“A real education must be based on a serious, consecutive, progressive study of something definite, teachable and hard.”

Paul Shorey

Description of Course
This course is concerned with the following questions. What is the proper end of education? What kinds of education are there? Can these be rank ordered? What is the best or highest kind of education? What are the proper roles, respectively, of teacher and student? What are the specific challenges endemic to democratic education? What are the specific challenges to mass education? What should be the end of a university education? Is theology a discipline proper to university education? How should the various academic disciplines be related to one another? What sort of educational technologies are valuable and appropriate? What are the principal modes of learning and how should they be evaluated? How do these relate to one another? In pursuing these questions, we will use a combination of lecture and class discussion. Among the aims of the course are to give each student an opportunity to practice and hone skills of philosophical analysis that he or she has been acquiring in previous courses as well as to bring these skills to bear on education as a major.

Texts:
There is one complete text, C. S. Lewis, The Abolition of Man (HarperCollins pbk. 978-0-06-065294-4). Additional readings are in the form of PDF files, which I will send via e-mail attachment to each student.

Course Requirements / Grading:
1. Two class presentations on reading(s) for the day: 40% total (20% each)
2. Final Exam: 30%
3. Term Paper: 30%

Grading Scale
Numerical and letter grades are correlated according to the following scale:

- 95-100   A
- 90-94    A-
- 88-89    B+
- 83-87    B
- 80-82    B-
- 78-79    C+
- 70-77    C
- 68-69    C-
- 60-67    D
- 0-59     F

**Term Paper Policy**
The term paper is due Wednesday, December 2. (It may be turned in prior to this date as well.) Late papers receive a one-half letter grade deduction. **No late papers will be accepted after Monday, December 7, the last day of class.** Late papers may receive no written comments. The term paper must be turned in to the professor by hand; this applies to late papers also. Students should retain an electronic copy of their paper. **Students are advised to read carefully the “Guidelines for Writing Philosophy Papers,” appended to the end of this syllabus.**

**Policy on Make-Up Exams**
The date for the Final Exam is listed at the end of this syllabus. Students are expected to be present to take the exam on this date. University policy stipulates that there are no make-ups for final exams in the semester in which they are given. Conflict with the date of the Final Exam due to travel plans or family events does not constitute an exception to this policy. **Plan any end-of-term engagements around the Final Exam date.**

**Academic Honesty**
Students are expected and required to conform to the highest standards of academic honesty, truthfulness, and integrity in taking exams. They are expected to hand in their own work and this alone. Cheating in the case of an exam will result in a zero for the exam. More than one instance of academic dishonesty (cheating and/or plagiarism) during the term in this class will result in a failing grade for the course. Cheating will be understood to constitute using, during the time in which the student is taking an exam, any written materials other than those comprising the exam and any other materials handed out or authorized by the professors. Plagiarism in the case of a paper will result in a grade of zero. Plagiarism will be understood as presenting the work of another as one’s own, without attributing it to that author. Close paraphrasing of another’s ideas and formulations without attribution can approach plagiarism. When in doubt, students should always explicitly cite the source of the idea or formulation used in their paper.

**Attendance – Class Etiquette**
Given the nature of the course format as including a significant amount of discussion, **regular attendance is expected.**
attendance is crucial, both for the individual student and for the common good of the class. Although there is no grade as such for attendance, it is nevertheless expected as a matter of course. Class etiquette includes arriving at class on time, turning off cell phones at the start of class, and not checking e-mail or surfing the internet on laptops during class. Students are expected to exhibit civility and respect for each other at all times in the classroom.

Schedule of Readings and Exams:

Monday, August 24 Introduction to course. Syllabus and procedures.

Wednesday, August 26 PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION Plato, Republic, p. 51 (374a5) – p. 61 (383c6); p. 63 (386a1) – p. 80 (402a7)

Monday, August 31 Plato, Republic, p. 91 (412b8) – p. 94 (415d3); p. 155 (475b4) – p. 159 (478d9); p. 163 (484a1) – p. 165 (486b3); p. 193 (514a1) – p. 199 (520d5)

Wednesday, September 2 Continuation of Plato, Republic discussion

Monday, September 7 No Class: Labor Day.

Wednesday, September 9 Plato, Euthyphro

Monday, September 14 Leo Strauss, “What is Liberal Education?”

Wednesday, September 16 Leo Strauss, “Liberal Education and Responsibility”

Monday, September 21 Dorothy Sayers, “The Lost Tools of Learning”

Wednesday, September 23 Josef Pieper, Reason and Contemplation (from Leisure: The Basis of Culture)

MODES OF LEARNING: THE GREAT BOOKS CURRICULUM AND ITS CRITICS

Monday, September 28 Robert Hutchins, The Great Conversation, Preface and chap. I-II + list of the volumes in Great Books of the Western World

Wednesday, September 30 Hutchins, The Great Conversation, chap. III-VI

Monday, October 5 Frederick Wilhelmson, “Great Books, Enemies of Wisdom”

MODES OF LEARNING: INSTRUMENTAL EDUCATION

Wednesday, October 7 John Dewey, “The School and Social Progress” from The School and Society.
Monday, October 12  No Class:  Fall Break.

Wednesday, October 14  John Dewey, “The School and the Life of the Child” from *The School and Society*.

**MODES OF LEARNING: IMAGINATION AS A MODE OF KNOWING**  
Monday, October 19  C. S. Lewis, “On Stories.”

Wednesday, October 21  C. S. Lewis, *Til We Have Faces* (selected passage)

Monday, October 26  C. S. Lewis, *Til We Have Faces*, continued.

**EDUCATION AND THE UNITY OF KNOWLEDGE: THE QUESTION OF INTEGRATION**

Wednesday, October 28  E. O. Wilson, “Resuming the Enlightenment Quest” – Consilience and the Unity of Knowledge


Wednesday, November 4  John Henry Newman, “Bearing of Theology on Other Branches of Knowledge,” from *The Idea of a University*

Monday, November 9  Alasdair MacIntyre, “The End of Education: The Fragmentation of the American University.”

Wednesday, November 11  No Class: TH at National Honors Conference in Chicago.

**MULTICULTURALISM AND EDUCATION**  


**POSTMODERN EDUCATION: DECONSTRUCTING THE WESTERN TRADITION**  
Monday, November 23  Richard Rorty, “The Contingency of Language”

Wednesday, November 25  No Class: Thanksgiving Break.

Monday, November 30  C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*, chapter 1

**DECONSTRUCTING DECONSTRUCTIONISM: RECOVERING THE WESTERN TRADITION**  
Wednesday, December 2  C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*, chapter 2

Monday, December 7  C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*, chapter 3
Final Exam: TBA.

Note: There are 27 class meetings in the term.

Guidelines for Class Presentations
Phil. 4336A:
Philosophy of Education
Fall 2015

Description of the Class Presentations

Every student will make two formal class presentations. These presentations will be made at the beginning of the class, will last 10-15 minutes, and will be over the reading assignment for that particular class day. They should serve the class as an aid to understanding the material and to stimulate a good class discussion of the same. Presentations are composed in advance of class and are read out loud to the class. At the beginning of class, each presenter will furnish a copy of his/her presentation to each member of the class and to the professor. Presentations are meant to provide students an opportunity to hone their skills of analyzing and evaluating philosophical texts and arguments – they are thus exercises in actually doing philosophy.

Presentations are composed of three major elements, Explication, Critical Evaluation, and Provocation(s), as follows:

Explication

1. From the reading assignment on which you have chosen to do your class presentation, pick out three or four major ideas pivotal to the author’s purpose in your assigned text. Explain what you take to be the content and significance of these ideas, including an explication of the key technical terms the author uses and also – most importantly – how they are related to each other to make a larger point. You should weave into your presentation at least some of the main arguments the author presents. “Argument” is meant here in a technical sense, namely a conclusion that is drawn from premises. (If you need a quick refresher course in this technical sense of the term “argument,” read chap. 14-16 in John A. Oesterle’s Logic: The Art of Defining and Reasoning or chap. 1, “Basic Logical Concepts,” in Irving Copi’s Introduction to Logic [there are many editions of this standard logic textbook; any of them will serve the purpose.] )

Distinctions are also very important to note, as expositions of ideas often turn on them. (You might have seen this emphasis on making strategically crucial distinctions in Aquinas, especially. For an easily accessible example of just such a crucial distinction in Aquinas, see Summa Theol. I, Quest. 75, Art. 1, objection 3 and reply.)

Critical Evaluation

2. For each of the three to four major ideas, state the reasons/evidence the author presents in support of his ideas and give your judgment of the validity/soundness of his/her reasoning. You can also include reasons/evidence the author omits but which you think could be brought in to support him or her. In your Critical Evaluation, you should present at least one objection to or difficulty with the
author’s position. You do not have to agree, in the end, with these objections, but you do have to present them. In other words, I am asking you to formulate objections, not necessarily to endorse them. You should be able to say how someone might reasonably disagree with what the author says. On the other hand, if you think some of the objections you raise are in fact convincing, do not be shy about saying so. If there is time and you wish to take this line of thought a step further, you can suggest how you think your author might reply to (i.e., rebut) the objections you have raised.

**Provocations**

3. Out of the welter of analyses, critical judgments, etc. you have just offered vis-a-vis items #1 and #2, at the end of your allotment of time, you should present at least one or two questions – provocations – for the ensuing class discussion. These are meant to provoke the rest of us to think further about the matters to which you have drawn our attention – something to provoke us to think more deeply, precisely, and extensively. This is in a way the most challenging aspect of your presentation – but it is, I think, a challenge worth accepting. Provocations can be placed at the very end of your presentation, in which case your presentation will lead up to them. Provocations can also be placed at the beginning, and you can then announce, “What follows is how I arrived at these particular questions.” Probably most people put the provocations at the end and this is fine.

There is a fair amount of latitude in formulating provocations. Sometimes they will be rather specific, but not too specific. E.g., you might pose the question of whether, say, E. O. Wilson when he argues that natural science can be the discipline that integrates all our knowledge or John Henry Newman when he argues that theology, not science, is the most integrating discipline.

**Mechanics of Presentation**

– Presentations should be around 10 minutes or so. Presentations should not be longer than 15 minutes. Note: At a normal speaking pace, one can read about a page of text, or around 250 words (typed, double-spaced, one-inch margins all around, 12-point Times Roman type), in 2½ minutes. Accordingly, a 10-minute presentation would equate to about 2500 words or about 4 pages of double-spaced text. To conserve paper, *let’s single-space the presentations, with two spaces between paragraphs*. Thus, a 10-minute presentation text will be about two pages of single-page text, a 12-minute presentation about 2½ pages single-spaced, and a 15-minute presentation would come in at around 3 pages.

– A written presentation is required. Trying to speak from an outline or “talking points” is risky unless you have a sure grasp of the material. Absent this comprehensive understanding of the reading, you risk drawing a blank at critical places in your presentation.

– You will need to make copies of your presentation to pass out at the beginning of the class to your colleagues (other students plus the professor).

– Very Important!! Be sure to keep an electronic copy for the remainder of the semester.

– Also very important is to read your presentation *slowly and pronounce all words distinctly*. You will be tempted to read so fast that the rest of us will have difficulty following you. Avoid this temptation. Allow our minds to follow your words at a reasonable pace. Reading too fast and mumbling words are among the most common deficiencies in class presentations.

**Sample Seminar Presentation on**

Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*

Philosophy of Culture and History

*Note: This is a sample presentation from another philosophy class, but it follows the same*
format that I have laid out for our class. This was an A-level presentation, so it can serve as a model for what an excellent presentation looks like.

Today’s reading is focused on what Fukuyama terms the mechanism for desire. By this term Fukuyama means a “mechanism,” or more precisely a final cause, by means of which history evolves directionally and ultimately comes to an end – not in the sense of a temporal end (in which case men would cease acting) but in the sense of what Aristotle terms a telos, a state of perfection and completion. So the question is, at bottom, “What causes history to display the events and outcomes that it does?” An end in the sense of a telos is the final stage of development of the thing in question, beyond which there is no more satisfying or developmentally complete stage. So his question is: how is it that history – which is a record of men acting in the world, of exercising innumerable choices that seem to be themselves uncaused – nevertheless is led inevitably to a point of development beyond which it is impossible for mankind to advance any further? This final stage of human development is what Fukuyama calls “the end of history.” If one can identify this cause, one will have identified the mechanism that brings about the “end of history.” So this question of mechanism is the most important question of today’s reading.

First, Fukuyama presents the question on p. 71: “Is history directional, and is there reason to think that there will be a universal evolution in the direction of liberal democracy?” Then he claims that if we do assert that history is indeed directional, we must also commit to saying that once we supersede a particular form of social organization, that kind of organization can never be repeated by the same society. If, on the other hand, we deny that societies evolve in a uniform direction then we must assert that societies can repeat any social or political customs of the past – including past American social practices such as slavery, child labor, and restricting the right to vote. To men only. Fukuyama is claiming that history will never repeat itself because there is a mechanism that directs political evolution in a single, uniform direction. Moreover, this mechanism will in some way preserve the memory of all previous eras.

What is this “mechanism” that Fukuyama claims can produce directional history? What is most fundamental to understanding the mechanism of directional history is knowledge, particularly knowledge about the natural universe that we can acquire through science. Scientific knowledge of the natural universe, according to Fukuyama, is the key to a directional/universal history. It is the key because, unlike all other types of knowledge, modern natural science is our only form of knowledge that is both cumulative and directional. He maintains that natural science is directional in the sense that it builds upon itself and once certain facts are discovered we never return to a state of unfamiliarity of these facts. It is this uninterrupted progression of modern natural science that allows Fukuyama to claim that modern natural science is the “mechanism” by which we can understand succeeding historical development/evolution.

Fukuyama’s argument for how modern natural science produces historical change is as follows: there are two main ways that science regulates historical change: (1) military competition and (2) through progressive conquest of nature to satisfy human desires. Briefly,
military competition moves countries in a uniform direction because the universality of war in the world is such that if only to preserve territorial integrity, a country must possess the knowledge to produce the infinite number of technological devices that other countries have. Nations with weaker technology have two choices: they must either give up or advance. According to Fukuyama, when a nation decides on political autonomy they are compelled to adopt the technology of its rivals, which paradoxically forces the nation to restructure its social system to the point where it is actually united with other nations. Now, the second way Fukuyama saw modern science dictating historical change was through the conquest of nature to satisfy our wants. Economic development, in other words, is a means by which we progress historically. Fukuyama’s contention is that science allows us to bring physical nature under the rational categories of modern natural science. Fukuyama would say... “if you want to have economic prosperity in your society, you are going to have to open up society, and have science/technology brought to the forefront.” Now, just as military competition and warfare restructured the social system, so will economic development. Modern natural science makes possible improvements in communication, transportation, and expansion of labor. These changes in labor organization will inevitably produce a large-scale transformation of the social structure.

Now that Fukuyama’s basic argument about modern natural science being the producer of historical change has been set forth, it is time to answer his question, “Is history directional?” Do we now have a reason to believe “that there will be a universal evolution in the direction of liberal democracy?” Fukuyama entertains the possibility that modern natural science is a fundamental (but not ultimate) mechanism by which history progresses universally. Fukuyama sees it as a mechanism because it is the only cumulative and directional social activity that exists. In addition, Fukuyama says that science is the social phenomenon that allows us to gratify our desire for security. In essence, modern natural science is a mechanism through which we satisfy our desire for security for all possessions. Fukuyama’s question for us is: do we think our industrialized society could ever revert back to a pre-modern time in our society where women had no right to vote, where child labor was perfectly acceptable, and where slavery was permissible?

Provocation: Do you think that our society would be able to avoid lapsing back to a pre-modern state if most of us fell victim to a catastrophic event, such as a deadly disease or a world war or wide-spread terrorism, following which we would be forced to begin history anew? Or, do you think it is possible to lapse back into a pre-modern state even without a flood (or similar natural event) of biblical proportions?

Consider this: we know modern science is cumulative and directional by its very nature, but science is explored and built upon by scientists, not by ordinary, non-specialized human beings. Scientists are thinkers who use rigid methods of testing, observing and recording. Scientists are highly educated analysts, but what percent of the population do they make up? Have scientists managed to convince everyone that the world is older than 4500 years? Have scientists managed to, through their work, bring about world wide intelligence? Unfortunately the answer is no. Scientific knowledge does produce directional history, but science does not produce human maturity. In my opinion, Fukuyama’s statement about science producing directional history is credible, but there is a flaw in his assumption that humans
advance at the same rate as science. I see science, and more specifically technology, advancing much faster than human nature. Currently, technology like nuclear and biological warfare seems to have already outpaced our ability to control it. Unless Fukuyama has a way to mend this flaw, I think there is a possibility that science could lead to world-wide annihilation. I would like to know if you agree with this bleak assessment of Fukuyama or if, alternatively, you think I am being too hard on him.

[Professor’s note: This student decided that his/her provocation itself needed a little further elaboration and undertook to provide it with a paragraph following the statement of the provocation. I like this example of a student taking responsibility for the common good of the class, to assume the obligation of being as clear and thorough as possible, within the time limits imposed. On the other hand, not everyone needs to add a “consider this” part; if everyone just follows this slavishly, it gets tedious quite quickly. Bottom line: you figure out how you want to handle any explanation of the provocation, or not.]

Guidelines for Term Papers
PHIL 4336A
Philosophy of Education
Fall 2015

Mechanics
1. Paper should be 10 pages in length, using a 12-point Times Roman font and one-inch margins all around. The page count does not include a title page, nor does an endnote page or works cited page (if you are using the MLA style). Pages of the text should be numbered throughout (either top center – except for first page of course – or top right or bottom center).

2. There should be a title page, set up thus

Socrates’ Indecent Proposal:
Naked Men and Women
in the Gymnasium

Ima Bright
PHIL 4336A
November 30, 2015
3. Citations should be used where appropriate to avoid plagiarism. This includes all direct quotations from a text and also close paraphrases. Citations may be in the form of footnotes, endnotes or parenthetical citations in the body of the text, in the MLA style. Either the MLA Style Sheet or Kate Turabian, A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations (the latter based on The Chicago Manual of Style, which may be used instead) should be followed when making citations.

Substance of Paper
1. Your paper should in some sense be “argumentative.” That is to say, it should have a point, or set of points, it is concerned to argue. Such points should be “controversial,” not in the sense of being sensational but in the sense that what you say could be reasonably contested by another reader of the same text. You want to develop an interpretation of the material that you believe you can defend, for which there is evidence in the text or texts with which you are working and which is sufficiently “weighty” to be worth arguing. You should show that you are aware that one might look at the material in another way, that one can make different points than you are making, but that, even so, you believe your view is sound and worth considering. What you regard as good evidence for this should, of course, be the backbone of your paper.

2. Thus, your paper should have a well-developed and clearly formulated thesis statement in the first paragraph. The easiest way to do this is to introduce your thesis statement with a phrase like: “In this paper, I intend to argue that ____________” or “In what follows, I intend to show that ____________,” or a similar formulation Using the first person is perfectly fine, regardless of what others have taught you; first person is widely used in philosophy and many other of the humanities and with good reason: it makes things clear.

3. Your paper can take the form either of an argumentative paper or of a clarifying paper (conceptual elucidation).
   ! Argumentative Paper = one in which you contend for one view or claim (or set of views or claims) over another (or several other competing views/claims), when it is possible to defend both or all of them with reasons and evidence. E.g.: In Contingency, Irony and Solidarity, Richard Rorty claims that the self is thoroughly contingent, that it possesses no essential nature. For this claim he presents two (or three or four) principal arguments, namely (1), (2), and (3) [i.e, here you would give the arguments Rorty uses; you will probably have to paraphrase in your own words his arguments, since they would likely be too lengthy and cumbersome to quote]. I intend to contest this claim by showing that all three (or two, or one) of his arguments fail on their own merit.

   ! Clarifying Paper = one in which you attempt to spell out the meaning of a central term or terms that one of our philosophers has used. E.g.: Nietzsche, in Beyond Good and Evil, frequently makes use of the concept of the “will to power.” Notwithstanding his repeated invoking of this notion in order to say what he thinks must follow upon the experience of the “death of God,” it is not immediately clear precisely what the phrase means. Does it mean that one can and should do just whatever one wants: rape, murder, pillage, tell the truth, lie, commit suicide? And if it does, is Nietzsche then saying anything significant and philosophically interesting? In this paper, I want to examine a number of passages in which “the will to power” occurs in order to work out what it seems to mean for Nietzsche. In the course of this inquiry, I will draw upon the work of Alexander Nehamas and Arthur Danto, two influential contemporary interpreters of Nietzsche, in order to demonstrate that, while their work does advance our understanding of the will to power somewhat, in the end it fails fully to grasp Nietzsche’s meaning. I will then try to improve on their efforts by suggesting a more adequate statement of what Nietzsche means by this illusive concept.

(In both examples, above, the underlined sentences are the thesis statement part of the opening paragraph. However, you need not use such underlining in your paper.)
Note that a Clarifying Paper is a kind of argumentative exercise. After all, in it you must make a case for understanding a concept, or several concepts, in the way you think it must be understood – and that is tantamount to arguing your case.

4. Try to guard against what I call merely “retelling the story,” in which you simply repeat what an author has said. If you find yourself writing several pages in which all you do is say, in effect, “first Socrates says this, and then Socrates says that, and then Socrates says this other thing,” that is a warning flag that you are probably merely retelling the story. I want to know what you think Socrates, e.g., means, where he is right or insightful and where he goes wrong, etc. You need to make space in the paper – a considerable amount of space – for *you*: for your interpretation, criticism, assessment, thoughts, observations.

5. **Secondary Sources**: I would like you to use at least three secondary sources in addition to the using a text from the author on whom you are writing (e.g., John Dewey, Martha Nussbaum, etc.). You may write on a text other than the ones we are reading for the course, but if you do it should be on a text that deals with some topic, issue, problem or controversy in philosophy of education. Citations must be in some standard format, MLA, Chicago Manual of Style, etc. If you use parenthetical citation within the body of the text, you must then include a Works Cited page at the end. If you are unsure of how to use proper citation, consult with me.