

**FAMILY VALUES IN THE
MEDITERRANEAN**

A Seminar Report

Peter Jones

The Institute for
Advanced Studies in the Humanities

The University of Edinburgh

May 1994

The Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, in The University of Edinburgh, is the only one of its kind in the United Kingdom, and since its foundation in 1970 has welcomed over 400 International scholars as Fellows to pursue advanced studies in the *Humanities* - understood as the study of all matters concerning the human condition and culture which do not require laboratory work.

The public dimensions of the Institute's work take the form of seminars, lectures, cultural events and publications.

The Institute is an intellectual and social catalyst, selecting themes which bring together people from different walks of life to address common problems, and to pool resources: those from the educational profession work alongside those from industry, commerce, government and the media. Traditional scholarship is augmented by innovative work of an inter-disciplinary nature.

*The five major themes in recent years have been: **The Scottish Enlightenment** (1986); **Technology, Communication and the Humanities** (1988); **1789-1989: Evolution or Revolution?** (1989); **Cultures and Institutions** (1991); and **Costing Values** (1993-95).*

Three international exhibitions have been devised and mounted at the Royal Museum of Scotland during the Edinburgh International Festivals, and have attracted attendances of up to 100,000.

Sponsorship and generous benefactions make the work of the Institute possible, and the Director welcomes the opportunity to discuss matters in confidence.

The publications associated with the Institute reflect the personal interpretations and views of the named authors; neither The Institute for Advanced Studies, nor The University of Edinburgh is responsible for the views expressed.

For further details of the Institute, please write to:

Professor Peter Jones, FRSE, FRSA, FSA Scot,
Director, The Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities,
The University of Edinburgh,
Hope Park Square,
Edinburgh EH8 9NW, Scotland

FAMILY VALUES IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

A Seminar Report

Peter Jones

Institute Occasional Papers 6

A Seminar Report based on the meeting held in

The University of Malta,

3rd - 5th December 1993

by

The University of Malta and

The Institute for Advanced Studies in the

Humanities

EDINBURGH: 1994

© Copyright: The Institute for Advanced Studies in the
Humanities, The University of Edinburgh

First Published 1994

ISSN 2041-8817 (Print)
ISSN 2634-7342 (Online)
ISBN 0 9514854 6 6

COSTING VALUES

The Institute project, beginning in 1993, under the title "Costing Values", has three goals:

1. to identify and analyse fundamental ideas on which everyday decisions rest, throughout the world, but which never receive such attention;
2. to bring together from different walks of life the very people who make the daily decisions and need to reflect on such ideas - leaders from industry, commerce, politics, the diplomatic world, as well as from specialist professions and research institutes;
3. to challenge and transcend the boundaries of current thinking by insisting on perspectives from different cultures.

The seminars will be held not only in Edinburgh but in Malta, India, Canada, and in other countries. All participants in the seminars will consider three questions:

- what values should be upheld in our particular communities?
- what resources are needed to implement them?
- what sacrifices must be made in order to pursue such priorities?

INTRODUCTION

The seminar was opened by the President of Malta, H.E. Dr. Censu Tabone, who welcomed participants to the Foundation for International Studies of the University of Malta. He observed that the venue of the meeting was especially appropriate since it was the site of the Collegium Melitense to which the University of Malta traces its origin in 1592. Moreover, the Mediterranean is the cradle of European civilisation where many cultures and religions have had their origin. Prominently situated on the major routes of communication, Malta itself has enjoyed a long history of commerce and trade and a corresponding exchange of values, ideas and beliefs.

In many respects, he said, the family remains the primary element within any society, but family values are affected by many factors: by the place of work, the political and religious context, the pattern of sexual relationships, the nature of leisure, and so on.

Values are integral to all aspects of a person's life on both the individual and social level. They permeate social structures, institutions, organisations and professions. No single

human being has the right to impose his or her individual values on others, which is why debate is most heated on questions of values and beliefs. But such debate is both necessary and healthy in all societies, and properly secures the interest of specialists from all fields, such as anthropology, psychology, theology, law, medicine. Two contrasting views characterise much contemporary discussion. The first considers the family as an obsolete institution. This view, fuelled, perhaps, by views on individualism propagated in the 1960s, has reached the Mediterranean region, and may be associated with the increased separation and divorce rates and the falling birthrate. Marriage is sometimes characterised, on this view, as a 'partnership' negotiated between a couple according to their own specifications, and without reference to the traditional family values on sexuality, indissolubility and the education of children. Such attitudes towards the family may also have been influenced by the development of the welfare state, and the emancipation of women who continue to work after marriage. In many Western societies individuals are increasingly more self-reliant and are less influenced by parental authority or religious conviction. The contrasting view of the family considers it in a traditional way as a fixed point of reference for each individual. What this means, however, has also undergone considerable change.

The programme for the 1994 United Nations International Year of the Family indicated many issues for reflection and some of these underlie discussions in the present seminar:

- To what extent does, or should, the family reflect the values of society?
- To what extent does, or should, society influence the values of the family?
- To what extent is the family still an essential means of transmitting cultural values?
- To what extent do families promote new values and behaviour consistent with the rights of individual members of the family?
- What are the material and non-material costs for the upkeep of family values and the protection of the most vulnerable members of the family?

In a special message from hospital, The Rector of the University of Malta, The Rev. Prof. Peter Serracino-Inglott, stated that, while Malta had participated in the rapid economic development of the Mediterranean region, it had retained some adherence to traditional values in the areas of family and religion. Nevertheless, a new level of interpersonal and shared

responsibility within the family was developing under the influence of critical debate and social change.

A number of important questions needed to be squarely faced. First, should marriage be encouraged by the state? About 10% of mothers under the age of 24, throughout Europe, are single; in Britain the figure is nearer 20%: 50% of all children, in some ethnic groups in Europe, are illegitimate.

A second question concerns State co-involvement in the parent's role in the education of their children. Difficult questions about the relations between authority and liberty arise in this context, but it is generally recognised that there can be no true freedom for individuals which is not buttressed by a framework of recognised authority. The Maltese policy of penalising parents for the truancy of their children might well be commended to other nations.

A third and more complex question concerns the provision of appropriate welfare services to deal with criminal trends among young people, and in particular with their rehabilitation. In the United Kingdom, 40% of prisoners under 21 have been 'in care', as against 2% of the population as a whole. Whilst the criterion of need must prevail, some

sensitive considerations of merit or desert should, perhaps, be built into the evaluation of need. The central question, however, is how best to integrate private (especially, family) resources with those of the public sector, in order to ensure the most effective pedagogic and therapeutic mix. It seems to be the case that the more services can be delivered by the family and by voluntary organisations, rather than by the State, the better the results. One task therefore is to find the best ways in which families and voluntary organisations can be given the State support without which they cannot function or deliver effectively.

In adding his own welcome to the participants, Professor Jones recommended that attention be given to the view that all ideas have histories. For example, the notions of 'agriculture' or 'justice' or 'government' in 18th century Britain were understood very differently from today. The content of such notions has evolved, not only because of differing interpretations of the facts, but because the facts themselves had changed. A second point deserved consideration. The immense complexity of problems that face us today, together with the rapid rate of change in their identifiable elements, may well require all of us to revise, or even abandon, some of the concepts we have inherited. Global problems, for example, about the environment, or health,

or finance, call for reassessment of ideas about nation states or national identity. It is likely, therefore, that, in discussing the nature and roles of the family in different contexts, policy recommendations will be unclear so long as we fail to understand the rights and duties, beliefs and attitudes of individuals themselves, as well as of the family and social relationships into which they enter. It is necessary to begin, however, in this context of ever-present change, by identifying precisely what is changing, under what conditions, at what rate and within what domains.

SEMINAR REPORT

Working definitions were offered at the beginning of the seminar, between two common forms of family life, namely, the nuclear family and the extended family. The nuclear or conjugal family comprises two parents and their dependent children, while the extended family moves beyond the nuclear family to embrace other near relatives (aunts, uncles, grandparents, for example). Further, it was suggested that 'values' refer to 'what we consider the chief good things of life, which we mainly seek and cherish'. That is, a value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or goal is preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or goal. Aside from important distinctions between the cognitive, emotional and instrumental aspects of a particular value, there are often differences between the personal aspects of the value, and those of the society at large in which the individual lives.

In terms of family life, values guide us towards what we perceive to be good or valuable, although what we perceive to be good is always culturally conditioned. Central questions are: What promotes the well being of the family? What destroys the quality of family life? How are positive values transmitted from generation to generation and how are the negative values or so-

called 'disvalues' discarded in favour of more positive guideposts?

Family values, rooted, as they must be, in distinctive cultures, are nevertheless in competition with values purveyed by modern global technologies. All peoples of the world are now part of a single, inter-communicating, electronic network, the many implications of which have yet to be identified and analysed. One potential danger is that homogeneous attitudes and values will emerge and displace current diversities. Family values in the Mediterranean are subject to the same pressures and shifts as experienced in other cultures, and we must realise that under pressures of various kinds, or simply through lack of support, values can degenerate.

Communities should be alert to the implications of homogeneity in values throughout the world, particularly as this might promote materialism and individualism on the one hand or fundamentalism and exclusivity on the other.

The changing norms and values concerning family life span a wide range of family issues - including gender roles, marriage, divorce, bearing children, premarital sex, extra-marital sex, nonmarital cohabitation, and intergenerational

relations.

In recent years there have been substantial changes in attitudes towards marriage. Although several studies among young people have documented a growing negative attitude towards marriage, there is no strong movement yet towards wanting to remain single. In a recent US survey, however, 50% of those asked viewed marriage as a restrictive way of life, and 70% stated that marriage had not changed their lives at all.

Trends and attitudes towards divorce are both clear and dramatic. Divorce is now very widely accepted as a positive value.

The social norms regarding childless marriages have also changed. More than 65% of young women in the United States, for example, reject the notion that all married couples who can, ought to have children. The satisfactions perceived from parenthood are diminishing.

A shifting appreciation of gender roles is clearly relevant to the issue of family life and values. The division of authority in the family, the allocation of family and occupational roles, the results of maternal employment, and the segregation of male

and female roles in the family are increasingly open to question. In the United States and Western Europe there is a very substantial and continuing transformation of sex role attitudes.

As early as 1949 a Royal Commission on Population in Great Britain reported that it would be harmful to restrict the contribution that women could make to the cultural and economic life of the nation.

The so-called 'two role ideology' emphasizes that fathers and mothers should share the roles of providing income, child-rearing and socialisation. The simultaneous existence of several generations complicates problems about the generation gap between parents and children, and gives rise to many issues in the area of family values.

As contemporary medical technology and environmental conditions extend human life, family life will be subjected to increased stress, and family values that ideally should support the web of human interrelationships that comprise the family, will require further elaboration. Values, like the family, are history bound, and each historical period and each particular culture must seek out and learn from the

positive values of earlier historical periods and other cultures. It should be recognised, nevertheless, that some people hold values to be permanent and immutable: what alone changes is the priority given to them in different contexts.

* * *

The family can fruitfully be approached from many directions and enquiries should not be framed in a single dimension. Questions about social structure, cultural symbols, material property, values and laws interact but require careful analysis on their own as well. The single English term 'family' is not sufficient to identify all the topics and inter-relationships that require examination, even in English; in other languages the wealth of linguistic clues to the matters that require examination and analysis has been overlooked. The legal concepts of family and the roles associated with them vary within as well as between different legal systems - Islamic, Napoleonic, British. In most communities it will be necessary to consider at least the following variables: age, sex, marriage relationship, parental relationship, education, employment, social status, income level. Some of these factors change through life and because of social circumstances such as migration from country to town; others change according to

external factors beyond the control of the individuals or groups to which they belong. Within families themselves the exercise and perception of power, for example as between mother and father, influences the fulfilment or readjustment of roles. It should be emphasised that detailed research into the family, as such, is still uncommon in Islamic communities, in Morocco or Algeria, for example, and the influence of current European modes of enquiry sometimes conflates questions about women, children and family. Here, as elsewhere, care must be taken to identify and distinguish causes, symptoms, and effects of change. Differences between Islamic countries are at least as great as those between Christian countries. The social and political influence of women in Islamic countries is often not apparent to outsiders, who necessarily only notice superficial features.

Throughout history most of Europe has experienced conflict and tension between civil and canon law, and a major challenge for many societies today is to acknowledge a plurality of religious points of view, and thereby the plurality of ideologies, within their boundaries. It was observed that on the theological side official doctrine has sometimes tolerated and sometimes sought to expunge variations in pastoral practice, but it was agreed that educational systems ought to

lay stress on freedom of conscience and freedom of choice for the individual.

In Maghrebi societies most observers agree that traditional family values have changed irrevocably. In Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, extensive migration of the rural peasant population to the towns, under French colonial rule, had already broken the mould by the 1930s. But, in addition to urbanisation, the influence of schooling, political organisations, information conveyed by the media, the employment of women and family planning, have all contributed to the processes of change. As in most societies throughout the world, the city is the primary context for conflicts between past and present values promoting both modernisation and nostalgia.

In many communities a major concern is to ensure that socialisation within the family, rather than external policing or coercion, becomes the main means of sustaining shared social and moral values. In the Mediterranean region subordination of individual satisfaction and desires to the welfare and honour of the family is a deeply embedded tradition. Individuals have a stake in the achievements of other family members and a share in the result of their benefits. Loyalty and responsibility of this kind enable families both to generate mutual support and

to exercise control over their members. In addition, particularly in the Mediterranean region, families so structured can act as effective shock-absorbers to crises in society at large. On the other hand, the subordination of individual desires to family welfare can also lead to authoritarianism, conservatism, nepotism and the invasion of privacy. Moreover, emphasis on family honour can generate vendetta patterns which themselves evolve into terrorism. In some Islamic countries there are vigorous attempts to respond to changes elsewhere in the world simultaneously with proclamations by fundamentalists of rigid interpretations of the law from the past. It was pointed out that differences in religious interpretation were tolerated and accepted within Islam from the earliest times and fundamentalist interpretations of our own day are justified neither in terms of Islamic law nor tradition. An unresolved question is whether in the 20th century, as in the 17th century, religious toleration is possible only when society develops or accepts a degree of secularism. Just as there are many forms of Islam and Christianity, so there are many forms and causes of fundamentalism, some arising out of particular political protest - for example against communism - and some occurring more on the micro level than on the macro level. It can be argued that fundamentalism, in all its forms, is essentially anti-

traditional, even when it claims an interpretation of tradition as its rationale. This is because it seeks to deny and resist the evolution of tradition and the conditions which ensure its life. Fundamentalism represents a closed mind or totalitarian view familiar in European Jacobinism. In the 19th century, for example, Orthodox Jews in Eastern Europe developed a fundamentalism which falsified the actual traditions of interpretation. For such reasons it is always valuable to locate issues of fundamentalist response in a wider context concerning the identification and interpretation of traditions. There is a perception in many societies of certain practices and beliefs as 'foreign', and this encourages a search for a 'purer' past to be claimed as the proper source for present day identity. In tracing the evolution of ideas of identity in different cultures and communities, it is beneficial to study how the great religions expanded and evolved in the past - Islam, Christianity, Confucianism.

* * *

Many governments are now interested in the material and non-material costs associated with sustaining or implementing various values in their nation. For more than a decade interviews have been conducted throughout Western

Europe aimed at identifying values, and findings have been made available recently concerning family values. In Malta, for example, 94% of those asked claimed that the family is very important in their lives and add that they would like to see greater emphasis on family life. 85% think that the Church in Malta gives adequate answers to problems of family life. Among Western European nations the Maltese expressed the highest level of satisfaction with their home life, the highest rejection of divorce as an acceptable practice (72%, compared with the European average of 16%), and similar rejection of abortion, homosexuality and prostitution. 30% of respondents in Malta (as against 67% in Europe as a whole) agreed with the statement that "having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person"; the 9% in Malta who strongly support married working women tend to be themselves young, single and women. On the question of social skills, Malta shares with the rest of Europe the priority attached to good manners (79%) and responsibility, but gives lower importance to tolerance and respect for other people (40%); by contrast the Maltese give greater importance to hard work (58%; Europe 31%), obedience (57%; Europe 37%), religious faith (55%; Europe 25%), thrift (40%; Europe 32%). Less popular in Malta are such values as independence (32%; Europe 41%), determination and perseverance (20%; Europe 32%) and

imagination (11%, Europe 24%). The more highly educated are inclined to opt for values such as responsibility, determination, independence and tolerance, whereas the less educated favour the more established virtues of good manners, hard work, thrift and religious faith.

In Britain, in a recent questionnaire organised by Gallup, interesting spontaneous answers were given to a series of general questions:

80% agreed that there was a need to "get back to basics and pay more attention to traditional values"

17% considered that family life is a primary basic value. The second value cited was "a caring community", followed by "respect for others; honesty; integrity; trust; truthfulness".

56% of young people aged 13-17 found "under-age drinking" acceptable. Relatively high percentages in the same age group found all sorts of criminal offences acceptable, along with taking drugs, carrying a weapon and under-age sex. Not surprisingly, a considerable majority of the parents of such children denied holding such views when they were that age.

In a two-part enquiry undertaken in 1981 and 1990, the following findings were made (1981 figures first):

Proportion of people claiming to be "very happy"

Europe as a whole:	21%	24%
Republic of an Ireland:	39%	43%
West Germany:	10%	15%
Italy:	10%	16%
Great Britain:	38%	38%

Proportion of people claiming to be "very healthy"

Europe as a whole:	23%	21%
Republic of an Ireland:	48%	49%
West Germany:	14%	15%
Italy:	15%	13%
Great Britain:	39%	36%

Proportion of people claiming to be "very proud of their Nationality"

Europe as a whole:	37%	36%
Republic of an Ireland:	66%	76%
West Germany:	21%	17%
Italy:	41%	41%
Great Britain:	55%	52%

Proportion of people claiming to have confidence in the police

Europe as a whole:	72%	67%
Republic of an Ireland:	86%	85%
West Germany:	71%	70%
Italy:	68%	66%
Great Britain:	86%	77%

Proportion of people claiming to have confidence in the press

Europe as a whole:	32%	35%
Republic of an Ireland:	44%	36%
West Germany:	33%	34%
Italy:	31%	40%
Great Britain:	29%	13%

Proportion of people claiming to have confidence in the church

Europe as a whole:	52%	48%
Republic of an Ireland:	78%	73%
West Germany:	48%	39%
Italy:	60%	64%
Great Britain:	48%	43%

The apparent methodology of questionnaires was challenged, and especially the justification of asking undefined questions, or using undefined concepts such as happiness, and the view that significant inferences could be drawn from spontaneous answers to unexpected questions. The formulation of the questions, in addition to commentary on the answers, might unduly distort the views of respondents who were not themselves used to thinking discursively about the issues. People who are asked about religion, for example, might give no thought to matters of belief, spiritualism, emotions or behaviour, but only think in terms of whether they should admit to going to church. Moreover, uniform answers to questions may mask important differences. Young people might agree with their parents, for example, that they wished to get married and that the family is a priority value; but have quite different notions of marriage, size of family, responsibilities between parents, and towards children.

It was agreed, nevertheless, that concepts are understood very differently in different cultures and at different moments of history. For example, the Protestant work ethic in Germany meant that Germans understood the concept of work very differently from the Maltese.

* * *

As a social institution, the family is both public and private in character. It refers to the organisation of collective life and depends on collective values and social conditions; and at the same time it refers to the organisation of private life and, in modern societies, it depends on individual values, conditions and aspirations. By 'social institution' is understood a socially accepted stable mode of individual and collective behaviour and action in the pursuit of one or more socially important aims, against a background of stable and socially accepted relationships. The aims, form and the structure of the family change as society changes. Modern urban or industrial societies, organised around the individual, have replaced traditional rural societies, organised around the group.

Changes in social institutions entail changes in values, or the ideals which function as models of behaviour. To the extent that social implies institutional modernisation, this in turn, implies the modernisation of models. But modernisation does not uniformly affect all parts of one and the same society or all aspects of social life.

Unfortunately, modernisation is too often defined in socio-economic terms alone, and its socio-cultural aspects which include the process of change in concepts, values, identities,

institutions, have been neglected.

If it is asked whether modern societies are experiencing a 'family crisis', the terminology, as always, must be clarified. By a 'family crisis' may be meant a disturbance at the level of society, at the level of the individual, at the level of the links between them, or even at all three levels.

Five factors are commonly quoted as indicative of the so-called modern 'family crisis':

- (a) the increasing frequency of family dissolution;
- (b) the increasing frequency of cohabitation (without marriage) and of single parenthood;
- (c) the decreasing number of children and the dramatic fall of birth and fertility rates;
- (d) the shrinking of the family group;
- (e) the changes in family structure through the changes in gender and generation roles.

The statistical and social significance of these factors varies considerably, even throughout Europe.

It must be emphasised, however, that all these phenomena refer to one specific nuclear family pattern: the family based on marriage, composed of spouses and their

children and having a structure defined by sex and age or, in some Mediterranean regions, a patriarchal structure.

This forces us to ask whether the so-called 'family crisis' refers to the family, or the institution of the family, or the family model? Only if we accept that the family always has a specific form and structure in any society, and at any time, can we argue that there is a crisis in all three - the family, the family institution and the family model. But if the family is regarded as a primary group which, in modern societies, may take many forms and have a variety of structures, a more complex analysis of the so-called 'crisis' is required.

Constant change characterizes both the contexts and the needs and practice of every individual, but the phenomena assumed to express the 'crisis' of the family may do nothing of the sort. They may express, rather, the fluidity of modern society; the inadequacy of traditional concepts, such as that of the conventional family; the discrepancy between the family as a variable social reality and as a social institution; the breakdown of the socialisation process which enabled persons to cope with social demands; the blurring of values, perhaps resulting from the variations in both their intensity and their application. Changes need not be characterized as crises; and neither a

crisis in the institution nor the model of the family entails or amounts to a decline of values.

What really creates the crisis is insistence on models of behaviour that have become obsolete, on the mistaken assumption that the preservation of those models means the preservation of the values they have expressed. Such insistence may prove fatal to the values. Because of an equation of values with a specific behaviour, the twin errors of refusing to accept changes in behaviour, and of identifying behaviour with values, may make the values appear irrelevant to the needs and aspirations of modern life.

There are three main possibilities: values disappear; or values are changing; or values appear to be changing because the models of behaviour that they have inspired are changing (or disappearing).

Family values have not disappeared. They have changed. But this does not mean that there is a crisis. For example, in many Mediterranean and traditional contemporary societies, the family wanted a good education for its boys, and a good marriage for its girls. And until the mid-1970s many more boys than girls continued their studies after compulsory

education. By the mid-eighties, it was noticed that whilst parents continued to wish a good education for their sons (and the good jobs dependent on it), they had acquired a very liberal attitude toward the future of their daughters, who were now permitted to choose whether or not to study or work. Marriage was viewed by them as less of a priority or necessity. More recently still, it has become apparent that parents have become even more ambitious for their daughters than for their sons. This complete reversal of the attitude of the family, in roughly one generation of 25 years, leads to profound and complex changes in the family behaviour of the younger generation. For example: some women will radically depart from tradition by not marrying or by marrying men less educated than they are: more women will enter the labour force and not leave after the birth of their children; more women, being economically independent will end an unsatisfactory marriage and ask for a divorce. None of these changes indicate that the family as a value has diminished: they imply only that many social values have changed. As such, this can not be considered as a crisis; rather, it is social evolution: there has never been an immobile, unchanging society.

It would be disingenuous, as well as unwise, however, to deny that many people and societies feel bewildered, anxious,

concerned about modern society. A common cause of the malaise may be an inability to acknowledge and adapt to change: to admit the end of an era and the beginning of a new one. If we accept that values, models and institutions change more slowly than patterns of behaviour, the main elements of the present social crisis can be considered as embodying the elements of the new reality. To the extent that social theory and methodology have failed to evolve in step with emerging social problems, all who have to address these problems, whether concerning drugs, violence, fanaticism, racism, poverty, AIDS etc., must do so without clear or stable theoretical foundations. In most contemporary societies families are formed by people with diverging concepts, models and values. Such divergence is mainly related to gender and generation variations within the family group.

* * *

The development of social policy in all nations has much to gain from increased understanding of changes in family values, and attempts to identify the help required by those in need. Modern society is unquestionably more self-aware and self-analytical than most societies in the past. To this extent modern societies consciously 'choose' values and

structure their social arrangements in the light of such conscious decisions. There are, nevertheless, many areas which have received surprisingly little analysis. In some western countries, for example, but not all, it was argued that 'falling in love' has considerable significance in understanding family values and relationships.

Whereas policy-makers want to know what to do, about what, where, when and how, theoreticians have tended to say that we know too little of the facts and, in any case, do not pretend to predict what changes might occur. Such sceptical reactions, however, should not deter enquiry and careful provision. Almost everyone now agrees that education can no longer be restricted to the formal boundaries of school and college: it is a lifetime experience for all individuals. The concepts, attitudes, interpretations and values that are acquired at different stages of our lives are constantly challenged and tested by the changing contexts around us. Practical steps at both the micro and macro levels can be taken to facilitate social justice and cohesion and ensure the formulation and implementation of appropriate legal and political structures.

Preventive social policy is at least as important as remedial measures and the following issues were identified as

needing special attention.

1. There is a need to secure social justice for minorities and other vulnerable members of society.
2. To implement principles of subsidiarity, a balance must be achieved between state and local communities, voluntary and non-government organisations, families and individuals. Supportive structural arrangements, including day centres for children of working mothers, maternity and paternity leave, parental benefits, flexitime for parents with young children, all need consideration.
3. The location of social and family welfare services in local communities need to be developed, with special attention to evolving needs for residential care.
4. A greater toleration towards divergent views depends on an effective educational programme. Such a programme needs to extend beyond the narrow confines of schools and formal institutions.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ABELA, Rev. Dr. Anthony	Malta
AGIUS, Mr. Leslie	Malta
ALBERONI, Professor Francesco	Italy
BONDI, Mr. Lou	Malta
BUSUTTIL, Professor Salvino	Malta
BYK, Judge Christian	France
CAMILERI, Rev. Louis	Malta
CARUANA GALIZIA, Ms Daphne	Malta
CASSAR, The Hon. Dr. Joseph	Malta
COWARD, Professor Harold	Canada
DARMANIN, Dr. Mary	Malta
EISENSTADT, Professor S.N.	Israel
EZZINE, Professor Abdelfattah	Morocco
EL-HAMAMSY, Professor Laila	Egypt
FRIGGIERI, Professor Joseph	Malta
FSADNI, Mr. Ranier	Malta
GALEA, The Hon. Dr. Louis	Malta
HEAL, Mr. Gordon	United Kingdom
INGUANEZ, Rev. Dr. Joseph	Malta
ISYAR, Professor Dr. Yuksel	Turkey
JONES, Professor Peter	United Kingdom
KERROU, Dr. Mohamed	Tunisia

KHAROUFI, Dr. Mostafa	Tunisia
LEVY, Dr. Shlomit	Israel
MINTOFF, Dr. Wenzu	Malta
MIFSUD BONNICI, The Hon. Dr. Ugo	Malta
MIRALLES GONZALEZ, Professor Isabel	Spain
MORAN, The Hon. Dr. Vincent	Malta
MOUSSOUROU, Professor Loukia	Greece
MUSCAT, The Hon. Mr. Richard	Malta
O'CONNELL, Professor Laurence	United States of America
RUEGG, Dr. François	Switzerland
SANT CASSIA, Dr. Paul	Malta
STAVROU, Professor Teofanis	United States of America
TABONE, Rev. Dr. Carmel	Malta
TONNA, Rev. Dr. Benny	Malta
VASSALLO, Professor Mario	Malta
VELLA, Rev. Charles	Italy

Institute Publications

Occasional Papers:

1. *Europe Redefined*, Richard McAllister, 1991
ISBN 0 9514854 1 5
2. *Europe: Ways Forward*, Mark Russel & Richard McAllister,
1992 ISBN 0 9514854 2 3
3. *Constitutions, Ninian Stephen & Indigenous Peoples*, Paul
Reeves, 1993 ISBN 0 9514854 3 1
4. *Indigenous Peoples & Ethnic Minorities*, Peter Jones, 1993
ISBN 0 9514854 4 X
5. *Educational Values*, Peter Jones, 1994
ISBN 0 9514854 5 8

Project Publications:

A Hotbed of Genius, Daiches, Jones and Jones (eds.), Edinburgh
University Press, 1986 ISBN 0 85224 537 8

Revolutions in Science 1789-1989, Jean Jones, 1989.
ISBN 0 9514854 0 7

Morals, Motives & Markets - Adam Smith 1723-90, Jean Jones,
1990. ISBN 0 9516377 0 3

Associated Publications:

Philosophy and Science in the Scottish Enlightenment, Peter
Jones (ed.), John Donald Publishers, 1988. ISBN 0 85976 225 4

*The Science of Man in the Scottish Enlightenment: Hume, Reid
and their contemporaries*, Peter Jones (ed.), Edinburgh
University Press, 1989. ISBN 0 7486 0109 0

Adam Smith Reviewed, Peter Jones and Andrew Skinner (eds.),
Edinburgh University Press, 1992. ISBN 0 7486 0346 8

ISSN 2041-8817 (Print)
ISSN 2634-7342 (Online)
ISBN 0 9514854 6 6

Printed by the University of Edinburgh

**If you require this document in an alternative format,
such as large print or a coloured background, please
contact Ben Fletcher-Watson at iash@ed.ac.uk or +44
(0) 131 650 4671.**