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Abstract

This paper offers a critical interpretation of a number of issues linking social justice and education. This critical interpretation is based on a framework developed from the conclusions of research conducted in relation to a PhD thesis. The research was aimed at finding out how social justice is constructed in education in 'new times' and took the form of a critical case analysis in a country primary school. It concluded that social justice in education in 'new times' is aligned to an ideology of liberal democracy resulting in the emergence of a hyper individualism. This results in the language of economics dominating the social justice and educational debate. In such a situation the social whole, social identity and social cohesion are marginalised. This produces a curriculum which focusses on the education of the individual for economic imperatives. What is concluded is that the way towards a more socially just society is related to the assimilation of the hyper individual with the social group. A shift to a culture where the individual's rights and responsibilities are respected within a social whole, resulting in the emergence of the socially responsible individual. Such a cultural shift suggests the emergence of a curriculum that educates for social responsibility, rather than the current curriculum that is aligned to economic imperatives. In arguing this I will draw on my PhD research that was conducted in a country school.
Dominant and marginal themes of 'new times'

We live in a time when change is, according to social theorist Anthony Giddens (1984), moving at a pace which is "white hot" (p.199). This suggests that the changes that are occurring which challenge our deepest cultural assumptions and can be interpreted as a cultural shift. It is a time when the intellectualisation of all aspects of life is evident. The intellectually trained are in 'new times' the dominant group (Pitt 1998) and their rise to dominance brings with it particular features and values. According to a number of authors including Sharp (1983) the intellectually trained tend to operate in abstract ways and the need for people to engage face to face fades. As Sharp (1983) puts it: "universalisation is over against the more parochial social forms from which the intellectual type is abstracted" (p.90). This form of universalisation, through extension, sees the intellectual operating in a particularly open form of network (Sharp 1983), one which extends over time and space.

One of the results of abstraction is the emergence of a more autonomous self. A hyper- individual who places value on individual rights, competition and individual achievement (Pitt 1998). When the intellectual comes to dominate the social groupings we see the emergence of four main inter-related issues.

Technology becomes all pervasive, it is both brought into being by and sustained by the intellectually trained. It has had a far reaching impact on all aspects of life from one's work to leisure pursuits. The second inter-related issue is globalisation. This is about the changing of the relationship between time and space (Waters 1995). It is about global connectedness, the changing relationship between the local and the global. It is also about the development of a global consciousness, of thinking globally. Thirdly we see the dominance of economic rationalist tendencies which is closely aligned to the rise of liberal democracy which is politically of the 'new right'. One of the features of economic rationalism is that it creates and depends on the: "hyper-objectification" (Pusey 1991, p.171) of the market. This results in the splitting of the economic order from the socio-cultural order. In this situation society is merely something which 'gets in the way' of the economy. In the 1970s the socio-cultural (normative) structure had precedence. In the 1980s it was the economic order, the market, that has priority (Pusey 1991). This new form of economics prefers efficiency to equality and humanity. Thus recasting all aspects of one's life. The fourth and last inter-related issue that is dominant in 'new times' is that of bureaucratic rationalism which works in concert with the three issues outlined above to bring about a cultural shift toward the hyper individualization of life. The dominant social grouping along with these issues are reflected in the both policy and practice in schools. We see a rise of credentialism along with the need for schools to act more like businesses and for students to become proficient users of new technologies as well as excelling in literacy, mathematics and science.

Both the dominant social grouping, the intellectually trained, and the issues relating to their rise to dominance, technology, globalisation as well as economic and bureaucratic rationalism result in the marginalisation of other social groupings. The marginalised social groupings include the unemployed and the under-employed (Pitt 1998). For these marginal groups issues including poverty and inadequate housing dominate. For those in marginal groups who live in rural areas these issues are compounded. As rural industries such as fruit growing are increasingly technologised the manual worker becomes redundant and numbers in the marginal groupings grow (Pitt 1998).

Also marginalised in 'new times' is co-operation whether it be in relation to social life, industry or education (Pitt 1998). The word is reworked and framed within the abstracted world of the intellectually trained and co-operation is set in new parameters related to co-operation of the hyper individual for the greater good of the economy. With in such a climate there remains some vestiges of co-operation which could be rework for the development of a
more socially just society. In school initiatives such as parents networking within the school and community to improve the relationship between schools and their communities (Pitt 1998).

So we see in 'new times' a cultural shift which sees the rise of the intellectually trained to dominance thus increasingly marginalising those in the community who are unable to either join the ranks of the intellectually trained or to operated in the abstract ways 'new time' demands. Such a culture produced a particular form of social justice and it is to that I will now turn.

Social justice in education in 'new times'

The dominant and marginal themes in social justice in 'new times' reflect the complex issues outlined above and need to be interpreted as a cultural shift, one which sees the hegemonic rise of the intellectually trained with their inherent individualism. It is a time when economic rationalism and a political ideology of liberal democracy is on the rise on a global scale. This sees the valorisation of the individual, as compared to the group and the family, as compared to the social whole within the context of expanded economic groupings and markets. Such an ideological position sees the role of the state as providing the 'legitimising muscle' to advance the cause of individuals and their families as compared to larger social groupings. This perception applied in Australia even under a Labor Government. In this sense, social justice policies in 'new times' are ideological; they act as a political lever to legitimate economic restructuring. They are policies designed to carry disparate groups forward and together, on a common wave of economic reform. They are, in this sense, used to 'sell' economic reform as being 'good' for all of society. Against the backdrop of economic rationalism and liberal democratic ideals, there emerges a language geared to the production of an economically viable self; image, identity, esteem and confidence. As a result, the sense of identity as 'social' is lost from view.

Social justice as it is seen in schools in 'new times' is far removed from the classical sense in which justice was defined by philosophers. Aristotle, for example, emphasised the individual striving for virtue within a community, when an individual was striving to be virtuous the result would benefit the whole of society. In this sense what is good for the individual is also good for society (MacIntyre 1985). If Margaret Thatcher is to be believed in contemporary life 'there is no such thing as society' (Cox 1995). While acknowledging the possibility of this statement I would argue that it is not, at this time and hopefully never will be, the case. In contemporary culture notions of the link between the virtuous individual and the good of society are, with a few exceptions, missing.

Schools are one of the institutions of the current culture and thus what occurs in them reflects the hegemonic practices of that culture. Ideologically, social justice policy and practice in schools is set within the hegemony of the intellectually trained. This being the case what is presented as social justice is seen through a veneer which has us believing it to be 'natural' and 'normal'. Social justice has been colonised by the dominant social group; it has become a symbol used to legitimate their material practices and thus consolidate their dominance. The policies and practices of the dominant social group result in social justice being defined according to economic gain, while marginal themes focus more on the development of social cohesion and a sense of community. To demonstrate what I mean Table 1 below considers the key themes in social justice in terms of the dominant and marginal language used in policy and practice:
Table 1 Key Themes in Social Justice in 'New Times'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Language</th>
<th>Marginal Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• market driven</td>
<td>• social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• global competitiveness</td>
<td>• social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• individual access</td>
<td>• community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• measured competencies</td>
<td>• reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• development plans</td>
<td>• trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• accountability</td>
<td>• co-operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dominant language of social justice results in a very narrow view of what social justice is, one tied to intellectualism and its prevailing economic views. It is one where the rights of the autonomous individual hold precedence over the individual as a part of a cohesive community with responsibilities to that community. This is the social justice reflected by what MacIntyre (1985) calls bureaucratic individualism.

**A framework for a further cultural shift**

In premodern times, life was tied very closely to institutional roles, notions of honour and chivalry prevailed amongst the aristocratic males of society (Berger 1983). The emergence of liberal democratic ideals can be traced back to the revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries and reflect a genuine and deep seated change in the structure of social life including the demise of the concept of honour. The transformation of social life over the period of the last three centuries has been due to many factors. According to Berger (1983) they include: "technology and industrialization, bureaucracy, urbanization and population growth, the vast increase in communication between every conceivable human group, social mobility, the pluralization of social worlds and the profound metamorphosis in the social contexts in which children are reared" (p.178). The institutions of social life have been increasingly challenged over recent centuries. There has been an increasing movement away from monopolistic forms of control over labour and capital. Behind such developments is an ideology that privileges the rights of the individual to function without undue influence or control by the government (the state). Most people, in the so called free west, have been formed as social beings within this ideology. The struggles that have resulted in the freeing of the individual person from various forms of bondage of the past, for example, slavery, child labour and the denial of many 'rights' to women, have been significant social gains (Berger 1983). The emergence of human dignity has seen the recognition that even those who occupy the weakest positions in society have the right to protection and to dignity. This has resulted over the years in movements in favour of such things as the abolition of slavery, rights for workers and laws relating to racial discrimination. What has occurred is a movement from an ideology of the person who acted within a framework of honour, where the self is found within one's institutional roles, to one where the self is found outside of institutional roles and an individual acts with dignity. It may be said then, that honour is associated with bondage to traditions in forms such as feudalism, while dignity is associated with individual freedom.

In 'new times' there has emerged a hyper individualism and along with this a contradiction. This contradiction can be seen in the way some actions taken to preserve the freedom of
some can act against the best interests of others. 'Free' markets and minimal government illustrate such a point. It is these ideals which are reflected in the dominant themes of social justice seen in Table 1. How then are we to move towards a more socially just society? To do this it is necessary to acknowledge that for both the individual agent and the social group, social bonds, have both positive and negative effects. The emergence of the individual agent has resulted in progress in human rights but there needs to be curbs on the excesses which result in the contradiction mentioned above. Social bonds can be supportive, the environmental movement has provided examples of this. They can also be oppressive and restrictive of individual freedom, such as when young people become trapped in cults. What is necessary here, is a new way of considering the relationship between the individual and society. Socialist regimes of the political Left have been seen in recent years as failing to provide the answer. The political Right suggest a return to tradition though fundamentalism, but this does not provide the answer either (Giddens 1994). A position supported by Berger (1983) who suggests that the notion of honour, must re-emerge. He does not suggest a return to past institutions but rather the development of institutions with codes of honour, which embody the notions of human dignity. Following Berger's (1983) position I believe a more socially just society would emerge with the assimilation of the hyper individual and social group and would result in the emergence of the socially responsible individual. While concern for self and others are interdependent (Sharp 1997) a socially responsible individual would put concern for others ahead of concern for self. What is required is a radical political stance, one beyond the politics of the left and right (Giddens 1994).

A framework for such a radical politics is provided by Giddens (1994). He suggests a framework which draws on philosophic conservatism: "a philosophy of protection, conservation and solidarity" (Giddens 1994, p.10). It is a framework which also preserves some of the core values which have been associated with socialism (Giddens 1994). There are six key points in the framework:

- repairing damaged solidarities by reconciling autonomy and interdependence
- recognising the importance of the discussion of ethics, 'life politics'
- allowing individuals and groups to make things happen, a 'generative politics'
- creating a democracy where issues are discussed openly by the public
- developing a welfare state which is empowering rather than merely dispensing
- confronting the role violence plays at all levels of human affairs (Giddens 1994)

This framework suggests a radical politics which connects autonomy with personal and collective responsibility. To achieve this, it is necessary to build on the gains resulting from the emergence of human dignity (Berger 1983), such as human rights, while at the same time curbing the excesses of individual agency. It is also necessary to develop social responsibility, though not a return to the institutions of the past but rather the building of new social ties. The marginal themes of social justice outlined in Table 1 suggest one way of doing this. It is a way supported, to some extent, by writers such as MacIntyre (1985) and Cox (1995) when they write about the development of community. MacIntyre (1985) suggests, unless there is shared contribution to tasks and shared understanding of rules within community there can be no justice. Cox (1995) also calls for a reinvigoration of community where social cohesion and a sense of trust is restored. Both Alisdair MacIntyre and Eva Cox are regarded as communitarian thinkers (Abbey 1996/7). As such they may err on the side of society having precedence over the individual rights in some situations which concern common welfare (Abbey 1996/7). Accusations of increased authoritarianism have been leveled at communitarians because of the ways they advocate for dealing with social disorder (Wilson 1995). It also needs to be noted that the development of community could lead to a further fragmentation of society, with communities competing with each other to further their own ends (Abbey 1996/7). While I am providing the work of MacIntyre (1985) and Cox (1995) as support to the position I am advocating here, I am not suggesting that the
Communitarian position provides an answer to the current dilemma. What I am suggesting is that writers such as Giddens (1994), Berger (1983), Cox (1995) and MacIntyre (1985) provide a starting point for developing an understanding of ways, in which an assimilation of the hyper individual and social group can result in the emergence of the socially responsible individual. This is a cultural shift which creates a different balance in the individual/society dualism than what currently exists. A shift to a culture where the individual's rights and responsibilities are respected within a social whole. This provides us with an alternative view of a socially just society in 'new times'. What this means for curriculum is the subject of the remainder of this paper.

Current curriculum trends

The current curriculum is built around the dominant themes of social justice listed in Table 1. It is a curriculum focussing on the production of the 'flexible' worker who will be Australia's economic future. What is seen is the valorisation of the academic, the intellectual and the individual. Such a curriculum emphasises strategies which will result in developing skills for employment, income generation and consumerism (Jones 1995).

It is a curriculum which focusses on education within a particularly narrow framework. It is about producing the 'flexible' worker, as opposed to educating the person. It is about the academic success of the individual within a competitive framework. To this end then, curriculum offerings are tied to specific notions of the 'basics' and to 'competencies' (Collins 1993) within these 'basics'. These curriculum 'basics' include an emphasis on literacy, numeracy and science as it relates to technology. These areas stood out as key initiatives in the policies and practices examined in the critical case analysis.

Literacy was seen as a key curriculum component in social justice policy and practices. Policy documents emphasised it and the school received funding for just such curriculum emphasis from both state and federal governments. Literacy is seen as being important to the economic future of the country and thus to be acquired by all students. To fulfill such an agenda it is a certain type of literacy that is required. A literacy where correctness in aspects such as spelling and grammar take precedence. This 'functional' approach to literacy stands opposed to one which relates to the development of independent socially responsible thought, creativity and aesthetic pleasure. A similar emphasis in the 'functional' is seen in numeracy/mathematics and science, a science which is related to the technologically oriented society. The emphasis is placed on producing the 'flexible' worker thus enhancing economic development.

What we see within schools is that most of what is done is drawn into the production of the 'flexible' worker. Parent participation is seen as good, not in relation to the happiness of the child but for the way it can improve a child's performance in school. Social skills are taught so the child will become a better worker. Physical Education is important as it will produce a fitter healthier worker. In such a curriculum all areas of school life are attuned to the 'production' of a 'flexible' worker who can stake a claim for the individual or corporation in the market place.

If we are to see the emergence of the socially responsible individual, one who will create a more socially just society, there is a need for a change in curriculum. This change must be one that reorients the focus of curriculum from production of worker to education of the socially responsible person, a person who is more than just a worker. Such an education would result in a person who is able to be a full participant in a life which would include community participation as well as work. In this sense educating for work is only one part of the curriculum. A curriculum that focuses on the education of the person as a member of a socially cohesive community, rather than the worker for the country's economic salvation.
Such a curriculum would be socially just in that it would assimilate the hyper individual with the social group, resulting in the socially responsible person.

**Possibilities for a curriculum for 'social responsibility'**

Being set within a class stratified society schooling is drawn into a socially divisive process which revolves around developing the individual intellect for economic gain. What is needed is a curriculum which assists in the assimilation of the hyper individual and the social group resulting in the socially responsible person. A curriculum built around the six key points of the Giddens (1994) framework offered above.

I want here to provide an overview of what I believe would be the aims of a curriculum which assimilated the individual with the social, that is, the socially responsible person. I will also provide an insight into some of the pedagogical implications of such a curriculum, that is, suggestions for implementation. The curriculum I am proposing is one that sees the person within the social context as being of prime importance. The marginal themes in social justice shown in Table 1 revolve around rebuilding a sense of the social. I want to suggest that these themes present a starting point for the development of an alternative curriculum. The development of a 'curriculum for social responsibility' would assimilate the hyper individual of 'new times', with notions of social cohesion, moving from self identity to social identity and social responsibility. Such a curriculum would focus on the development of co-operation, reciprocity and trust (Cox 1995) while students are, at the same time, learning literacy and numeracy. The curriculum would: build social identity, promote socially responsible independent thought and make space for creativity and the aesthetic.

**The building of a social identity is a key to the development of a sense of community and thus a more socially just culture.**

There is a need to build a self and social identity in unison, as part of a synthetic and symbiotic process. Students need to understand themselves, their own social and emotional needs and then to see them in relation to their interactions with others. By this I mean individuals seeing themselves in relation to what they are able to do within, and for the community, rather then simply in relation to their own personal goals and achievements. This is about putting the 'I' back with the 'us' to promote the re-emergence of social identity and a sense of community. It is about developing a school that sees initiatives such as parent participation as an end in itself, rather than simply the means for improving students academic success. It is about opening up the school. Opening it up in the physical sense thus encouraging people to come in and use it. From community groups such as Neighbourhood Watch having meetings there, to making available, free of charge, facilities such as the library or a computer network to the wider community. It is also about opening up in an administrative sense by making transparent processes related to such things as decision making. This would result in opportunities being provided for all those with a stake in the school, families, staff, students and the wider community to participate in making decisions about the school and thus the education of the next generation. In doing this the school is providing opportunities for people to develop trust in each other and to work co-operatively. Thus we can see such an outcome would take the school to the people and also bring the people to the school. In doing this, the school is providing a basis for the development of social cohesion and a sense of community. Examples of this already happening were seen in the data from the school.

**The development of social responsibility where all members of society are involved in the discussion of a diverse range of subjects.**
This outcome is directly related to promoting learning which reaches beyond the functional. A learning which can open up new topics for discussion and debate. I would propose that a new global student/person is emerging in 'new times' This new person is one for whom technology especially the electronic media is normalised. This normalisation of technology, its persuasiveness in a young person's life, and the increasing role it plays in socialisation, raises questions about the values and attitudes it conveys. What are the values and attitudes the child is exposed to through watching television, playing a computer game, or through the retrieval of information from the Internet? This makes imperative the need for students to become socially responsible, independent thinkers. In place of the narrow specialised curriculum there is a need for a diverse range of moral and ethical topics to be brought into the classroom and opened up for discussion. Topics could include; the challenges and implications of the introduction of new technologies, from ATMs to invitro fertilisation, from coping with change through to issues of the environment. The aim of the discussions is to ask questions such as; 'Who benefits?' 'Who is marginalised?' 'How could things be done differently?' and 'Whose interests are being served?' Ontological questions such as; 'Who am I?' 'What is my place in the world?' 'Where am I headed?' and 'How am I connected to others and what are my responsibilities?' would also be asked. Opportunities to reflect on and discuss these questions with others will not only help to develop socially responsible thought, but will also work toward the establishment of a stable social identity.

Providing space for the creative and aesthetic will allow for the development of new ideas for the promotion of social responsibility.

Creativity and the aesthetic are marginalised in the current curriculum which focuses on the production of the 'flexible' worker. Space needs to be found for them within the curriculum to provide opportunities for young people to be creative within their own world. Such opportunities can be found in dance, drama, music and the visual arts. It takes the young person beyond being the consumer of 'packaged arts' such as music video clips or television advertising, to become creators. If the curriculum plays a role in demystifying these 'packaged arts' through discussion of them, students can move beyond them to create an alternative. Such an outcome could also put fun/pleasure on the agenda and if students worked collaboratively on projects they could develop a sense of community at the same time. The 'Rock Eisteddfod', while still tied to the 'packaged arts' in a commercial sense, is an example of how this outcome could be achieved. Many secondary school students around Australia participate (Fitz Clarence, Bigum, Green & Kenway 1993) in this 'event'. Students perform an eight minute dance set to a selection of 'appropriate' rock music. The performance is structured by the students who use the cultural artefacts with which they are familiar to create a message. This message speaks their language through music, dance, drama and costume. It speaks to the 'global student/person' in a language they understand. It also provides opportunities for creativity, aesthetic innovation and socially responsible, independent thought focussing on a current issue, in this instance the use and abuse of drugs. It is a learning experience that speaks the language of the students and promotes creativity and aesthetic appreciation. It also promotes co-operation between a large group of students sharing a common goal and working together in a socially cohesive way.

If this is what a 'curriculum for social responsibility' aims to achieve one must ask how can this be done at the school and classroom level? I want now to provide some tentative answers to that question. These answers focus on what one would see happening in schools and classrooms aiming for a 'curriculum for social responsibility', a more socially just curriculum. These answers draw on the six point framework provided by Giddens (1994) and discussed above.
The school would become a place which modelled social cohesion and a sense of community.

The school in my critical case analysis showed examples of how this may occur at a school level. Initiatives such as the Class Parents, the Parent Network, the establishment of a Parent Room and the Fundraising Committee have the potential for developing a sense of social cohesion within the school. These initiatives need to be seen as valuable in their own right rather than as a means to an end. In the case school they were seen first and foremost as a way to promote student academic success rather than a way of developing cohesion and a sense of community. What I am suggesting here is that such initiatives need to become an end in themselves as they are able to promote a sense of community for those involved. The school thus becomes a focus point within the wider community for re-establishing co-operation, and reciprocity between people. It provides opportunities for people, in this case those who have a stake in the school, families and friends of students, to work collaboratively for an improved life not only for their children but for themselves. It must be a school where all the stakeholders are listened to and taken seriously. By providing opportunities for people to connect in a positive way with others, schools would be able to contribute towards the development of social responsibility and cohesion.

The classroom would become a place which modelled social cohesion and a sense of community.

The classroom would be a mini community. One where students would learn, and practice the skills needed to function in a cohesive society. One where the development of trust, reciprocity, mutuality, co-operation along with time for others is valued by students and teachers. The development of a social, as opposed to a self, identity. In such a classroom class meetings would open up for discussion a multiplicity of topics which are of real interest to the lives of the students both inside and outside of the classroom. They would also provide a forum for developing socially responsible independent thought and opportunities for students to make a real difference. A forum where trust, reciprocity, mutuality and co-operation are developed. Where all members of the mini community, and the larger community of which it is a part, have a voice and that voice is taken seriously. The development of the classroom as a mini community and the democratic notions behind such things as class meetings provide a starting point for students to engage in the political process. Where they can learn and practice the skills they will need for such political engagement in the wider community.

The school and classroom provide opportunities for reconnecting with the self and understanding and (re)acting to change

If the outcomes related to social cohesion and social responsibility are to be achieved students need to learn how to better understand themselves and to understand and (re)act to change. The emotional and psychic aspects of students' lives need to be directly addressed. One way to achieve this in the classroom is through directly confronting ontological questions such as; 'Who am I?' 'What is my place in the world?' 'Where am I headed?' and 'How am I connected to others and what are my responsibilities?' A pedagogical example of this could be the way the interactions between students and teachers and between students and students are approached. It would mean moving
beyond the use of a behaviourist model to one where the whole range of issues related to the formation and maintenance of relationships are open to discussion. One where socio-cultural as well as ontological issues are important.

The school and the classroom become forums for the discussion of ethical issues

The rapid changes related to techno/scientific innovation in 'new times' lead to the emergence of a whole plethora of new ethical dilemmas. To ensure students become socially responsible independent thinkers in relation to these issues it is necessary to discuss a wide range of ethical issues in the classroom. These could range from environmental concerns to issues raised by genetic engineering to concerns about television advertising and control of the Internet. While the content of such discussions is important, of equal importance is the pedagogy employed to facilitate such discussions. It must be a pedagogy which encourages debate and consideration of all issues rather than one which results in students being 'told what to think'. One way to do this is to focus on the questions suggested above in relation to developing socially responsible, independent thought. The questions mentioned there were; 'Who benefits?' 'Who is marginalised?' 'How could things be done differently?' and 'Whose interests are being served?' These provide a framework for discussion and debate. They promote discussion which looks below the surface, refusing to accept things at face value. Discussion which will promote analysis of why things are as they are and to begin imagining, creatively, how they could be different. This relates to what Giddens (1991,1994) calls 'life politics'.

Table 2 Existential Questions and Life Politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Moral arena</th>
<th>Internally referential systems</th>
<th>Substantive moral issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence</td>
<td>Survival and Being</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>1. What responsibilities do human beings have towards nature?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. What are the principles of environmental ethics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finitude</td>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>1. What are the rights of the unborn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. What right has the foetus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. What ethical principles should</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
govern genetic engineering?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual and communal life</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>Global systems</th>
<th>1. What limits should be placed on scientific/technological innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. What limits should be placed on the use of violence in human affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-identity</th>
<th>Personhood</th>
<th>Self and body</th>
<th>1. What rights does the individual have over his/her body?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. What, if any, gender differences should be preserved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. What right do animals have?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Giddens 1991, p.227)

As Table 2, suggests such a pedagogical approach would allow opportunities for students to engage in meaningful discussion about the ethical issues of 'new times', issues that are, in 'new times' often sequested (Giddens 1991). This position is supported by Singer (1993) who suggests we live in an age of self-interest where the question "how are we to live confronts us more sharply than ever" (Singer 1993, p. 11). It is a time when discussion related to the domains of existence, finitude, the individual and communal life, and self identity (Giddens 1991) must be entered into. Such discussion in the school context would enable students to reveal the issues behind injustices and inequalities. More than this, it could provide opportunities for students to become active in pushing for social change. They would not only envisage what a better more socially just world may look like, but it would provide them with the tools to begin making changes. One of the keys to such a pedagogy is the development of a literacy which is far removed from the functional approach we see associated with the competencies of the current curriculum focussed as it is on economic imperatives. It would be a literacy that would engage students in the texts of 'their world' and it would involve learning reading, writing and listening and speaking for, and through, social action.

The school and classroom provide opportunities for exploring one's creative capacities and gaining pleasure from learning.
The school and classroom of the 'curriculum for social responsibility' would also be one where students would be encouraged to think creatively in relation to all aspects of their learning. We have seen in all of the points above that creativity is essential to promoting a way of thinking in students which leads to changing present inequalities and injustices. Such creativity can extend from the arts to proposing possible solutions to ethical dilemmas. Creativity is an essential conceptual tool for social responsibility. The use of one's creative capacities can be a source of pleasure and this is of crucial importance to the curriculum I am describing here. Research has shown that a classroom pedagogy that opens up for discussion and critique topics and texts of importance to students' lives, can have the effect of negating them (Kenway Blackmore & Willis 1996). Such a situation can result in resistance by students. More than this, it is important that the time spent at school is not merely a time when one is striving for competencies that may lead to employment. It is essential that the school curriculum provides spaces for students to gain pleasure from learning. One way this could be done is by ensuring that the issues of importance to students are a part of the curriculum. The 'Rock Eisteddfod' described earlier provided an example of using the music and dance of the students' world to bring pleasure to their learning in school.

**Summary**

I have argued here that social justice in education in 'new times' is dominated by an ideology aligned to democratic liberalism. This sees the emergence of a hyper individualism and results in the language of economics dominating the social justice and educational debate. In such a culture issues related to the development of social cohesion are marginalised. I have suggested that the way towards a more socially just society is related to the assimilation of the hyper individual with the social group. A shift to a culture where the individual's rights and responsibilities are respected within a social whole, resulting in the emergence of the socially responsible individual. Such a cultural shift suggests the emergence of a curriculum that educates for social responsibility, rather than the current curriculum that is aligned to economic imperatives. A 'curriculum for social responsibility' promotes a more socially responsible and just culture. Pedagogically such a curriculum would focus on the development of a school and classroom which model the 'ideal' socially cohesive and responsible community. It is a curriculum which leads away from the hyper individualism towards social responsibility and a culture where trust and honour along with dignity are central themes.
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