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Abstract

The need for ethical or moral consciousness is becoming increasingly desirable in the world, and particularly in Kenya, today more than ever before. Every time corruption is mentioned in various quarters, for example, in the transport sector where traffic officers solicit for bribes shamelessly, in other government departments when people deliberately cheat on their taxes, banks do insider trading (like it recently happened with Chase Bank, Kenya), in institutions of higher learning et cetera, there are raised questions on ethics. Is it due to lack of ethical knowledge that all these ills are so rampant in our society? Is it a lack of values or moral education that is the cause of all these? It calls to mind the Socratic question whether values can be taught; and whether, and to what extent, knowledge is really virtue. In the year 2015 when the President of the Republic of Kenya, H.E. Uhuru Muigai Kenyatta, while making his State of the Nation Address to Parliament, reiterated and in fact asked that Ethics be taught in all levels of learning; which I interpreted to have meant that it be taught right form Primary One all the way to institutions of Higher Learning, the reasoning was that at the end of their career training, the learners will not only have attained the necessary skills that they are taking to the job market; they would have also nurtured an ethical culture that shall in turn make them better and patriotic citizens. That means that should Kenyans be ethically conscious, they would act ethically, more or less the same way as the Socratic thinking that to know virtue is to be virtuous. Whether or not that would be the best approach, institutions of learning are yet to heed that call. Nevertheless, the critical questions that beg are: does knowledge really and necessarily translate into action? To what extent and in which ways can we teach ethics? And, what kind of approach should be employed to ensure that a proper ethic is taught and who, therefore, should be the teachers of ethics? The aim of this paper is to interrogate whether ethical teaching, in whichever level of learning, should be based on values (value education) or should it be founded on the reasoning that informs ethical judgments. Should the teaching be on what ethical values there are (that ought to be done) or on how to arrive at (good) ethical judgments, irrespective of what the particular act is, a reasoning that should always guide us in making ethical decisions? In other words, is it the values or the training of conscience (that is, how we know a value) that should be the point of focus?
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1.1 Introduction

This part deals with the relationship between knowledge of the good (virtue) and doing the good thing (being virtuous). The basic question answered here is the question of whether having knowledge of virtue makes one necessarily a virtuous person. The section spells the domain of ethics as a discipline and attempts to answer the question of whether ethics can be taught.

1.2 Knowledge of Virtue

In *Saturday Nation* of May 14, 2016, a leading newspaper in Kenya, under the title, “Networks stifle probe on graft, report says,” it was revealed that a Strategy document to guide the new team of commissioners at the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC) chaired by Mr. Philip Kinisu “exposes the rot and the systematic failures at the Commission and proposes new ways of fighting corruption.”\(^1\) According to that revelation, the EACC was deeply infiltrated by criminal networks which had made it difficult to prosecute prominent people mentioned in graft scandals. Yet, “efforts to get rid of the individuals working for corruption networks through fresh vetting, have been blocked after a section of employees moved to court and obtained an injunction…”\(^2\)

The Commission chairman, according to the report, and his team wanted the agency’s annual budget increased from sh. 2.5 billion to sh. 6 billion (an increase of 140%) to pave way for fresh restructuring. The reason for his claim was that the failure to adequately fund the commission had opened it up to infiltration by corruption cartels, making it difficult to fight the vice. “The commission is infiltrated with people sponsored to frustrate investigations…what ails the commission are vested interests…manifested in poor investigations and weak charge sheets. For this reason, charges preferred against suspects in most cases fail to stand the scrutiny of top lawyers hired by suspects.”\(^3\) He goes further to add that new ways have to be devised whereby success against corruption shall be defined by laying emphasis on changing the attitude of the people.

What clearly transpires from the above is the fact that it is implied that what is instrumental to the fight against corruption is enough funding to the agency that fights the vice. Lack of enough funding is seen to be the main cause of shoddy investigations and failure of cases against graft suspects to stand. But there is also raised the concern to change people’s perception or attitude. The latter concern is of more interest for this paper: how can people’s attitude about doing the good be changed?

Ethics, which is etymologically derived from the Greek word *ethos* or *ethikos*, meaning *character*; which translates to the Latin *mores*, meaning *customs* or *habits of a person*, is generally defined as the science of morals. It is that kind of knowledge that studies human conduct (*actus humanus*) from the aspect of their rightness or wrongness. In other words, what is it that makes a certain kind of conduct morally good and what is it that makes conduct morally evil? Are there acts that are good or bad in themselves? How do we determine the morality of an action? Is there a criterion that is standard enough, and by which we establish the moral worth of an act?

---
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It must be borne in mind that ethics, as defined, is founded on both the fact that man is free by virtue of the possession of the faculty of free will, and has the natural desire for happiness as the summum bonum or his highest good. The duo have a relationship that is so necessary to the extent that the freedom of man is fully realized only when it directs man toward his last end; otherwise, it becomes an abuse of freedom to direct it toward other ends (away from the last end). In point of fact, human action is purposive, and ipso facto, it finds meaning in that purpose alone.

It should not escape our minds, though, that action presupposes knowledge of both virtue and vice. One can only make a free choice of what he knows, not vice-versa. Joseph Nyasani, in his Metaphysical Psychology: Rational Psychology argues that the intellect “…is the capacity …of the mind whose task it is to understand, think and reason…. It also happens to be the faculty from which the will flows.” From the above quote, it is abundantly evident that willing, which is a free act, proceeds from the intellect. One cannot will what they do not know. It logically follows therefore that before free choice and action, knowledge of value is essential. In essence, it is an irrefutable fact that before decision and action or implementation, an important process, that of deliberation, takes place where one weighs the options of doing one action as against the other then eventually decides to perform one and forgo the other or others. All this is meant to show that knowledge is a necessary requirement for decision and action. In addition:

Since values are our focal point of interest, we hold that the mind should be formed so that it is an effective faculty for discovering genuine or true values…discerning, when necessary, what is a true value from that which, perhaps despite appearances, is not.

In other words, it is not everything that appears like a value is a value. For that reason, it is imperative that a criterion for the discernment of true value be devised to enable us make true judgments about value before we can put knowledge into action.

Socrates, one of the greatest Greek philosophers, clearly pointed out that knowledge of virtue is a sine qua non condition for being virtuous. That is to say, it is impossible to be a virtuous person if you have no idea of what virtue is. Put in another language, Socrates equated knowledge with virtue or wisdom: “the close connection between virtue and knowledge is characteristic of Socrates and Plato.” According to Socrates, “no man sins wittingly, and therefore only knowledge is needed to make all men perfectly virtuous.” In his view, evil is a result of ignorance, not deliberate. Furthermore, it is vital to understand that for Socrates, knowledge has to be understood as “not just having abstract intellectual propositions in your head, however; it is knowledge of what to do and how to do it.” In this sense, Socrates envisioned a situation whereby knowledge of virtue necessarily translated into acting virtuously. He therefore meant that knowledge is good only if it is applied;

---
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we seek knowledge so that we may use it to improve our well-being. It is this knowledge in *techne*\(^9\) sense that Socrates maintains that it must be both a *sine qua non* condition for human excellence, meaning that without it one cannot be a good person, but also a sufficient condition in that its presence also entails the presence of all the excellent qualities of human life. Socrates therefore sees human excellence as a *techne* since “the expert in human excellence (or virtue) - if there is one-would have to know human nature, how it functions, and wherein its excellence consists.”\(^10\) Those who wish to live well must understand themselves and what the point of living is and will in turn live well, he adds. This in effect means that a person who understands morality is necessarily moral. As we observed earlier, that no one sins wittingly, Socrates makes it crystal clear that mental endeavor and persistence always end in happiness only if they are guided by knowledge but in the reverse if they are guided by ignorance. Virtue is therefore understood as wisdom or knowledge.

From the above, it can obviously be inferred that if knowing the right implies doing the right, then failing to do the right is as a result of ignorance. Whoever acts wrongly does so due to ignorance.\(^11\) We therefore always act out of a belief that what we are doing is good. It is basically on this understanding that Socrates puts emphasis on moral education with the view of eradicating evils.

In spite of the fact that we may not agree with Socrates on the claim that knowledge necessarily leads to virtue, it would be defeatist of us to deny that one requires knowledge of virtue as a pre-requisite for being virtuous. This, in essence, calls the question of ethical education: is it moral education that we need to make people virtuous or moral or is there more to virtuous life than education can provide? If moral education does not end up in transforming individuals, do we need it any way, particularly in the education system? Is it not wastage of time to take the precious time of learners to teach them what is not going to make any positive impact in their productive lives?

In his *virtue ethics*, Aristotle, another ancient philosopher of great repute, argues that it is the virtuous or good and wise person who is the criterion and standard of virtue or goodness; “…the virtuous person is the happy person.”\(^12\) For him, we don’t study so that we know what virtue is; rather, so that we become good, for otherwise there would be no profit in it.\(^13\) That is to say that we learn virtue from virtuous men and women by emulating them. In his view, “virtues are character traits it’s good for a human being to have, good in the sense of contributing to their possessor’s well-being or happiness.”\(^14\) In this understanding, virtues are habits that constitute a person and define him. In addition, he sees virtue as a means by which a person achieves happiness or flourishes. In essence, therefore, virtue must not be chosen for itself as an end but as a means to the end; the purpose of human action is to achieve happiness, *eudaemonia*.\(^15\)

---

9*Techne*is a Greek word that means a kind of applied knowledge. It means putting knowledge into action. From it we get the English word *technology*. It is knowledge of what to do and how to do it.
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15*Happiness* is not the exact equivalent of the Greek *eudaemonia*. The terms which are closer in meaning are *well-being* or *flourishing*. It is not merely a matter of feeling happy.
On the contrary, a vice “makes it more difficult for its possessor to achieve happiness or a satisfactory state of well-being.”

Be that what it may, vice is not necessarily evil, but a choice of pleasure for itself. The incongruence between our free act and the ultimate end (happiness) is what makes action evil: “The function of man is activity of soul in accordance with reason, or at least not without reason.” Aristotle says this because he believes that human beings are being human when they are acting in essentially human ways; being rational. He therefore considers the function of a human being as living according to reason; which in effect means that rationality entails morality. The good for man in this sense is activity of soul in conformity with excellence or virtue. Thus: “doing what is characteristic of humans to do, living in accord with reason, and in the most excellent kind of way, is the good for humans.” Being the human being’s good, this essentially constitutes human happiness. In other words, happiness cannot be attained in the absence of excellence or virtue. Instead, “it surely includes wisdom, for excellent use of one’s rational powers is part of being an excellent human being.”

Yet it is incumbent of us as rational beings and through our rational powers to always act rightly, that being the only way by which we attain our last end.

For the philosopher, you cannot ask a vicious person of what virtue is, because he will show you what he practices as virtue. It is the good man who knows best about goodness for the man of good character judges every situation rightly; in every situation, what appears to him is good. In his view, we are pulled both by pleasure and by happiness. For that reason, some choose a life of searching for pleasures of the flesh and they are low form of human life. Others know the good but are weak-willed and do not do it. Aristotle here recognizes the force of habit; and rightly observes that it takes repeated acts of bravery to attain the habit of bravery; then it is easy and pleasurable to be brave. That is to say, once we consistently do virtuous acts, though tedious that might be, over time it becomes so easy to do them, thus, it becomes part and parcel of us to do good acts, hence, our habit. In other words, we are making reference to the formation of correct conscience here. Moreover, it takes many acts of stealing to turn you into a habitual thief; there after it is easy to steal; one steals so easily and with a lot of pleasure. It, therefore, becomes one’s habit to steal or engage in evil without feeling guilty. To change from that to become an honest person again is a long and difficult process. That explains why according to Aristotle virtue is seen as a habit and it involves both moral consciousness and acting in accordance with knowledge. Thus, moral training is necessary for building a virtuous habit as it provides the consciousness necessary for moral action. The question that begs is the approach to moral training.

1.3 Teaching Virtue (Moral Consciousness)

Men are potentially knowers and have the ability to exploit or actualize those intellective potentialities. They also have the ability to constitute themselves as good persons by consistently practicing virtue, as we have seen from Aristotle. In other words, being a good person is something that must be cultivated by acting rightly all the time.

\[\text{16} \text{ibid.}\]
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From the above it, therefore, follows that virtue can be taught, and to the extent that knowledge is necessary for deliberation and choice of the course of action to take. Put in another language, it would be illogical to expect that people would act virtuously where they have no knowledge of virtue; even though that does not necessarily imply that knowing will lead to doing. It is obviously true (as against Socrates) that ignorance is not necessarily the reason why people commit evil. More often than not, man chooses his course of action, regardless of whether it is good or not, with full knowledge of the nature of the action. He does so deliberately, knowingly and willfully. In any case, every human culture spontaneously operates in a framework of morality. There is no known culture that is devoid of ethics and values. And ethical training has been one of the core functions of culture through proverbs, sayings, rituals and various practices. All this underscores the importance of ethical education in society, hence, the need to extend the same to institutions of higher learning.

The point of moral or ethical education in that regard is to make what is implicit, through the moral obligation, explicit, to be clearer about how we operate in the moral sphere, which is imperative to us as rational beings. In any case, the moral obligation connects the human act with man’s last end (happiness); man naturally wants to be happy and therefore the calling to act rightly because that is the way happiness can be attained. That is what we implied earlier when we said that the human act is purposive in nature and that it finds meaning in that purpose alone.

It is for that reason that ethical teaching must be done in such a way as to link human freedom with man’s last end. Moral education is necessary since knowledge is a pre-requisite for action: emphasis should be on the fact that human conduct has an end, which is happiness, the highest good, and that the only way this can be achieved is by leading a virtuous life. By fact that we are pulled by both pleasure (short-term) and happiness (lasting), it is necessary that learners be trained on the need to choose pleasure only if it can lead them to their ultimate end, happiness. It is for these reasons that it is very important to base ethical education on the moral obligation whereby it is undeniable that good ought to be done and evil avoided.

2.0 Ethical Education: Towards the Moral Obligation

Having seen that knowledge of virtue is a pre-requisite for acting virtuously, and that virtue can be taught since man is potentially a knower; this part discusses ethical education in the light of the moral obligation. That is, all moral education or consciousness must be an education that is directed toward the moral obligation. The reason for this is that we intend to form a person (the learner) who can reason correctly in moral issues; yet morality is founded on the fact that man has an obligation to (always) do the good and avoid evil. This is a reality that resides in the very rational nature of man.

2.1 Moral Obligation

It is an obvious fact, naturally known to all men, that there is a moral obligation, that is the source of goodness, and which commands that good be done and evil avoided. This command has been known as the golden rule. This is a dictate of right reason which lurks in the very nature of man. Essentially, therefore, to act in accordance to the human nature is to do good and avoid evil. It is a dictate of reason that good should be done, not once, or twice, not many times; but always. That means that good has to be done as a duty of our rational nature.
Immanuel Kant, a Germany philosopher of the modern period, rightly observes that right is right and it must be done ‘even if the heavens fall.’ In his understanding, there will be no circumstances that will change the morality of an act either from good to evil or from evil to good; and given that happiness is the sumnum bonum the greatest good that is only attained through virtue, no compromise should be allowed with regard to acting in accordance to reason. He says: “there is one end, however, which may be assumed to be actually such to all rational beings…and, therefore, one purpose which they not merely may have, but which we may with certainty assume that they all actually have by a natural necessity, and this is happiness.” He rightly observes, just like Aristotle had done, that happiness is the greatest good of man and that it is attained through virtue.

The intention of Kant was to find the one source of moral obligation that will be universal for all human beings. He observes, and rightly so, that the moral obligation is in rationality itself. In his monumental Fundamental Principles of Metaphysical Morality, he says, “it is impossible to think of anything in the world, or indeed even beyond, that could be considered good without qualification except a good will.” The only ultimate good, then, is a good will. This is the case for the reason that:

a good will is not good because of what it effects or accomplishes, because of its fitness to attain some proposed end, but only because of its volition, that is, it is good in itself and, regarded for itself, is to be valued incomparably higher than all that could merely be brought about by it in favor of some inclination and indeed, if you will, of the sum of all inclinations…

In this regard, it is not the consequences that make a will good. Thus, a good will is a will which acts for the sake of duty and not one that acts in accordance with duty. Emphasis is put on the idea of duty, where he purifies it from selfish motives and inclinations. This essentially means that we act out of a good will when we act rightly. For “in trying to do what is morally right, we do not have our eyes on some advantage to ourselves, but only on the rightness of the action.” Put in another way, all we want is to do our duty and nothing else. Hence, we act out of a sense of duty, doing what is right mainly because it is right, from respect for the moral law and so only such acts have true moral worth.

Alternatively, we have an inclination to seek happiness but if actions are done for the sake of happiness, then, even though they are done in accordance with duty they are not done for the sake of duty and therefore have no moral worth whatsoever. To obey the law simply for fear of being imprisoned then that has no moral worth whatsoever and is not done for the sake of duty. Thus, only those acts that are done for the sake of duty have moral worth. Kant sees duty as the necessity of acting of reverence of the law.

It is clearly evident that there exists a moral obligation by virtue of which morally good acts are objectively so, if they conform to it; and morally bad acts are objectively so, if they do not conform to it. It is for these reasons that it is not only important but also necessary that moral education be founded upon, and be directed

---
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toward the moral obligation. What that means is that all such education must aim at making the learner understand that the moral obligation is natural and therefore objective and all human conduct must conform to it. In other words, our actions must always be good because only then do we act virtuously and constitute ourselves as rational beings. On the other hand, evil must be avoided by all means for the reason that it is against the moral obligation, and thus, against our rational nature. It goes without saying that the moral obligation connects the human act with man’s last end, happiness; man naturally wants to be happy, therefore the calling to act rightly, that being the only way happiness can be attained.

The above raises the question of how we can determine virtuous action. Accordingly, to determine the moral worth of an act, three important aspects are considered and evaluated. These are: the act itself, the motive, and the circumstances.

3. Necessary Conditions for a Morally Good Act

In this section, we look at the guide to morally good acts. We deliberate on those necessary conditions for a morally good act and how they should be evaluated while making ethical judgments. Ethical judgments are judgments about morality, hence, the focus here is what one should consider in judging human act as good or evil. It would be important, though, to begin by making a distinction between human acts and acts of man before we can deal with the criterion of moral goodness.

3.1 Human Acts and Acts of Man

Before we can discuss the necessary conditions of a morally good act, a distinction between human acts and acts of man is imperative to make. A human act (actushumanus) is the act of which man is master, one that is consciously controlled and deliberately willed, so that the agent is held responsible for it. It is the kind of act that distinguishes man from animals and therefore are specifically human. They define man as rational free being, for example, stealing, murder, abortion, and helping. An act of man (actushominis) refers to the act which a man happens to perform, but he is not master of it, for he has not consciously controlled it, has not deliberately willed it, and for it he is not held responsible. These are the acts that man shares with animals, for example, sneezing, walking, and eating. Such acts have no moral significance and do not constitute human conduct. Morality, therefore, deals not with acts of man but with free acts, human acts, commonly referred to as conduct. Ethics, as a branch of philosophy, deals with the study of moral values. It is “an examination of all human conduct…”

Evidently, free choices or acts are the ones for which man is held responsible because he is in control of them. Chris Horner and EmrysWestacott, in their book, Thinking Through Philosophy: An Introduction, hold that “when I make certain choices, whether they are trivial or momentous, it usually seems to me that I could have chosen otherwise and am thus responsible for my decision.” In effect, this means that one is held accountable of their acts if they are able to do otherwise, for only then can we question them why they did them in the way they did. If one’s action were to be of necessity, then it would not make sense to ask anyone

to take responsibility. Such then are voluntary acts which man can opt to do or not. They differentiate man from animals and are contrasted to involuntary acts because they are specifically human. They are human acts, not acts of man. For Nyasani reiterates, “all human acts as opposed to acts of man are voluntary, deliberated and consciously undertaken. They take place as a result of some conscious and voluntarily willed decision and hence create unshakeable moral, legal and social responsibility for an individual.”

In addition, “the person who will not accept responsibility does not understand the true scope and meaning of his freedom, is not fully in possession of it, or is perhaps afraid of it.” This also implies that freedom translates into choosing the right course of action, making freedom and responsibility two sides of the same coin. In other words, freedom is the moral necessity to do the good; the two cannot be separated.

In the understanding of Thomas Aquinas, a Mediaeval Philosopher, “…since those acts are properly called human which are voluntary, because the will is the rational appetite, which is proper to man, we must consider acts in so far as they are voluntary.” This gives the further implication that such acts are free and deliberate acts of the will. Human acts are acts that man does and is in control of while acts of man are those acts that man does but is not in control of. It therefore follows that human acts are a product of free choices while acts of man are not. In that regard, man cannot be held responsible for acts of man. For example, you cannot ask a person why they have fallen sick but we can ask them why they steal. In answering the question of what constitutes a morally good act, we must adhere to the necessary components.

3.2 Criterion of Moral Goodness

By criterion we mean a standard, a yardstick, something by which we can measure something. This section deals with the standard of moral goodness, or the criterion to judge the rightness or wrongness of human acts. A morally good act must agree with right reason. Yet to agree with right reason means that one’s act agrees with knowledge that one has: if one knows that an act is good, then he performs that act since he is also implicitly aware of the obligation to do good and avoid evil. If the act is evil, one must refrain from performing it for the same reason of the consciousness of moral obligation. The learners in institutions of Higher Learning should, therefore, be taught on what to look for in an act (whatever it is) to see whether it is in agreement or disagreement with good reason. What must we look for in the act to see whether it is in agreement or disagreement with reason?

To answer this question, we must break down the human act into its elements. We now seek those elements which can be the sources of harmony or conflict between the act and the reason. We may consider the act itself in its own very nature as an act, or we may consider the circumstances in which it is performed. Among the circumstances, we may single out one, the motive or intention of the agent, as of such importance as to be put in a class by itself. Two people may do the same thing but from different motives, or different things from the same motive, or the same thing from the same motive but in different circumstances. In each case the act can have a different morality because of a different combination of these three elements.

26Nyasani 31.
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Hence, considering the act itself, that is before looking at the motive for it or the surrounding circumstances, it is morally imperative that it be good or indifferent. An act that is evil in itself (intrinsically) cannot acquire goodness from the motive or the circumstances, for then, it would go against the golden rule that the (good) end does not justify the (bad) means used to attain it. It would as well imply that good can be obtained from evil, which is absurd. It is ethically imperative that evil should never be chosen for itself as an end, or even a means to an end; evil should never be deliberately willed and freely chosen.

Alternatively, if we look at the motive of the act in question, we also affirm that one must have a good motive in performing the act. To do a good act with a bad motive would be evil, for the reason that good would not have been done because it is good but because of the bad motive attached. For example, one cannot distribute money to poor people, which is a good thing, with the motive of convincing them to vote for him as a member of parliament.

Furthermore, when it comes to circumstances, they must also be good or rather necessary in the sense that there must be no any other possible option but to act in that manner. Circumstances cannot be necessary where an alternative way of acting is possible.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, therefore, we must agree that though moral or ethical education does not necessarily lead to acting virtuously, however, it is a *sine qua non* condition for acting so; for knowledge precedes deliberation (due to the free will), decision, and implementation or action. In order for one to make a decision and implement the same, they must first need to have knowledge of fact, i.e., whether an act is good or not. And on the understanding that man has the natural call to do good and avoid evil, people with good knowledge will always make informed decisions; even when they do evil, they will do so knowingly, and therefore, must take responsibility.

Besides, ethics in higher learning can be taught by encouraging learners to put into practice the knowledge they gain in theoretical learning so that they can constitute themselves as good persons and persons of integrity. They should learn that it is a good thing to be a good person and be a criterion of moral goodness. They should strive to make virtue a habit, as Aristotle says, by consistently doing the good. Not only is it good to be good persons but it is also human. This part should therefore consist of persons who have lived a good life to serve as role models and examples to be emulated. It is my strong belief that if ethics in Higher Institutions of Learning takes this perspective, it will surely go a long way in transforming our society to make it the perfect society that we always dream about in demanding for constitutional amendments or reviews.

To the question of who should teach, I find it imperative that the teachers of ethics in higher education must be good moral thinkers (of course philosophers); while people of good character shall also play part as role models. In other words, on the part of theory we need people who can teach learners on good and correct moral reasoning while we need good role models on the part of practice. But, if there be good moral thinkers who also internalize and practice what they teach and constitute themselves as good persons, those should be preferable.
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