualizing Social Worlds. London: Pine Forge Press.

Beck, C. (2004). Postmodernism, Pedagogy, and Philosophy of Education. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Brown, W. (1998). Genealogical Politics, in Jeremy Moss (Ed.), The Later Foucault, London: Sage.

Carrette, J. R. (2000). Foucault and Religion. London: Routledge.

Davidson, A. (2005). Ethics as Ascetics: Foucault, the History of Ethics, and Ancient Thought. The Cambridge Companion to Foucault, 2nd ed. Gary Gutting, pp. 123-148. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

David, K. (1996). Meta-ethics (analytical ethics), 1 , p. 70-75, translated by M. Javadi [in Persian].

Dreyfus, H. and Rainbow, P. (2008). Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Translated by H. Boshiriyeh. Tehran: Ney Publications [in Persian].

Foucault, M. (1973). The order of Things. New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1982).The Subject and Power. University of Chicago press.

Foucault, M (1986). Power/knowledge, selected interview and other writing 1972-1977 ed. Colin Gordon New York: pan theOn.78-108.

Foucault, M. (1997).Friendship as a way of life in Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: the New Press.pp135-140.

Foucault, M. (1995). Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of The Prison. Tr. A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1966). The Order of Things, Archaeology of the Human Sciences, London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1990). The History of Sexuality, vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure, trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, In Language, Counter Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews, edited by D.F. Bouchard, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Friberg, M. (2010). Foucault, Freedom, and the Limits of Modernity., 4 (1), pp:3-14.

Roger, D. (2005). Moral orthopedics: A Foucaldian Account of schooling as discipline, pp. 84-102.

Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, Knowledge, Materiality, History. Theory and Psychology, 11(4), pp. 521-547.

Hoy, D. C. (1998). Foucault and Critical Theory, in Jeremy Moss (Ed.)(1998), The Later Foucault, London: Sage.

Kant, I. (1972). Groundwork of metaphysic of morals, Translated by Paton, H. J. in Moral law, London: Hutchinson university library, PP. 53-123.

Marsico, R. (2010). The care of the self in Foucault and Socrates, April 23, Department of Philosophy. pp.1-55.

Menihan, C. J. (2012). Care of Self, Foucauldian Ethics and Contemporary Honors. Senior Honors Projects. Paper 263.

Mesbah Yazdi, M. T. (2005). Investigating the Ethical Schools of Thought. Qom: Emam Khomeini Educational Institute.

Owen, D. (1997). Maturity and Modernity: Nietzsche, Foucault, and the Ambivalence Reason. London: Routledge.

Palmer, A. (2001). Foucault and education – Discipline, in Fifty Modem Thinkers on Education: form Piaget to the Present Day. Advisory editor. Daivid Ecooper. London: Routledge..

Parker, I. (1992). Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology. London: Routledge.

Paul, V. (2013). Foucault: His thought, His Character .John wiley and Sons Publisher

Smart, B. (2006). Michel Foucault. Translated by L. Joafshani and H. Chavoshian. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications [in Persian].

Stuart, S. (2006). Introducing Critical Theory. Translated by P. Yazdanjo. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications [in Persian].

Thomson, A. (1999). Critical Reasoning in Ethics, First Edition, London: Routledge.

Wallace, R. and Wolf, A. (2005). Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition, Sixth Edition: Pearson Prentice-Hall.