

ティーチング・ポートフォリオ

筑波学院大学

Department of International Liberal Arts (ILA)

アンドリュー・タイラー・ヨルン



筑波学院大学
TSUKUBA GAKUIN UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement of Teaching Philosophy	2
Statement on the International Liberal Arts (ILA) Faculty.....	4
1. The Role of the ILA in the Neoliberal Academic Environment.....	4
2. Goals and Expectations for New ILA Students.....	4
3. The Attraction of Philosophy	5
List of Courses Taught at Tsukuba Gakuin University	6
Detailed Course Descriptions	7
Appendix 1.....	10
Appendix 2.....	12
Appendix 3.....	17
Appendix 4.....	23

STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

My commitment to good teaching is informed by an awareness and acceptance of the fact that the vast majority of students who take courses in philosophy will not major in philosophy let alone go on to become professional academic philosophers. Most are simply filling a gap in their curriculum with something they're mildly curious about or, in some cases, even genuinely interested in but have no intention of pursuing further outside the classroom. This is not to say students aren't serious about philosophy. Indeed students tend greatly to enjoy their philosophy classes and even to regret not having the time or space to take more. Unlike other, more "practical" courses in business administration, biochemistry, engineering and the like, philosophy gives students a rare—and perhaps the only—opportunity to ask and address the kinds of "big questions" that, on some fundamental level, provoke and motivate us collectively as human beings (questions of reality, meaning, value, social and political organization etc.).

For these reasons, I am happy if I can simply kindle this nascent and inarticulate philosophical curiosity, and perhaps also provide students with certain intellectual tools and resources they can take with them and apply as they see fit in their own professional, civic, and personal lives. In philosophy as in any other field, it takes many years not only to be in a position to say something original, but indeed even to be able to discuss the fundamental concepts with any degree of fluency. Thus I don't expect my undergraduate students to be intellectually bold or creative. I am happy enough if they can acquire some rudimentary, fragmentary grasp of the main figures and texts, and even happier if they can find some way, however basic, to connect the material to wider problems and issues.

It goes without saying that the humanities are lately in a precarious situation. Given a world in which everything is subordinated to the agenda of maximizing growth, humanities departments are constantly expected to "justify" their existence in conformity with this agenda. Philosophy, too, demonstrates its relevance by making the university an attractive climate for investment, as measured by its ability to boost enrollment figures, procure funding, and raise the university's research profile through "high-impact" outputs. This puts the humanities in a doubly difficult position insofar as both their mission and their success in achieving it are imposed from outside, by a neoliberal model which it is precisely their duty to interrogate and resist. This is perhaps the biggest challenge facing both instructors and students today. To the extent that teaching is reduced to a business transaction between "educational service providers" on the one hand and customers seeking "experiences" and "product satisfaction" on the other, it becomes ever more difficult for the humanities to stay true to their inherently self-critical spirit and mission. In my own teaching, I have always tried to push back against this reduction of the university to a mere knowledge service industry, and to treat my students as curious, open-minded, thoughtful, and responsible human beings rather than clients purchasing a product or, what is worse but just as common today, factory workers to be supervised, managed, and disciplined. In my experience, students respond positively when they feel they're being treated as free, rational adults and given problems and assignments commensurate with their maturity, independence, and intelligence.

Teaching in a Japanese university in English poses special problems. For one thing, philosophy as such, the way philosophy engages with the world—the kinds of problems philosophy poses, its preferred method of dealing with those problems through logical reasoning and argumentation, and the codification of all of this in the discipline of academic philosophy—is historically foreign to Japan; philosophy is translated into the Japanese idiom only with difficulty and a not insignificant degree of arbitrariness and novelty. Second, the vast differences between English and Japanese make even ordinary language acquisition extremely daunting, to say nothing of achieving a level of facility that would allow one to say something philosophically meaningful or interesting. I have always excelled at breaking down complex, technical information and presenting it in ways my students could easily process. I'm also extremely patient with my students, and always happy to go over difficult points several times or from different angles or with the help of different examples.

In addition to my belief in the social value of philosophy and, concomitantly, my investment in my students' personal development, there are also internal reasons motivating my commitment to good teaching. The old adage that "the best way to learn something is to teach it" is a sound one, and I view every course I

teach, whether introductory or advanced, in or out of my AOS, as an opportunity to expand and deepen my own knowledge. For these reasons, my students can count on a consistently high level of enthusiasm and engagement under all circumstances. I devote several hours each week to writing extensive lecture and review notes, responding to mail, commenting on papers, and offering extra help both during and outside of office hours, and judging from my evaluations this level of attention is something my students greatly appreciate.

STATEMENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL LIBERAL ARTS (ILA) FACULTY

1. The Role of the ILA in the Neoliberal Academic Environment

At a time when liberal arts and humanities departments around the world are increasingly being downsized or shuttered altogether in response to their (perceived) inability to justify their existence vis-à-vis a neoliberal agenda fixated on the imperatives of “productivity” and “efficiency,” it is nothing short of a miracle that a small and ambitious university like Tsukuba Gakuin has taken a bold step in the opposite direction, by creating a new International Liberal Arts programme staffed with foreign researchers in various fields from film studies to global resource management. I believe I speak for all the new ILA faculty when I say that this is an exciting time. We’re a kind of vanguard, still flying a bit blind but full of passion, and working hard to lay the groundwork for what we hope will grow into a lively, diverse, and flourishing intellectual environment.

As a humanities scholar (in general) and professional philosopher (by training), I cannot help but think of the ancient and venerable traditions we are carrying on here, wittingly or otherwise. In fact, we should not be too quick with acronyms (like “ILA”) whose very convenience comes at the cost of a concealment of the deeper resonances of the language they necessarily truncate. The term *artes liberales* was already in currency in the Roman Republic; it referred to a curriculum that extended back to the Greeks and included such disciplines as logic, rhetoric, geometry, and music. Taken literally, it meant something like “practices of liberty”—“liberty” here referring not to any modern “free will” but rather to a kind of *vocation*, an ethical imperative. The *artes liberales* were those fields of knowledge one had to master in order to be a responsible, competent agent in society. By the Middle Ages, the liberal arts (expanded to seven) were organized under the rubric of philosophy as their common root and shared essence. With the rise of humanism during the Renaissance, further disciplines were added, such as history and moral philosophy (all grounded in the Greek and Latin classics), which became known as the *studia humanitatis*. These fields of the nascent “humanities” involved not merely a study of human beings and their works; more fundamentally, they represented those higher branches of learning whose purpose was cultural refinement and worldly sophistication—together they constituted an “education befitting a cultured person.” It goes without saying that the original meanings of these terms have been almost entirely forgotten. At the same time, given the nature and scale of the problems humanity faces today—problems entirely of its own making—it should be equally obvious that a return to the liberal arts and humanities has never been more urgent and necessary.

As a professor in the liberal arts faculty, my goal is precisely to help my students cut through and surmount the lazy thinking that plagues our age. The rationale for this is fourfold. First, good thinking is self-justifying, an end in its own right; it need have no other value or aim than promoting our own development as human beings. Second, how we act is a reflection of how we think, and if the world is on fire (both figuratively and literally), this can only mean that we are thinking very badly indeed; as the ancients taught, it is impossible to be a responsible citizen of the modern world unless we are able to formulate clear ideas, weigh evidence, and mount coherent arguments in support of our views. Third, good thinking is the best defence against gullibility and deception; it is essential for cutting through the deluge of lies, nonsense, superstition, fake news, ideology, and bogus theories that proliferate on social media and are propagated by power-hungry politicians, corporations, and charlatans of all sorts. Finally, and because pragmatic concerns are not unimportant, it is a fact that students who are exposed to a wide range of views tend to perform better on admissions exams and secure good-paying jobs (amongst other objective criteria of “success”). Critical thinking, responsible citizenship, self-cultivation—in my view, this constitutes the core of what the new ILA department at Tsukuba Gakuin University should be about, and it’s what I’m constantly striving for in my own teaching and research.

2. Intellectual openness and independent thinking: goals and expectations for new ILA students

Being a university student involves enormous opportunities and challenges alike. The hard work of studying is inseparable from the thrill of being exposed to new ideas, perspectives, texts, and fields of research. At no other time in our lives are we so free to explore, interrogate, reflect on, analyse, criticise, and try to change the world around us. And for this very reason, at no time are we so lost, anxious, and confused, adrift on the vast and ever shifting and swelling sea of knowledge. To make the most of this singular and all-too-brief time,

students must actively seize its offerings rather than passively absorb them; the rewards of a university education are directly proportional to the effort spent on acquiring them. In the first place, and minimally, this means becoming a more efficient learner by forming or improving certain habits and behaviours (such as keeping a schedule, staying organised, etc.). Second and far more important, and above all in the liberal arts, is cultivating an attitude of intellectual openness, curiosity, and flexibility, a naïve sense of wonder at the inexhaustible richness and complexity of the world. Such an attitude necessarily demands a certain courage – to accept vulnerability, to appreciate difference, and to change course as the situation requires. Finally, and perhaps most difficult of all, is the effort of finding one’s own voice, of learning to put the ideas and concepts one has studied to work in the service of a unique, personal, well-reasoned, and coherent outlook or orientation; this is essential for being an informed and engaged citizen ready to tackle the numerous problems we face today. These are just a few of the goals I expect students to strive to attain while at Tsukuba Gakuin University, and I look forward to helping them in every way I can.

大学生になるということは、大きなチャンスと挑戦の機会を得ることであります。その中で学生は積極的に学び、自由で知的な姿勢やオープンな好奇心を持ち、最終的にはそこから自分自身の意見を探し出して欲しいと思います。それは今日の世界における様々な問題に取り組む際に必要となるものです。これが私が筑波学院大学でこれから学ぶ学生に期待することであり、その学びの手助けをすることを楽しみにしています。

3. Attraction of philosophy

At the most general level, philosophy is an ever-unfolding enquiry into the nature of the world as such and our unique place and role within it, namely, as beings capable of addressing the world in a philosophical way. To do philosophy is therefore to commit to becoming a more complete and authentic human being. In posing fundamental questions about reality, knowledge, mind, language, beauty, and the good, philosophy elaborates the basic concepts, categories, and modes of thought that underpin and structure all other disciplines; for this reason philosophy can be studied on its own or supplementary to any field or course of study. Philosophy is an especially attractive subject for university students, as it provides rigorous training in skills such as active reading, critical analysis, and logical reasoning and argumentation which extend far beyond the classroom and yield lifelong returns.

哲学とは現実や知識、善等凡ゆる根本的な問いを扱う学問です。そこから得られる批判的思考や論理的推論等の技術は全ての研究領域に応用でき、人生其の物をも豊かにします。

LIST OF COURSES TAUGHT AT TSUKUBA GAKUIN UNIVERSITY

Course	Type
Liberal Arts: Humanities I	Elective
Seminar: Introduction to Philosophy	Elective
Basic English: Reading and Writing	Required
Basic English: Communication Skills	Elective
Contemporary Ideas	Elective
Critical Thinking	Elective
English through Film	Elective
Basic English: Listening and Speaking	Required

Individual course descriptions to follow below. All courses are taught in English in a manner consistent with the aims, objectives, and methodological principles stated in the above teaching philosophy statement.

DETAILED COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

LIBERAL ARTS: HUMANITIES I (elective)

Objectives: To provide students with a broad survey of major movements, themes, figures, artworks, and texts representative of the study of the humanities as they are taught in Western university departments. To introduce students to new ideas; to foster and encourage critical thinking; and to help non-native English speakers practice listening to university-level lectures in English.

Approach: The objectives are pursued through lectures, discussion, PowerPoint presentations, art/music demonstrations, films, etc. (For example, for lessons on music, we will typically listen to several relevant pieces and discuss them.)

Assignments: Short reaction papers, plus one longer end-of-term report or essay.

Assessment: Students are assessed according to the following criteria: (1) attendance; (2) participation; (3) short reaction papers; (4) final report/essay; and (5) final exam.

Materials: Miscellaneous book chapters, scholarly papers, newspaper articles, essays, visual media, etc., as well as self-prepared lectures. See Appendix 1.

SEMINAR: INTRODUCTION TO WESTERN PHILOSOPHY (elective)

Objectives: To provide students with little or no background in philosophy with a broad, general, and easily digestible survey of the major movements, divisions, figures, texts, ideas, etc. of/in Western philosophy from Plato to the present. To introduce students to new ideas; to foster and encourage critical thinking; and to help non-native English speakers practice listening to university-level lectures in English.

Approach: The objectives are pursued through lectures and discussion.

Assignments: Short reaction papers, plus one longer end-of-term report or essay.

Assessment: Students are assessed according to the following criteria: (1) attendance; (2) participation; (3) short reaction papers; (4) final report/essay; and (5) final exam.

Materials: Self-produced lectures, plus occasional outside reading from classic texts in philosophy (depending on students' level). See Appendix 2.

BASIC ENGLISH: READING AND WRITING (required)

Objectives: To review English grammar relevant to reading academic texts and to writing university-level essays and papers. To give students practice reading real (unmodified, unedited) academic materials in English in order to prepare them for taking standardized tests (IELTS, etc.), studying at the graduate level, and/or studying abroad. To give students a chance to practice writing an essay in English and to receive detailed feedback.

Approach: The objectives are pursued through a combination of (1) textbook-aided grammar review; (2) guided readings of intermediate to advanced academic texts; and (3) short writing exercises.

Assignments: Short reaction papers, plus one longer end-of-term report or essay.

Assessment: Students are assessed according to the following criteria: (1) attendance; (2) participation; (3) short reaction papers; and (4) final report/essay.

Materials: Textbook, plus self-produced exercises and other materials. See Appendix 3.

BASIC ENGLISH: PRESENTATION SKILLS (elective)

Objectives: To give students skills and confidence necessary to give a presentation in English on a topic of their own choosing. To encourage critical thinking, reasoning, and arguing skills through mock debate and discussion (e.g., asking questions about others' presentations).

Approach: The objectives are pursued through creative, interactive methods including reading poetry and children's books, and acting out scenes from plays. Students typically do a mini-presentation every other class in a pre-determined format (ice-breaker speech, layout speech, compare-and-contrast speech, etc.).

Assignments: Regular class presentations, plus one longer (5-10 minute) end-of-term presentation chosen in line with a pre-determined theme (e.g., contemporary social issues, etc.).

Assessment: Students are assessed according to the following criteria: (1) attendance; (2) participation

(exercises, short presentations); and (3) final presentation.

Materials: Selected poems, children's stories, plays, etc. Self-produced exercises to improve listening skills and encourage public speaking. See Appendix 4.

CONTEMPORARY IDEAS (elective)

Objectives: To introduce students to major intellectual figures, texts, and currents that shape the world at present, including (but not limited to) Marx/Marxism, Weber, Nietzsche, psychoanalysis (Freud, Lacan), modernism, existentialism, Foucault, feminism, gender theory, ecological/environmental philosophy, critical theory/Frankfurt School, neoliberalism, etc. To introduce students to new ideas; to foster and encourage critical thinking; and to help non-native English speakers practice listening to university-level lectures in English.

Approach: The objectives are pursued through lectures, discussion, PowerPoint presentations, art/music demonstrations, films, etc.

Assignments: Short reaction papers, plus one longer end-of-term report or essay.

Assessment: Students are assessed according to the following criteria: (1) attendance; (2) participation; (3) short reaction papers; and (4) final report/essay.

Materials: Self-produced lectures, supplemented with selected academic texts and articles depending on students' English-language abilities.

CRITICAL THINKING (elective)

Objectives: To improve students' critical thinking, reasoning, and arguing skills through close examination of relevant and controversial current events (capitalism, climate change, race and gender, etc.). To improve students' reading skills through readings of relevant academic texts and newspaper articles. To improve students' discussion skills by fostering in-class discussion and debate about selected topics.

Approach: The objectives are pursued through guided readings of selected materials followed by class discussion.

Assignments: Short reaction/evaluation papers on topics covered in class, plus one longer end-of-term report, essay, or argumentative paper.

Assessment: Students are assessed according to the following criteria: (1) attendance; (2) participation; (3) short reaction papers; and (4) final report/essay.

Materials: Relevant newspaper articles, scholarly articles and book chapters, as well as self-produced lectures, PowerPoint presentations, etc.

ENGLISH THROUGH FILM (elective)

Objectives: To develop students' English-language skills through watching and discussing notable English-language films. To introduce students to important movements and directors in the history of English-language cinema (Hitchcock, Loach, Lynch, etc.).

Approach: The objectives are pursued through watching films, reviewing vocabulary, and discussing relevant issues raised by the films.

Assignments: Attendance/viewing, short worksheets, optional final essay/report.

Assessment: Students are assessed according to the following criteria: (1) attendance; (2) participation (daily review worksheets); and (3) final essay/report (optional).

Materials: Films (to be decided each term), self-produced worksheets and other review materials.

BASIC ENGLISH: LISTENING AND SPEAKING (required)

Objectives: To improve students' English listening and speaking skills through the use of a wide variety of media including (but not limited to) music, film, speeches, podcasts, academic lectures, and documentaries. To introduce students to current affairs by grouping the selected materials around relevant key themes. To foster critical thinking by encouraging discussion and debate surrounding selected materials and issues.

Approach: The objectives are pursued through watching/listening to the selected media and by engaging in small-group discussion about important issues raised therein. Difficult material is supplemented by short vocabulary and grammar exercises, explanation, etc. Occasional lecturing when useful.

Assignments: Listening to/viewing the selected text (music, lecture, talk, etc.); group discussion; short reaction papers; optional final essay/report.

Assessment: Students are assessed according to the following criteria: (1) attendance; (2) participation in discussion; (3) final essay/report (optional).

Materials: Selection of films, talks, podcasts, music, etc. designed to improve listening skills and generate discussion.

APPENDIX 1

Lecture notes used for a unit on European music from the Medieval to the Baroque periods.

Lecture 2: Music from the Renaissance to the Classical Period

Play something, e.g. Tallis's 'Lamentations' — explain from the Book of Lamentations in the Hebrew Bible, poetic laments, i.e. songs of grief and mourning, for the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BCE

Play a little bit of Allegri's 'Miserere' (1638) — tell the story of Mozart copying the score from memory (1770)

Both of these works are from the Renaissance period — what do you notice about them? Two main characteristics of Renaissance music are:

- Highly expressive — music as a vehicle for personal expression, i.e. the composer has a distinctive style of expression, even when writing sacred or religious texts; music likewise a vehicle for self-expression of performers — improvisation
- Highly complex, rich texture — multiple voices, melodies all working together: polyphony

Compare with a piece from the Middle Ages, e.g. Hildegard von Bingen's 'Chants for the Feast of St. Ursula' — again, what do we notice?

- The composer's voice recedes behind the music — almost as though the music comes from a place, as the music of heaven, the composer as merely a vehicle for bringing the music into the world, but not the author of the music
- Simpler, a single melodic line — monophonic

HvB: 12th century German nun, mystic, writer, composer — had mystical visions from a young age, was sent to live in a monastery, wrote down all her visions, and her music based on these

Ironically, not instructed in the Seven Liberal Arts

Review the map of the history of the liberal arts / humanities up to the Renaissance. Going back to Tallis, Allegri, Palestrina, Byrd et al., what are some of the defining features of the age in which this music was written?

- Rise of 'humanistic' thought, i.e. stresses the value, power, agency etc. of human beings over nature.
- Corollary to this, scientific and technological advancement.
- Accordingly, the beginning of what Nietzsche will later call 'the death of God', the slow deterioration of the Christian worldview.
- Recovery of the literary traditions and texts of ancient Greece and Rome.
- Colonial expansion, emergence of new markets, rise of a bourgeois class, i.e. a middle class.
- Invention of the printing press and increasing availability of printed materials.

All of this has some effect on the music of the period — what, how? Guesses?

- Greater personal expression through polyphony clearly related to the rise of humanism — now the music issues from the mind of the composer, even if it is devoted to God. Composers and performers not merely vehicles.

- Similarly, the spread of forms of non-religious music, e.g. songs, dances etc.
- Recovery of ancient Greco-Roman literature manifested in e.g. the invention of opera as a modern form of Greek tragedy, e.g. Jacopo Peri's 'Dafne' (Apollo falling in love with a nymph / nature goddess, Daphne) and 'Euridice', and Monteverdi's 'Orfeo' (both about the Orpheus and Eurydice myth).
- Rise of the middle class / bourgeoisie and invention of the printing press = increasing demand for amateur music and greater dissemination and consumption of music.
- Spread of printed information, expansion of markets, increase in trade etc., in short, emerging 'globalization', all contribute to the birth of what we now call the 'music industry' — trained musicians, composers, performers etc., virtuosos, increasing musical education, music as a job = one could be hired by a church or a court, emergence of centres of musical activity, Rome, Venice etc.
- All of this = emergence and spread of a common musical language with local variations

Orfeo written toward the end of the Renaissance and the beginning of the Baroque. Some Baroque examples to play — :

- Charpentier, La pierre philosophale, H501: II (Divertissements)
- Charpentier, 'Rentrez, trop indiscrets soupirs' (Divertissements)
- Handel, Sonata in A, Op. 1 No. 10: I, Andante (Violin Sonatas)
- Vivaldi (if time)

What similarities and differences do we notice compared to the music of the Renaissance?

Similarities:

- Very expressive
- Multiple voices

Some differences:

- Hard to tell just from listening, but instrumentation becomes much more important — Renaissance music was often only barely sketched out, instrumentation hardly ever given — emphasis on adaptation, improvisation etc. Music was more of a guideline.
- During the Baroque period, composers start to write for specific instruments. Scores are still sparse compared to e.g. Beethoven, but more complex than Renaissance scores.
- More importance given to the virtuoso performer, and whereas before the virtuoso was supposed to improvise, now the improvisation was written out beforehand and incorporated into the score — i.e. the composer writes more complicated music which only the virtuoso can perform.
- Writing for certain instruments + writing virtuosic music for performers = appearance of new instruments designed for this purpose, e.g. we see the appearance of the violin as both highly expressive and capable of virtuosic playing
- Shift from polyphony to counterpoint — polyphony = all the voices are equal; counterpoint more = bass-treble modulation, bass and melody lines most important, with other voices added for harmony — quickly got extremely complicated with the addition of numerous voices — multiple melodic lines all playing together simultaneously
- In general, Baroque music is elaborate, complicated, often thought to lack a single coherent melody, changes key frequently etc. — difficult.

Play examples from Bach, e.g. 'French Suites', 'The Art of Fugue' etc.

APPENDIX 2

Lecture notes for a unit on identity, responsibility, and free will (basic problems in ethics).

Lecture 6: Identity, responsibility, free will (on the way to Kant)

Expression – missing the forest for the trees → overview / review of what we've done

Could have started with the ancients, the Greeks, but they're rather far from our experience today

Started with Descartes because he sets the agenda for the modern world – still living in his shadow

- What's an 'agenda'? – Problems and ways, methods etc. for addressing those problems

What problems? Want to get to the *essence* here – :

1. Knowledge – : for Descartes, knowledge = *certainty*, 'clarity and distinctness', indubitability
 - a. Questions: is certainty possible, and if so, how?
 - b. Descartes says *yes* – knowledge/certainty possible through *reason*
 - c. Hume, Locke et al. say *no* – certainty is possible, but certainty is not knowledge; knowledge is possible, but knowledge is based on experience and so 'dubitable', never certain
 - d. Why is this a problem? – clearly when we do science, we want to know if we're *explaining* the world or merely *describing* it
 - e. Descartes and rationalists think we can *explain* the world, give *reasons* why things are the way they are
 - f. Empiricists counter that explanation *just is* description – all we get are ever-finer descriptions, e.g. to break down a causal process isn't to make a rational connection but simply to describe things that follow each other in experience (B follows A, C follows B etc.)
 - g. Reason neither describes nor explains but merely *analyses*, breaks down (Socrates is a man..., etc. – if I know the definitions of 'man', 'mortal' etc., there's nothing new here, just definitions
 - h. So this is one cluster of problems: how is knowledge possible, how is certainty possible, are they the same thing etc. etc.
2. Reality – : for Descartes, mind and matter are two completely different kinds of stuff
 - a. Interaction: How do they interact? *Do* they interact? Do they have to interact? – etc.
 - b. Priority: Consciousness out of matter, or matter out of consciousness?
 - c. 'Hard problem': I can give an exhaustive description of the world without ever talking about things like hardness, colour, taste etc. – all that stuff seems 'extra', somehow *inessential*
3. Identity – : for Descartes, the thinking *stuff* is also an *I*, ego, self etc.
 - a. This gave us new problems: Is this *I* a little indestructible ball, centre etc., as it were? Or is it a 'cluster' of perceptions, representations etc. with no centre?
 - b. If we introspect, we never find the little ball or centre – but we also can't make sense of unowned perceptions (mental contents without a centre).
 - c. Is the self just the continuity of memory, or is it just the way our experience 'hangs together' as a condition of having any experience at all?
4. It was with this last set of questions that we finally hit on something of *ethical* significance – something really important and relevant for our own lives today.
 - a. Identity was directly related to *responsibility*, e.g. legal responsibility

- b. Well, in case you think philosophy is totally useless, consider *State v. Milligan*, 1978 – :
 - i. Billy Milligan, multiple felon, committed armed robbery and three rapes, acquitted on the grounds that he had DID (dissociative identity disorder), i.e. didn't have one coherent personality
 - ii. Had something like 24 distinct personalities, including an English scientist, an escape artist, a connumist from Yugoslavia, and a 19-year-old lesbian who cooked for all the other personalities
 - iii. The lesbian was the rapist – so Milligan found not guilty
- c. Caused a huge uproar – DID defence rarely successful again after that
- d. Here's another one – last year (2020) a 93-year-old German man was convicted on 5,230 counts of murder for when he worked at the Stutthof Nazi death camp in 1944-45, 75 years ago
- e. The man cooperated, accepted responsibility, apologized etc. – all of this shows that he was still in possession of his memories, i.e. on Locke's conception, he was *still the same person*
- f. But here's the kicker: he was only given a two-year sentence, suspended, on the grounds that he was only 17 years old at the time, still a child
- g. Meaning what – ? Implying that *a child is not yet a person because his identity isn't fully formed* – identity still in flux, somehow not yet a whole person
- h. So a former Nazi was spared jail because he committed his crimes when he was not yet a full person
 - i. Here's a last one – *amnesia* is almost never an acceptable legal defence
 - j. Here you might have a look at Kafka's *The Trial*, for example – not exactly about amnesia, but it could be, at least offers a good thought experiment: suppose one day you are woken up in the middle of the night and arrested for murder...you have no memory of the event, and what's more, your experiences seemed to be completely continuous – *there's no gap in your recollection of your experiences*
 - k. Or take, say, Christopher Nolan's *Memento*, where the main character can't form any new memories (anterograde amnesia) and is trying to solve the mystery of his wife's murder – it is suggested that he killed his own wife by giving her too much medicine, i.e. after he gave her medicine, he forgot, gave her more etc. until she died – guilty?

These last examples are nice because they show something we said at the beginning of the course, viz. that philosophical ideas are often *presupposed* even when they are not acknowledged, that we sometimes *think philosophically* without knowing it – philosophy *creeps into* our lives, quietly

All of this falls within the sphere of what's called *practical ethics* – what should I do in this or that case?

These examples above are not taken from philosophy – they're taken from newspapers, legal reports, psychology papers, literature, film..., but they all *presuppose* certain philosophical ideas about identity, responsibility etc.

All such examples *say more* than what they *mean to say* – take our 93-year-old Nazi: *guilty* because he's still *the same person*, *not guilty* because he committed his crimes *before he was a real/full person*, yet would nevertheless remain *guilty* even if he had *no memory* of crimes he committed 75 years ago

- All of this *assumes* certain things about what it means to be a person..., why we hold people responsible for certain actions..., etc.
- The job of philosophy is to *make explicit* what is only *implicit* – bring out those hidden assumptions etc.
- What's the *assumption* here? – that identity is *fluid* up to a certain age, *after which* it never changes: once a person, always a person
- The 'person' here is not Locke's person, the continuity of memory, but the *common-sense* idea of a

- person – *but*, with a twist: not immortal or immutable, but ‘organic’, as it were, grows up etc.
- Perfect example of Locke’s charge that when we hold people guilty for crimes they don’t remember, we confuse *the human being* with *the person* – the ‘self’ here is like a little ‘human being’ inside you, something that grows up and has a kind of unity until you die – *but what kind of unity?*

This is what philosophy can do – etc.

Here’s something else – we’re talking about *responsibility* – what we’re saying is: responsibility depends somehow on identity

Everything here turns on Locke’s problem of whether one human being can have multiple *persons*, or personalities or personal identities – clearly *I* can’t be responsible for *your* actions if *you* are a different *person* – but the question now is: *what if ‘I’ ‘myself’ am not the same person, the same self?*

Well, what else? – is there anything else that responsibility depends on? Is there anything else *assumed* or *presupposed* here? Anything else that we have to think about when we hold people responsible?

Of course – *freedom*.

Let’s go back to our legal cases above – what do we notice? In fact, things like DID, amnesia etc. are only valid excuses when the criminal can claim *insanity* – what does that mean?

Take, say, DID / multiple personality disorder – the idea is that you can only use this as a defence if it can be used to prove that *you could not have acted otherwise*

In other words, it’s *not* because – as Locke held – the person is really a *different* person altogether; it’s rather because DID is a kind of ‘disease’ or ‘disorder’ that prevents people from acting freely
Same with *amnesia* – only used to try to prove *insanity*, madness etc.

Same with our 95-year-old Nazi – why not tried as an adult? Not only because a 17-year-old is not a fully formed person, but because immature persons are *not totally in control of their actions*

The problem of *freedom* → another part of the Cartesian legacy or agenda – :

- Just as there’s a commonsense view of mind (I am ‘mental stuff’, *res cogitans*), and
- just as there’s a commonsense view of identity (this mental stuff is an ‘I’, a Real Me), so too
- there’s a commonsense view of freedom, viz. –

Freedom = some kind of hidden ‘power’ of this ‘I’, ‘Real Me’, Ghost-in-the-Machine etc. to start something *completely new* – to *escape* the prison of cause and effect

Remember our mechanistic picture of the world – the world as a giant clock → this world also, for the same reasons, *deterministic*, i.e. mechanism = determinism, no freedom, everything pre-ordained

French scientist Pierre-Simon Laplace wrote an article in 1814 → Laplace’s Demon, i.e. if there were a Supreme Intelligence that knew everything about the universe at a given time, it would also know everything about the whole of its past and the whole of its future → essence of determinism

Argument – :

The past controls the present and future.

You can’t control the past.

Also, you can't control the way the past controls the present and future.
So, you can't control the present and future.

This is called *hard determinism* – says freedom is totally *incompatible* with nature

People aren't free because they belong to the order of nature, and you can always find a cause for their actions. Problem – can't hold anyone accountable for anything.

Consider the famous case of the 'Twinkie defence'. In 1978 a city employee, Dan White, broke into City Hall and shot and killed the mayor and another person. The defence argument was that White was depressed, which caused him to eat junk food, which further increased his depression, causing him to kill the two people. The result? He was found *not guilty* of murder – guilty of a lesser crime, *manslaughter*.

This is a true case, and a very instructive one – instructive because it's so silly, i.e. because it shows the limits of the hard determinist or incompatibilist model. The man bought a gun, after all, went in through the basement to escape the metal detector etc. – clearly he was *plotting* what to do, acting with *intent*.

And this is what the commonsense view says – our circumstances may be determined, but we still have the power to think, deliberate, choose etc.

Moreover, we seem to be *conscious* of our freedom – I think about raising my hand, my hand goes up etc.

The common-sense idea, however, comes with all the old problems – :

- We're back to the old 'Ghost-in-the-Machine' model again – how does the ghost influence the world?
- Hume's 'bundle' theory – if I look hard, I never really *see* the 'conscious decision' – try for yourself, where 'is' 'it'? All you'll see are perceptions, thoughts, perhaps an 'inner voice' etc., but you'll never really hit on 'the decision' itself.
 - Try it sometime – early in the morning, over coffee, relaxed...
- Perhaps most damning of all, the GITM model leads to a *fatal regress* – it says human beings are free because they have a little ghost inside them making the decisions, but what about the freedom of the ghost? Never explained – freedom not accounted for, but just *displaced* onto another entity.

So here's our problem – : free will seems *incompatible* with determinism, so whenever we try to hold people responsible for their actions, we end up presupposing some mysterious, invisible, ghostly stuff endowed with strange, magical powers of intention, decision etc.

So the big question – the million-dollar question – is whether any *compatibilist* theory of freedom, any way to understand free will so that it doesn't contradict what we know about nature?

One way out might be to alter our picture of nature – is determinism right? Quantum theory says *no*. Random events do happen – two systems in the same state, one yields an event, the other not.

Now, you might think that's not much of an answer – suppose something random happens in your brain and you act a certain way. Just because it's random doesn't mean you've acted freely.

But suppose we allow for random mental events instead – does this help? No, because free will doesn't just mean arbitrary action but action done for a reason, deliberate action, action which is oriented toward certain *ends*.

The most influential *compatibilist* theory of free will originates with – again – David Hume.

Hume's solution is ingenious – we've already seen how it might work out.

- If free will is supposed to be some mysterious 'ghostly' stuff or power, then this is only because determinism *itself* makes the same mistake: C&E is likewise a mysterious power of *compulsion*
- Hume distinguishes between *necessity* and *compulsion* or *violence*
- Again, look in nature – you'll find no such compulsion, only *constant conjunction* of events (one thing always seems to follow another)
- *That's all that C&E in nature amounts to* – no 'cause' beyond that, i.e. habit of mind
- This is why there was no problem thinking that mind can influence matter: we see mental events 'constantly conjoined' or linked with physical events – and that is enough
- This is also why there's no problem of free will – i.e. we see events in the world correlated with our motives and intentions all the time
- Maybe I never really 'see' 'the decision' itself, but I certainly know when I'm making one, just as I know when I'm bored without being able to 'see' 'the boredom' itself
- I make decisions, things happen – that's enough to establish that my decisions caused those events
- It's possible that there are hidden causes I'm not aware of – unconscious motives, factors etc.; no problem here
- So in a nutshell, the *whole problem*, for Hume, goes back to this mistake of treating causes as if they were mysterious powers, energies etc. in nature – if we assume causality is a mysterious power, of course we need another mysterious power, 'free will', to counter it – all sorts of trouble

If time, Kant's solution...

APPENDIX 3

Exhibit 1: Sample worksheet: writing “toolbox” review (common writing mistakes and how to fix them)

WRITING TOOLBOX (REVIEW)

PARALLEL STRUCTURE

1. Whenever she went home to see her mother, Emily much preferred _____ than to sit around and watch television.
2. Eddie went to the store to buy milk and _____, [2 options]
3. _____ is much better than a visit to the dentist.

CLEAN SENTENCES (ELIMINATING WORDINESS)

1. The subjects that are considered most important by students are those that have been shown to be useful to them after graduation. _____

2. In the not too distant future, college freshmen must all become aware of the fact that there is a need for them to make contact with an academic adviser concerning the matter of a major. _____

MISPLACED / DANGLING MODIFIERS

1. Flying over the countryside, the cars and houses looked like toys. _____

2. The messenger spoke to the receptionist who delivered the package. _____

3. Staring at the ceiling, the idea became clear. _____

4. Destroyed by the fire, the owners rebuilt the house from the ground up. _____

SENTENCE FRAGMENTS

1. Monday, which is certainly the worst day of the week, because it's so long. _____

2. Crashing the party even when he wasn't invited, which was very rude. _____

TRANSITIONAL PHRASES

1. Mary likes traveling very much. She's scared of flying.

Logical relationships? _____

Rewrite with a transition: _____

2. I don't like raspberries. I like raspberry jam. I like it with cream on scones.

Logical relationships? _____

Rewrite with a transition: _____

3. Bamboo is lightweight and sturdy. It can be produced sustainably.

Logical relationships? _____

Rewrite with a transition: _____

DEFINING AND NON-DEFINING CLAUSES

1. Which sentence means that there are three pictures on the wall?

- a) The picture which has mountains was painted by me.
- b) The picture, which has mountains, was painted by me.

2. Which sentence implies that there are many computers?

- a) The red computer isn't working anymore.
- b) The computer, which is red, isn't working anymore.

3. Which sentence implies that there are thousands of galleries in the world?

- a) The gallery which we visited on holiday is very interesting.
- b) The gallery, which we visited on holiday, is very interesting.

The four meanings of democracy

Adapted from Bernard Crick, *Democracy: A Very Short Introduction* (OUP: 2002)

[1] ‘Democracy’ may be a promiscuous and often rhetorical word, but this is not to say that it can mean just anything. There are limits, and these limits are found in four broad clusters of meaning attached to ‘democracy’. We must examine these because they are at the root of our civilization, as well as of the hope that it will remain civilized and perhaps even progress. As we consider them, we must be aware of whether we are talking about (1) an ideal or doctrine, (2) a type of behaviour towards others, or (3) a set of laws and institutions. ‘Democracy’ can refer to all of these together or to each separately.

[2] The first usage is found in the Greeks, in Plato’s attack on democracy and in Aristotle’s qualified defence of it. In Greek, ‘democracy’ is simply a combination of *demos* (the many, the mob) and *kratos* (rule). Plato attacked this as being the rule of the poor and the ignorant over the educated and the knowledgeable. His fundamental distinction was between knowledge and opinion: democracy is the rule, or rather the anarchy, of mere opinion. Aristotle did not utterly reject this view but rather modified it: good government was a mixture of elements, the few ruling with the consent of the many. The few should have *arete*, ‘excellence’ – the idealized concept of aristocracy. But many more can qualify for citizenship by virtue of having education and property. Democracy as a doctrine or ideal unchecked by the aristocratic principle of experience and knowledge was, however, a fallacy. It is not true ‘that because men are equal in some things, they are equal in all’.

[3] The second usage is found in the Roman republic, in Machiavelli’s great *Discourses*, in the seventeenth-century English and Dutch republicans, and in the early American republic. Just as in Aristotle’s theory, good government is mixed government, but more power could be given to the state. Good laws to protect all are not good enough unless subjects become active citizens making their own laws collectively. The argument was both moral and prudential. The moral argument is more famous: it assumed that human beings were active makers and shapers of their world, not just passive, law-abiding, well-behaved receivers of traditional order. But the prudential argument was always there: it held that a state which was trusted by its people was a stronger state, and that an army or militia was more likely to defend its homeland than hired mercenaries or cautious professionals.

[4] The third usage is found in the rhetoric and events of the French Revolution and in the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Everyone, regardless of education or property, has a right to make his or her will felt in matters of public concern. Indeed, the general will or common good is better understood by any well-meaning, simple, unselfish, and natural ordinary person from their own experience and conscience than by the over-educated upper classes living artificial, meaningless lives. Now this view can have a lot to do with the liberation of a class or nation, but it is not necessarily connected or compatible with individual liberties. In the European eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, recall, most people who cared about liberty did not call themselves democrats but rather constitutionalists or republicans.

[5] The fourth usage of democracy is found in the American constitution and in many of the new constitutions in Europe in the nineteenth century and in the new West German and Japanese constitutions following the Second World War, as well as in the writings of John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville. It is that all can participate if they care (and they *should* care), but they must then mutually respect the equal rights of fellow citizens within a system of laws and regulations that protects those rights. This is what most people today in the United States, Europe, the Commonwealth, and Japan ordinarily mean by democracy, which we might simply call ‘modern democracy’, a fusion of the idea of the power of the people and the idea of legally guaranteed individual rights. The two should indeed be combined, but they are distinct ideas, and

can prove mutually contradictory in practice. There can be, and have been, intolerant democracies and reasonably tolerant autocracies. In the modern era of industry, the mass franchise, and mass communications, we can find it difficult to combine freedom and popular power.

[6] The invention of democracy and *political* rule, as well as the tradition of governing by means of political debate among citizens, has its roots in the practices and thought of the Greek *polis* and the ancient Roman republic. It is not myopically Eurocentric, or rather Graeco-Romano-centric, to see the history and actual usages of democracy thus. It is historical fact. Great empires arose all over the world, universal monotheistic religions arose from the Middle East and Asia, but modern science and democratic ideas first arose in Europe. Science, religion, and democracy all, of course, take on new and different meanings as they travel, and both influence, and are influenced by, different historical cultures.

Writing practice (summary, organisation, comprehension)

[1] Summary of the introduction: _____

[2] Summary of the first meaning (usage): _____

[3] Summary of the second meaning: _____

[4] Summary of the third meaning: _____

[5] Summary of the fourth meaning: _____

[6] Summary of the conclusion: _____

Democracy essay (vocabulary review)

promiscuous	qualified	aristocracy	militias
rhetorically	ignorant	unchecked	mercenary
cluster	anarchy	fallacy	conscience
progress	mere	collectively	artificial
ideal	utter	moral	compatible
doctrine	modify	prudential	mutually
institutions	consent	abide	regulations
fusion	contradictory	intolerant	mob
franchise	myopically	monotheistic	influenced

1. In Japan it is very important to _____ by the rules.
2. If you don't have all the ingredients, you'll have to _____ the recipe a little.
3. Nuclear _____ would produce an almost infinite supply of clean, renewable energy.
4. Judaism, Islam, and Christianity are all _____ religions.
5. _____ plants are nice because you don't have to water them.
6. When the teacher left the room, the class descended into _____.
7. If you focus _____ on one thing, you will miss the bigger picture.
8. In Japan, women won the _____ in 1947, almost 30 years after women were allowed to vote in the United States.
9. Your _____ is your _____ compass; it gives you advice when you don't know the right thing to do.
10. I tried to make a soufflé but it was an _____ failure; it was flat and chewy.
11. Modern society has become more _____ of violence against minorities.
12. In a democracy, people are supposed to make decisions _____; everyone should have their voice heard.

Democracy essay (simple version)

1. People often use the word 'democracy' when they want to *argue* or *persuade* others. Here they are using the word _____. There are four *groups* or _____ of meanings for the word 'democracy'. First, it is often a *goal* or _____. Second, it can refer to a *teaching* or _____. Third, it can mean a way of relating to others. And fourth, it can refer to laws and _____ such as voting and elections.
2. Plato didn't like democracy; he thought it was rule by the *stupid masses*, that is, by an _____. Aristotle likewise thought society should be governed by the *noble class*, the _____, but he also thought they should rule with the *agreement* or _____ of the people.

3. The ancient Romans agreed with Aristotle, but they also argued that people should play a more active role in government. The moral reason for this is that when people are allowed to participate in government, they will be more likely to trust it. The *practical* or *useful* or _____ reason is that the army and the _____ will be more likely than *hired soldiers*, or _____, to defend it.
4. The French writer Rousseau thought that the common people understood the needs of everyone better than the rich and powerful. This view, however, is not always _____ with respecting individual rights and freedoms: sometimes the needs of individuals and the needs of the group can go *against each other*, or be _____.
5. Finally, in modern democracies, everyone is allowed to participate as long as they _____ respect each other. Also, rights are protected by a system of laws and *rules* or _____.
6. Democracy began in ancient Europe, but has spread to many countries around the world. As it travels, it has been *affected* or _____ by the ideas of different peoples and cultures.

APPENDIX 4

Sample public speaking/presentation exercise: students are inventors introducing their latest (and craziest) inventions to a sceptical audience of scientists and journalists.

Instructions: Prepare a demonstration speech about your invention. Take care to clearly lay out the steps involved in using your invention so the audience can follow along and understand what it's for. Use (imaginary) examples. If possible, use a funny story or anecdote for your opening and/or conclusion.

Invention 1



Some possible questions to answer/address:

1. What do you call your invention?
2. What are its main uses?
3. How did you come up with the idea? Was there a "Eureka!" moment?
4. What are the steps involved in using your invention?
5. Where can you buy it?
6. Has anything ever gone wrong with it?
7. Do you have any funny stories about it?