"Teaching philosophy is an art." Sometimes I hear people say this, and when it is said, it has a certain ring of truth to it, so it generally goes unexplained, and unchallenged. Instead, people often nod in agreement, avert their eyes, and sigh. What does it mean to say that teaching philosophy is an art? Similar expressions may explicitly distinguish art from science. For example, sometimes people say "The practice of medicine is an art, not a science" or "The practice of medicine is an art, not an exact science." We speak of the healing arts. Such expressions seem to be simultaneously praising and evasive. They are praising in that an art involves "a skill acquired by experience, study or observation," it involves a mastery, a faculty of executing well what one has devised, and this mastery is especially associated with things that we consider good or valuable, such as making friends, or with aesthetic objects. On the other hand, calling the practice of medicine an art seems evasive in the sense that art involves something "fuzzy," "elusive," "hard or impossible to pin down," "unanalyzable." Furthermore, the practice of medicine is often thought to be an art in the sense that it is subject to individual variation; it is not formulaic, hence not an exact science. The same medical treatment may not work for two individuals with the same diagnosis. This elusiveness in the practice of medicine tends to carry with it additional ideas that it involves a "gift," or natural talent, that some people just "have" it; and, finally, that it cannot be taught. We might visualize the linguistic associations of "the practice of medicine is an art" with equal distributions as in Figure 1 [see p. 10]. When people say that teaching philosophy is an art, many of the same associations seem to cloud around the expression, but the distribution of the association clouds is shifted. Compare Figure 1 with Figure 2 [see p. 10]. In my experience, when people say that teaching philosophy is an art, they are less likely to be acknowledging either the skill and the mastery involved, or the individual variation. They are more likely to be referring to its being elusive, difficult or impossible to explain. In general, they seem to treat it as a gift or a natural talent and they do not think it can be taught. Thus, they avert their eyes and sigh.

I want to say that the teaching of philosophy is an art, or a set of arts, but I don't mean by this what many others seem to mean. I believe that teaching philosophy is an art in the sense that it involves skill, mastery and production of a valuable thing. I believe that teaching philosophy is an art in the sense that it needs to be sensitive to individual variation. And while I agree that parts of the art may be fuzzy, difficult, and perhaps impossible to explain, and while it can involve a gift or a natural talent, especially now, since we spend so little energy teaching it, I believe that it can be taught to a far greater extent than has been developed so far. The mental image I have for the phrase "teaching philosophy is an art" is visualized in Figure 3 [see p. 11].
BEGINNINGS

With this essay, I will soon begin my duties as President of AAPT.

Beginnings are times of introduction. Teachers of philosophy, and (I suspect) of everything else, understand the importance of spending a bit of time at the beginning of any new project introducing what is to come. Something analogous would seem to be in order here.

The president of an Association devoted to philosophy teaching should presumably have something to say about both emphases of that Association. With regard to the former, I consider philosophy to be the ongoing intellectual evaluation of beliefs. I recognize that this approach to philosophy encompasses a very broad area of human concern and, as such, leaves room for individual philosophers' specializations. My own work is more narrowly in the history of American philosophy, with an emphasis on the social aspects of Pragmatism. I believe that such specializations need not be centrifugal, however, since all of us who work in this discipline share common interests. We are all interested in examining standard ideas about, and inherited approaches to, the values — political values, religious values, economic values, epistemological values, and so on — that we use to construct our lives. As philosophers, all of us, regardless of specialization, are searching in our own ways for what is good and true and right.

With regard to the latter aspect of our Association, teaching. I believe that we are part of the vanguard, the advanced minority within the philosophy profession that concerns itself seriously with how the discipline is taught. In the lives of other philosophers, other concerns are more central. Perhaps they feel they have their research to do, and classroom work is a minor issue involving the transmission of their philosophical conclusions. Or perhaps they are baffled by their students' failure to be fascinated by philosophical inquiry, and they puzzle over their students' inability to learn. But we in AAPT have associated specifically to carry forward a focus upon the teaching of our discipline. As our most recent Workshop/Conference has again demonstrated, the task of teaching philosophy includes developing techniques and approaches, assembling resources and alternatives, designing and redesigning our classroom encounters. We know that teaching philosophy well requires ongoing concern.

We in AAPT also believe that the life of a philosophy teacher, a classroom philosopher, is a noble calling. Our interest in techniques and resources and designs is directed toward helping our students “wake up” (to use Thoreau's metaphor), helping them become more philosophical. Speaking to a gathering of assorted graduate students nearly a century ago, James Hayden Tufts said exactly what we try to say to ourselves each time we enter the classroom: what gives the “greatest value to the teacher’s work” is “the opportunity to stir and in some degree to shape” students' lives. As philosophy teachers, this is our greatest hope.

Beginnings are also times for giving thanks to those who have gone before. Any society that demonstrates the vision and vibrancy that ours does is benefitting from the prior labors of many devoted individuals. These individuals, both past leaders of AAPT and the many loyal members of the Association, were philosophy teachers who thought that they could do a better job in their teaching, and who assumed that an institutional framework and regular gatherings with like-minded philosophy teachers would help them. The Association has benefitted particularly over the last few years from the devoted efforts of our former President Betsy Decyk, our Executive Director Nancy Slonneger, our Treasurer Richard Hart, and our Newsletter Co-Editors Mark Lenssen and Daryl Close. Most recently, we have benefitted especially from the efforts of all those who coordinated last summer's Workshop/Conference at Old Dominion University, particularly Robert Timko and James Cadello. We are grateful to them all.

Beginnings are also times for beginning. I join with you all as we enter another academic year and I wish you continued success in the classroom.

James Campbell
The University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606

ENDNOTES
The teaching of philosophy as an intriguing interplay of elements with partial parallels in the various arts. My earliest and most sustaining analogy is with sculpture. For me, for example, designing a course before the semester starts - choosing the topics, organizing the instruction, developing the exercises and assignments, deciding on a grading system - is a piece of conceptual sculpture. It involves chiseling out and giving an initial shape to a set of ideas. Then, together, the students and I continue to shape the ideas and refine the design throughout the semester.

Research on concepts and concept development suggests that the primary learning and use of concepts occurs at m, the middle range, as in Figure 5 [see p. 11]. Education and/or experience provides opportunities to learn more specific concepts in that domain (the s level) and also more abstract ones (the a level). To give an example, we may early on know a maple tree from a pine tree. With additional education and/or experience we can begin to differentiate kinds of pine trees (white pine, Jeffrey pine, Liriodendron pine) and also understand more general principles about deciduous trees and conifers.

The parallels between teaching philosophy and these various arts are partial and imperfect. Nevertheless, they serve their purpose if they move us from the mastery of ideas - which is what most of our graduate training is about - to the mastery of the presentation of ideas. Part of the art of teaching philosophy is mastering the skills involved in presenting ideas.

3.

An objector might appear here: "But haven't you made a mistake? We do learn to present our ideas in graduate school."

"Yes," I answer, "but to whom?" That is a crucial question.

In general, we discuss and argue ideas with fellow graduate students and professors, we write a thesis or dissertation for a committee of professors, and scholarly articles for the professional community. In short, we learn to present ideas primarily to fellow philosophers, to people already caught up in the profession, to people already trained or in training.

Our students for the most part aren't like that. They do not have the training or the expertise we have. They may not have, yet or ever, the commitment we have. Probably the most common mistake that is made in teaching philosophy is that people fail to realize the implications of their training in philosophy. It is not that people forget that they have been trained. They remember they have an undergraduate degree, probably with a major in philosophy, and some graduate experience and a degree. But they fail to realize how their training has affected them. After all, it happened gradually, over a variety of courses and an accumulation of years.

One kind of significant change which occurs in our training as philosophers is the expansion of our conceptual range in our chosen area. It is not unique to training in philosophy, but a normal part of becoming educated, experienced or expert in an area. To develop a simple picture of this, suppose we divide the conceptual range from general to particular into three bands, a, m, and s, as in Figure 4 [see p. 11].

Nevertheless, they serve their purpose if they move us from the mastery of ideas - which is what most of our graduate training is about - to the mastery of the presentation of ideas. Part of the art of teaching philosophy is mastering the skills involved in presenting ideas.
or the utilitarian maxims. This expansion in conceptual range happened over the course of our education in, and our experiences with, philosophy, but now it seems natural. When we walk into the classroom, however, conceptually where are our students? For the most part they have a middle range understanding of concepts and their relationships (what in philosophy we sometimes call “person in the street” views). Furthermore, they may not know certain conceptual strategies. What has become natural to us, and is reinforced in our presentations to other philosophers, is not necessarily, and, in fact, is probably not natural to many of our students.

To take a small, but important example. Philosophers in the Western analytic tradition are trained (perhaps not explicitly) to find counter-examples, the cases or examples that will show that a claim is false. For many philosophers in this tradition, finding counter-examples becomes “second nature,” automatic. It turns out, however, that most people in an abstract (read: context-free) or an unfamiliar domain do not look for disconfirming cases. Some people may have learned the trick, but most people have not.

Part of the art of teaching philosophy, then, is presenting ideas to students, to people who, in general, are less knowledgeable and less trained than ourselves in philosophy. This means that we cannot just assume we can go into a class and present the ideas that excite us in the way we understand them. (Have you ever gotten weird looks from your students when you ask whether tables and chairs really exist? or how we know that? Have you ever gotten blank stares when you made fine distinctions that delighted you?) Instead, part of the art of teaching philosophy is to find out where the students are and to start there. This matches research in cognitive psychology which shows that learning is improved when students can connect new knowledge with what they have previously learned. For beginning students this will probably be in the middle range somewhere. Then the teaching/learning task is to expand the students’ conceptual range and their strategic repertoire (see Figure 6) [see p.11].

This last point is important. I believe that in addition to teaching the ideas of philosophy to students, we also need to articulate and teach the tools and techniques that are part of our repertoire as trained philosophers. For example, we should teach students about searching for counter-examples, if they don’t already know. Too often, I think, we focus on the ideas (the declarative knowledge) and forget to teach the skills involved (the procedural knowledge). We tend to assume that students already know how to do something, or will pick it up by some process of “osmosis”. Some do and some won’t, but others will give up. Furthermore, in teaching the tools and techniques of philosophy we should allow opportunities for students to practice and get feedback, and we should encourage methodological reflection, so that students become aware of the strengths and limitations of these tools and techniques.

Thus, part of the art of teaching philosophy is presenting philosophy, its ideas, and its tools and techniques, to students.

At this point I look to Leonardo da Vinci for both inspiration and help.

Leonardo da Vinci: famous during his lifetime; a legend within 50 years of his death. The creator of pages and pictures like Figures 7 - 15. I am not going to try to sort the legend from the life, but call upon his legacy.

In a notebook Leonardo advises:

“lt is indispensable to a Painter who would be thoroughly familiar with the limbs in all the positions and actions of which they are capable, in the nude, to know the anatomy of the sinews, bones, muscles, and tendons so that, in their various movements and exertions, he may know which nerve or muscle is the cause of each movement and show those only as prominent and thickened, and not the others all over [the limb], as many do who, to seem great draughtsmen, draw their nude Figures looking like wood, devoid of grace, so that you would think they were looking at a sack of walnuts rather than the human form, or a bundle of radishes rather than the muscles of Figures.”

Leonardo; observant of the surface details, curious about the causes. His curiosity led him to his famous - at his time, famous - studies in anatomy. His observations and understanding gave us pictures like these - of hands (Figure 7), of bodies (Figure 8) of faces (Figures 9-12).

The quality of Leonardo’s pictures leads me to wonder: wouldn’t we be better teachers if we were, like Leonardo, more persistently observant and curious about our own students as learners? As teachers we are engaged in an interaction with our students, but in the description of whether they are doing well or doing badly, understanding or not understanding, how much detail do we actually notice? And how much do we really know or try to find out about their learning processes? I worry that our classes come and go, like so many rats, or - in Leonardo’s words - radishes.

There are consequences of Leonardoesque curiosity and study. One of them is the recognition of variation. In the passage quoted earlier, knowing “which nerve or muscle is the cause of each movement” allows the painter “to show only those as prominent and thickenened, and not the others all over.” In any given movement, some muscles are contracted while others are not. The painter who
knows anatomy will be able to capture this difference. In a related passage, Leonardo states:

"The painter who is familiar with the nature of the sinews, muscles and tendons, will know very well, in giving movement to a limb, how many and which sinews cause it; and which muscle, by swelling, causes the contraction of the sinew; and which sinews, expanded into the thinnest carriage, surround and support the said muscle. Thus he will variously and constantly demonstrate the different muscles by means of the various attitudes of his figures, and will not do, as many who, in a variety of movements still display the same things in the arms, back, breast and legs. And these things [the uniform displays of muscle contraction] are not to be regarded as minor faults."11

Similarities and differences. Careful study and observation will show us both. Without study, however, we tend to recognize and represent similarity. The point is important for Leonardo, and it is not just a point about anatomy. Leonardo's famous picture of the "squared off man" (Figure 13) is often misunderstood. It is taken to show that all human figures can be drawn in mathematical proportions. For Leonardo, however, it is a first approximation. In another passage he warns:

"...for a man may be well-proportioned, or he may be fat and short, or tall and thin, or medium. And a painter who takes no account of these varieties always makes his figures on the one pattern so that they might all be taken for brothers; and this is a defect that demands stern reprehension."12

To see the difference that this attitude makes consider Leonardo’s "Adoration of the Magi" (Figure 14). These are people of our world. The heads and expressions of the people can be differentiated, and their variety create a dynamic swirl of emotion. It has been said that Leonardo would follow a person with an interesting face - all day, if necessary - in order to get a good enough look at it to draw it later (Figure 15). Curiosity, observation, understanding, individuation are behind the power of Leonardo’s art.

As teachers of philosophy we are concerned with presenting philosophy to students. I think, however, we tend to direct our attention and curiosity to the ideas and, sometimes, to the techniques of philosophy. But if we became curious about our students, if we began to carefully observe and try to understand their learning processes (maybe even their lives), we would be struck, I believe, like Leonardo, with the similarities, but also with the variations in strengths and strategies. I predict that curiosity, observation and understanding of our students as learners will add effectiveness to our teaching.
There are several different theories of learning styles. The one that my university uses differentiates learners into auditory learners, visual learners, and kinesthetic learners. On this system, auditory learners get their information primarily by hearing it; visual learners get information primarily by reading; and kinesthetic learners get their information primarily by movement. When one begins to use this system, one finds that the categories are quite "rough and ready" and there are interesting intersections and overlaps. For example, there are students who like to learn by doing role-plays. These students are learning in a mixed auditory/kinesthetic mode. Some visual learners learn by writing as well as reading and they would be visual-kinesthetic.

Furthermore, the categories do not seem to be complete. There are students who learn by drawing (images) rather than by writing (words). It is obvious that there is much more to be investigated about learning.

In terms of Gardner's list of multiple intelligences we can see that Western analytic philosophy is primarily logical-mathematical and linguistic. When we are trained in Western analytical philosophy we develop these competences. And it is part of the reason we often feel more comfortable with students who already have good language and reasoning skills than with students who don't.

The learning tasks of Western analytic philosophy are highly verbal, somewhat kinesthetic, and not terribly visual. We ask students to read, which is visual, but usually books without pictures, graphs, diagrams, etc. We ask students to write, which is kinesthetic, but again usually without pictures. And we ask students to discuss ideas by means of dialogues and debates which is auditory-kinesthetic. Western analytic philosophy centers upon words. We think that this is normal, and it is, for us. But not for everyone. It is, I think, the basis of that comment we often hear from students who are struggling with philosophy, "It is just semantics."

We tend to dismiss that comment, or argue against it, but suppose that we really listened to it instead. It may be a signal that the student is not a verbally-oriented student and needs another way to access and incorporate the ideas of philosophy.

Returning to Gardner's list, I think that studying philosophy is often geared toward personal inner intelligence: towards understanding of ourselves and developing a strength of being. However, if we look again at Gardner's list, with an eye towards teaching philosophy this time, we see that according to Gardner, teaching involves the development of outer personal intelligence - the ability to be sensitive to other people, "the ability to notice and make distinctions among other individuals." The training in philosophy as a discipline does not emphasize this interpersonal aspect, but as teachers of philosophy we need it.

I was glad to read that the latest APA statement on teaching philosophy recognizes the interpersonal nature of our work. In the section on teaching assistants it states that for all students (graduate or undergraduate) who serve as graders, discussion section leaders and even instructors "it is imperative that they be given such roles only: (2) when they have been carefully assessed and found qualified for the particular responsibilities in question, in terms of their command of the spoken and written language of instruction, the course material, and the interpersonal dynamics of their assignments." It is good to recognize that teaching is an engagement with students and that it involves interpersonal dynamics, and it is good to recognize that people who teach should be qualified in these dynamics. But the statement leaves unspecified what makes one qualified for these "interpersonal dynamics" or how one learns it. At this point the interpersonal skills are left as a "gift" or a "natural talent." We could do more to think about the qualities and skills that are important here, and to teach them. For example, a better understanding of the dimensions of conversations and practice at improving communication - things that I began to learn as a mediator, not as a philosopher - links a linguistically-based theory with an interpersonal set of skills. I believe this understanding and experience would benefit teachers of philosophy.

The categories of intelligence and learning are still very fluid, and others may be added or others may be more appropriate. At the AAPT conference, for example, someone suggested adding the categories from Women's Ways of Knowing, which strikes me, a strongly interdisciplinary learner, as a good suggestion. There is much more to be curious about, and much more we need to understand about teaching and learning. What I believe we can say, however, is that teaching philosophy involves presenting philosophy to students. It involves interpersonal interaction. This interpersonal interaction, in turn, involves a sensitivity to the variations in people. Teaching philosophy is not:

(1) presenting philosophy to just the people who already have, to some extent, the logical-mathematical and linguistic competences.

Nor is teaching philosophy:

(2) presenting philosophy as if our students had those skills (ignoring whether they really do or not).

continued on page 7
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Figure 12

I believe that a large part of the art of teaching philosophy is presenting philosophy to students, some of whom may be like ourselves and some of whom may not be. Thus, I believe that a large part of the art of teaching philosophy, like the art of practicing medicine, is presenting philosophy to individuals with individual differences as well as similarities.

5.

I am suggesting that we develop the fine arts of teaching philosophy. Just as the fine arts traditionally include language, music, the visual and the designing arts, I suggest an explicitly multi-modal approach to teaching philosophy that will engage different learners. Certainly understanding words, concepts, ideas and their logical relationships is central to our endeavor. Part of the art of teaching philosophy, however, is to make philosophy more accessible and comprehensible to individual learners, and we can help students gain philosophical skills and understanding by consciously activating their competencies and learning styles/preferences. While we already have some multi-modal presentations as part of our teaching repertoire in philosophy, there are still tremendous opportunities for expanding our teaching strategies to complement our students’ learning styles. Here are some ideas.

We already connect philosophy with some visual images in teaching logic. Venn diagrams, truth trees, and truth tables are visualizations of logical structure. Several philosophers enjoy collecting and using cartoons in their teaching. Movies are also a good visual resource. Some recent, student-suggested, movies that I have found especially effective are: A Few Good Men, The Shawshank Redemption, and Lorenzo’s Oil for critical thinking. Romeo & Juliet, And the Band Played On, and Murder in the First for introductory ethics classes, and Like Water for Chocolate, Kiss of the Spider Woman and The Mission for philosophy in literature. Local drama productions are another resource. A philosophy in literature course of mine, for example, compared and contrasted the philosophical messages of two theatrical productions, Sartre’s No Exit and Wasserstein’s The Heidi Chronicles. Pictures by Dali, Escher, Magritte and Tanguy often generate philosophical discussions. And I recommend David Perkin’s The Intelligent Eye for ideas about how to use art to promote critical thinking.

I, myself, have not really pursued the connection between music and philosophy, so I am glad that others, like Joel Aubel, have done some of this.20 Most of my ideas connect music with epistemology. In a seminar about the frontiers of epistemology, for example, we listened to, and discussed The Goldberg Variations in conjunction with essays in Goodman and Elgin’s book, Reconceptions in Philosophy. Moreover, in discussing Kant’s philosophy, there is, of course, Strawson’s argument about a sound-world. Furthermore, my dissertation on Kant used an analogy with Chomsky’s deep structure to explain the categories, schematism and principles of pure understanding in the Critique of Pure Reason. About the same time, Leonard Bernstein connected Chomsky’s linguistics to music. Thus, it should be possible now for one to complete a three way connection between Kant’s philosophy, music and language.

A different sort of connection between philosophy and music would be to use Kenzaburo Oe’s (the father, the Nobel prize-winning novelist) A Personal Matter and Teach Us to Outgrow Our Madness with Hikari Oe’s (the son) music to raise questions about our ethical commitments to our children and ourselves.

And finally, to pick up a question from earlier in this essay: will skills in listening to music and appreciating different themes and orchestral voices help us listen better voices in our own classrooms? Are there overlaps between conducting music and teaching philosophy?

Verbal-kinesthetic connections include group work, discussions, dialogues and debates. Many of these techniques have been common practice in teaching philosophy. We could take them further, like Tasha Rushing has done, creating role-plays and drama production.21 Computer discussions and notebooks contribute to the verbal-kinesthetic dimension of philosophy. Nonverbal-kinesthetic activities can also help us convey some philosophical ideas. Andy Young, for example, has used an exercise with modeling clay to help students understand Wu Wei and I have used a nonverbal exercise with paper to connect students to insights in Zen Buddhism. Visual-kinesthetic activities in philosophy include making or having students make outlines (more linguistic), mind-maps22 (more visual), and other graphic organizations of information for philosophical ideas. One could also suggest that students draw a picture or make model to “capture”, or alternatively, to investigate, some philosophical idea or nexus of philosophical ideas. Having students produce philosophical movies also involves them visually and kinesthetically. In the near future we will have virtual reality experiences that may help us sort ethical issues and practice decision-making.

Figure 15

Group work, peer reviewing and peer editing help students develop constructive interpersonal skills. One cooperative learning technique that is especially good is the modified teaching jigsaw. In this sort of activity students have group support in continued on page 8
designing a lesson plan and individual experience in teaching others. As philosophy teachers we could also focusing on the meanings of conversations, in addition to the meanings of written passages. This would help raise awareness of the variety of communication styles, and controversies that arise because of these mismatches in these. Meditation as part of a critical thinking course is a powerful way to help students develop interpersonal problem-solving skills.

Since I am committed to making philosophy understandable, exciting and practical to a wide range of students, I have done many things to make philosophy more accessible. In 1990 Peter A. French generously helped me make an instructional video for my critical thinking classes. The inspiration for this video came from the work of Eleanor Rosch and other cognitive psychologists on what is called "typicality effects." The video highlights the idea that many of the examples that we have or give for concepts are not only typical, but have become "frozen" or stereotypical. In the video I introduce a new critical thinking technique, "expanding," which questions the typical example and generates organized sequences of additional examples to enrich our understanding of the concept involved. Video is an excellent medium for conveying this strategy because the eye picks up sequences of examples very rapidly.

A second piece of my work which I have found useful is making models for philosophical ideas. I now have models for passages in Spinoza, Leibniz and Kant. My Kant model involves a puzzle, called a Philosopher's Knot, which was donated by a student of mine. There is a glass ball inside a complex structure of wooden pegs and the structure is held together with a string. The idea of the puzzle is to take the structure apart and then to put it back together again. On my model, however, I have placed red and purple string around the pegs. I use this to illustrate the Kantian position "Without sensibility no objects would be given to us, without understanding no object would be thought. Thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind." In this model, the wooden bars are to be considered concepts and the red and purple yarn that holds the bars in place are the intuitions of space and time. This is a way to visualize how concepts and intuitions work together, and we must recognize that as tempting as it may be, we cannot extend the concepts (pegs) beyond the intuitions of space and time (the yarn). Further, I imagine ourselves as inside, in the position of the clear ball. We experience the world within the complex of concepts and intuitions, and cannot extricate ourselves from it.

Finally, I am particularly intrigued with my latest research which connects Descartes as natural philosopher to sophisticated developments in perspectival art of his time. I originally developed this visual analogy to explain some of Descartes' puzzling remarks about imagination in works like the Rules and the Optics. It appears now, however, that there may be more to the connection than just a useful analogy. It is difficult, however, to get this published because philosophical journals are not generally set up to produce pictures with the text. This shows us once again how deeply linguistic and nonvisual the philosophical tradition is.

I have used Leonardo as an example from art to help me articulate some of the art of teaching philosophy. I have used his perspicacity and curiosity, his recognition and acceptance, even celebration, of variety and diversity. Actually, I think there is even more we can learn from studying Leonardo - about practice, about patience, about being broad and adventurous, about being detailed about what needs detail and fuzzy about things that are in the background (look again at fig. 12 and 14, for instance). We can even learn from Leonardo's failings -yes, he had some - as well as his successes.

By means of this workshop I wish to introduce the idea of actually studying and using the fine arts to discuss the art of teaching philosophy. And by "fine arts" here I mean to be as all inclusive as possible. As the Oxford English Dictionary says, while "fine arts" is often now restricted to the arts of design as in painting, sculpture and architecture, in its widest use it also includes "poetry, eloquence, and music." Furthermore, I mean to include on this list all of the arts, in all of the forms and places in which we find them. I mean to include arts as they appear in practical, everyday forms - to include, as Alice Walker taught us, "our mothers' gardens."

Leonardo would appreciate this inclusive sense of art. He himself was multi-modal. He moved back and forth easily from the visual (drawing and painting) to the spatial and kinesthetic (designing and building), to words. He was also an accomplished musician. A modern biographer, Bramley, notes that "Painting, according to Leonardo, was 'silent poetry.' His task was to transpose the Scriptures, to tell the story - the drama - through the gestures, attitudes, and the physiognomies of the characters." Indeed, Leonardo develops the descriptions of apostles in "The Last Supper," as Bramley suggests, like a "theater director" would.

Leonardo writes: "One who was drinking and has left the glass in its position and turned his head towards the speaker. Another, twisting the fingers of his hands together, turns with stern brows to his companion. Another with his hands spread open shows the palms, and shrugs his shoulders up his ears making a mouth of astonishment. Another speaks into his neighbour's ear and he, as he listens to him, turns towards him to lend an ear, while he holds a knife in one hand, and in the other the loaf half cut through by the knife. Another who has turned, holding a knife on his hand, upsets with his hand a glass on the table."

Furthermore, the practice of art was different in 16th century Italy. Art that was purely decorative and art that was more practical were mixed. Verrocchio's studio, where Leonardo was trained, was a workshop which took not only orders for paintings and sculptures, but also for practical everyday items. "A painter would gladly decorate wooden chests or china for weddings, coats of arms, headboards, caparisons for horses or weddings, canvas for tents; designed patterns for embroiderers, weavers and ceramicists. The goldsmith or sculptor (who might double as an architect) welcomed opportunities to manufacture pieces of armor, candelabras, bells, capitals for pillars or pieces of furniture."

But I know from work on examples, that we often start with some examples, rather than others. I also know that if we are not careful, these typical examples can become stereotypical and block our thinking, rather than open our minds to new ideas. Leonardo happens to be an excellent first example, but he is not the only one from whom we can learn. There are many artists, and many things that we can learn from them, once we have the idea to look in that direction at all. Perhaps the next time you go to a concert or a museum, admire a building or a garden, pull on a handknit sweater or use a handsewn quilt, you could ask, "What is there about the artistry of this that might give me insight into the art of teaching philosophy?"

Teaching philosophy is an art. We can nod in agreement, but we do not need to avert our eyes and sigh. We can, instead, be proud. Teaching philosophy involves skill and mastery. And while some of the art is elusive, difficult, or perhaps impossible, to
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explain, and while some of it involves talent, other parts of it can be learned. We can learn, for example, that teaching students is not the same as discussing ideas with fellow graduate students and with professors. We can learn more about interpersonal dynamics and we can develop interpersonal communication skills. We can learn multimodal ways for presenting information. And if we can learn these things, there is the possibility that we can also articulate them in order to teach others.

I wrote this address to try to articulate what I now believed about teaching philosophy and the art involved in it. I wrote it to share, so that other teachers of philosophy might learn from this and take it further. I firmly believe that we should teach the teachers what we have learned about teaching. Sometimes reinventing the wheel may be useful - you might get a better wheel - but often it is unnecessary.

But I also wrote it to honor the AAPT. Since its beginning the AAPT has been dedicated to improving the teaching of philosophy at every level. Since its beginning the AAPT has believed in, and provided a forum for, sharing information about effective teaching. Since its beginning the AAPT has recognized teaching as an interpersonal activity and requested that presentations about teaching be formatted in terms of workshops rather than papers. It was appropriate that the AAPT stress interpersonal interactions, and these have energized us every two years.

I also wrote this to honor all of the people who have come to the conferences over the years. There are many fine teachers of philosophy who have come to the conferences willing to share their ideas and learn new ones. Many have already questioned the logical-mathematical-linguistic boundaries and have developed new ways to present philosophy; many have already understood the need to be prepared to teach diverse learners. These messages reverberate in the daily discussions and echo from conference to conference.

I also wrote this address to thank the people I have known through the AAPT. It was a hot, sticky summer day in 1988 at Hampshire College when I registered for my first AAPT conference. When I found out that my daughter - then 8 - would be sleeping on a mattress on the floor without bedding, Roz Ladd - who didn't know me from anyone - quickly offered her sleeping bag from her car. I felt welcomed; I felt overwhelmed. The next morning, still not knowing many people, I sat down with a group of people at breakfast and was immediately involved in a great discussion about teaching. I found out later I was sitting with Nelson Pole, then AAPT President, and Phil Hamlin, and Terry Bynum, both of whom went on to be AAPT Presidents. Over the years - Bloomington, Burlington, Montreal - AAPT people have been friendly, generous and gracious. Thank you very much!

Finally, I thank the AAPT for its role in my professional development. In 1988, with great trepidation, I brought my first work on analogies and models to explain Kant and Spinoza; in 1990 I tried out a prototype of what would become my instructional video on exemplars; in 1992 I brought my student-publishing project, the idea of which was then picked up and carried further by Ed Thompson; and in 1994 I did a workshop on what I call "explore projects". In fact, it was a comment from that workshop about using Gardner's *Frames of Mind* which led to the last two years' search to understand learning processes better. The AAPT has been a place where commitment to teaching philosophy was understood. The AAPT has been a place where I felt encouraged and inspired to continue. I thank you for giving me, and my ideas, a philosophical home.

Teach Well!

Betsy Newell Decyk  
California State University, Long Beach  
Long Beach, CA

ENDNOTES

2. The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, Vol. I. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 229. Art does not have to be associated with the good, the valuable or the aesthetic. The *Oxford English Dictionary* records the following title by De Quincy "On Murder, considered as one of the fine arts" (1839). Loc. cit.
3. Webster's, op. cit, p. 49.
4. I will not pursue the point here that teaching philosophy is an art in the sense that it produces a good. I think that that is an idea many of us believe, and yet we could have lengthy, if not endless, debates about it.
5. A short summary of this research can be found in Robert J. Sternberg's, *Cognitive Psychology* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1996), pp. 299-300 and in George Lakoff's, *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind* (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1987), pp. 31-38. What I am calling "middle range" has been designated in psychology as the "basic level". Calling this level "basic" however, causes some confusion because "basic" in this sense means the one most widely used, not the one which is most specific.
8. If you want to find out if your students search for the disconfirming case, you can try what psychologists call "the four card selection task." In this task the subject(s) are presented with four large cards. Each card has a letter on one side and a number on the other. What the subjects see is: A D 4 7. The subjects are given the following statement, "If the card has a vowel on one side, then it has an even number on the other." The subjects are asked with respect to these cards, which card or cards definitely need to be turned over to prove the statement true or false. (The A card has a 2, D has a 6, has an e, and 7 has a u on the other side. Most subjects will say that the A and 4 cards need to be turned over; but the correct answer is A and 7. Subjects do better on the task when more familiar "permission" contexts, like drinking alcohol, are used.)
11. Ibid, 489, p. 245.
Leonardo’s Workshop...
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15. Ibid, p. 239.
17. Adding to the complication, learning styles or preferences may vary not only with the individual but also with the task at hand.
18. I qualify these statements to Western analytic philosophy because that was how I was trained and what I know best. I speculate, however, that some Eastern philosophies are different — perhaps still inward, but more kinesthetic and non-linguistic. In these philosophies the doing, be it meditation or living, is important, and words, rather than clarifying, get in the way. If this is right, it may account for the success that Andy Young reports in his article “Teaching Wu Wei Using Modeling Clay” Teaching Philosophy, 19:2, June, 1996.
20. Joel Auble, “Philosophy in Song,” The American Association of Philosophy Teachers’ 11th International Workshop-Conference on Teaching Philosophy, Norfolk, VA: Old Dominion University, August, 1996.
21. Tasha Mochle Rushing, “Student-Written Philosophical Dramas: A Practical Pedagogical Technique,” The American Association of Philosophy Teachers’ 11th International Workshop-Conference on Teaching Philosophy, Norfolk, VA: Old Dominion University, August, 1996.
23. In my teaching jigsaw I create a matrix: each student has both a letter and a number (e.g. 1a, 1b, 1c...2a, 2b, 2c...etc.) We begin in number groups. The students in a number group work together to create a lesson plan to teach a particular topic. Then we reconfigure into alphabet groups. Now each alphabet group has (usually) one from each number group (1a, 2a, 3a etc.). The person who represents group 1 in each alphabet group teaches group 1’s lesson; the person who represents group 2 in each alphabet group teaches group 2’s lesson; etc. (If there are two of the same number in the alphabet group, they team teach the material.)
30. Ibid., p. 277
33. Bramley, op. cit., p. 66.
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Reflections on the Teaching Seminar for Graduate Students

Mimi Marinucci
Temple University

Although the brochure announcing the 11th International Workshop and Conference on Teaching Philosophy caught my attention, I was somewhat skeptical. First, it seemed that the APA- and AAPT-sponsored Teaching Seminar for Advanced Graduate Students had arrived too late for me. I already had teaching experience and was familiar with the pitfalls that new instructors face. In addition, I knew from past seminars that I would probably never refer back to any of the notes I took. I had, for example, attended a mandatory TA training session the summer before my first teaching assignment. I left with some helpful suggestions but quickly discovered that it would have been nearly impossible for the training program to adequately prepare me for my new role as an instructor. Consequently, my expectations for the Teaching Seminar were low, but recognizing the potential professional benefits of attending such events, I submitted the Teaching Seminar application. Of course, I also hoped to pick up a few tips for more effective teaching.

I did, in fact, gain many good ideas for better teaching. But I also learned the more general and more important lesson that teaching is a skill, or perhaps an art, that can be developed and improved, but never perfected. This lesson was gleaned not so much from the words that Martin Benjamin spoke, but from the example he set.

Although he had already been cast as a model instructor, Martin recognized the Teaching Seminar as an opportunity to improve his own teaching. Without undermining his role as the seminar leader, he invited each of us to share our knowledge with the rest of the group, thus producing an environment in which all of us, students and instructor alike, were able to benefit from the dual process of teaching and learning. Through his example, Martin demonstrated that good teachers strive to become even better teachers, often by learning from their students. In addition, he showed us that one can responsibly and effectively lead a class without dominating it.

continued on page 12
Before the Teaching Seminar, my desire to become a good instructor left me struggling to replicate my own undergraduate progress, which was measured by final exams or term papers. The traditional classroom is structured on the assumption that learning is an individual and private process. In contrast, my own research, primarily in epistemology and philosophy of science, has taught me that knowledge production is, to a large extent, a community level phenomenon. Until the Teaching Seminar, however, I failed to see the irony in leaving my convictions behind when I entered the classroom as an instructor.

Too many scholars regard their teaching duties as a necessary evil, an unavoidable distraction from the "real" work as philosophers. Although I have always recognized teaching to be an integral part of my philosophical career, I was nevertheless guilty of assuming that teaching philosophy and doing philosophy are distinct processes. There is danger in this false dichotomy, for it leads us to believe that devoting our attention to teaching shortchanges our own intellectual development. In my case, it led to the compartmentalization of one of my deepest philosophical convictions. By breaking down the imaginary boundary between teaching philosophy and doing philosophy, I was able to acknowledge what is now painfully obvious: if education aims to produce knowledge (I think it does) and knowledge is at least sometimes produced by communities rather than isolated individuals (I think it is), then one of my goals as an instructor should be to transform the separate individuals listed on the course roster into a unified community of inquiry. When a class becomes a community, every member owns and is responsible for the knowledge generated by the larger group. By putting this belief into practice when I teach, I am not turning my back on my own philosophical interests. Instead, I am living what I have learned.

Despite my newly developed enthusiasm for community learning, I do not pretend that education has no personal component. I realize, for example, that the unique insights I gained by participating in the seminar may not be shared by the rest of the group. Yet I strongly doubt that I would have arrived at these insights by listening to a lecture, reading a book, or reflecting on my own thoughts. Although these are all very worthwhile activities, interactions between and among students are potentially just as meaningful—in some cases, perhaps even more so.

The suggestion that group interaction is on a par with more traditional classroom activities was a common thread running through many of our seminar discussions. When, for example, we considered various techniques for encouraging participation among students who are typically unresponsive, the unspoken assumption was that group involvement is beneficial. However, many of us admitted that we have been reluctant to grade class participation, not because we doubt its value, but because we simply do not know how to assign the grades fairly. It is no secret by now that male students generally speak longer and more frequently than their female classmates and that members of ethnic minority groups are often intimidated in predominantly white classrooms. In addition, some students happen to be shy about speaking in class, perhaps because of physical or emotional obstacles. Still others may think critically and carefully, but not necessarily quickly. It seems unfair to penalize such students for their silence or to additionally reward those students who already benefit from the class discussions.

Unless we are willing to deny that the exchange of ideas is important in philosophy or to pretend that preaching to our students constitutes an exchange of ideas, then we must recognize the need to develop successful ways of promoting student interaction without perpetuating the very problems we are trying to eliminate. Fortunately, our seminar group came up with several excellent ideas that might interest others, even our more senior colleagues. However, I can take credit for very few of the following suggestions. In some cases, different participants articulated the same ideas. In other cases, I can recall the suggestions but not their authors. Nevertheless, there is a definite sense in which the entire group is responsible for this list. For these reasons, and with some misgivings, I have broken a cardinal rule of writing by intentionally failing to cite sources. I should also note that while some of the following suggestions may be more useful than others, I have chosen to list rather than rank or evaluate them. Finally, I suspect that I have carelessly left out some excellent suggestions raised in the seminar, and for this I apologize.

- Mandatory, ungraded, interactive projects may encourage students to participate without suggesting that their grades will suffer if they risk making less than brilliant comments.
- The instructor might allow the students a few minutes toward the end of class period to write a brief paper reflecting on the class discussion. Or instead, maybe even in addition, one could assign a similar project at the beginning of class in response to reading assignments. This requires students to pay attention throughout the course and gives the instructor an opportunity to discover what they are learning and how much they understand. As a bonus, assignments of this sort reinforce the importance of regular attendance. One might even give warning at the beginning of the semester that the assignments are forthcoming without telling the exact dates.
- Arranging chairs in a circle has many potential benefits. Most obviously, it positions the instructor among rather than in front of the students, and may thereby avoid some unnecessary intimidation. When the students sit in rows, they face only the instructor. With a view of the entire group, however, students may be more inclined to address the whole class for more interactive discussions. If the instructor is the one to choose a seat, this arrangement also affords an opportunity silently to divide small cliques of students who may otherwise disrupt or even silence the others.
- With larger classes, a general discussion may be impractical. Consider dividing the class into pairs or small groups at first, and have them answer specific questions or set questions. When this task is completed, merge two groups into one for further discussion or debate. In smaller classes, the entire class might eventually be reunited. Not only can this keep the interactions manageable, but it also brings quiet students into the discussion early. In a very small group, every student is forced to participate. As the group size gradually increases, typically unresponsive students might feel more comfortable contributing to the discussion.
- Explain that group discussion requires not only good speaking skills, but good listening skills as well. If class participation is graded, let the students know that they can hurt their grade by interrupting other students or dominating the conversations. To ensure that students listen to each other, consider requiring them to repeat or paraphrase the previous comment before adding their own.

continued on page 13
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- Consider using literature, films, newspapers, or magazines to supplement or even replace traditional reading assignments. If students recognize the issues discussed in philosophy as real world problems, they may take them more seriously than they would otherwise. Such materials can be useful in leading students to ask questions and develop philosophical positions for themselves. They may feel more comfortable discussing their own ideas than the ideas of a long dead philosopher.

- When a student who is usually quiet enters the discussion, be particularly careful to avoid responding negatively. Instead, find some reason for praise. If the comment is nearly correct, the instructor might paraphrase it more correctly. If the comment reveals a dreadful misinterpretation, one might thank the student for demonstrating that the explanation provided was not sufficiently clear. When the instructor responds in this manner, students learn that they need not be embarrassed to join the discussion.

- Even in classes with a heavy emphasis on group interaction lectures are often necessary. On the one hand, pausing for questions during a lecture interrupts the flow of the presentation. On the other hand, the instructor should encourage students to develop questions and comments on the material presented. Moreover students should certainly be permitted to interrupt if they are confused or need something repeated. In such cases, it may be wise to distinguish between clarificatory questions and discussion oriented questions. The instructor can then let the students know that clarificatory questions are welcome throughout the lecture, but discussion oriented questions will be taken up at a more appropriate time. The first or last portion of each class, or perhaps even a whole class period every week, can be reserved for discussion oriented questions.

- The instructor might want to require office visits early in the semester. As we all know, an open door policy is often not enough to encourage students to pursue the instructor outside of class. By scheduling interviews or demanding that students deliver or pick up their first assignments, the instructor has an opportunity to speak individually with each student. Although this process can be time consuming, it has many potential benefits. It can help with matching the names on the roster with the faces seen in class. It also lets students know that they are honestly welcome to approach the instructor with comments or questions. If students feel comfortable speaking with the instructor casually, they may be more inclined to speak up in class. These suggestions will not solve all of the difficulties that we face as teachers, but they are at least first steps toward promoting something that all members of the Teaching Seminar seemed to value. This something, of course, is the exchange of ideas. We can tell ourselves that reading the work of great philosophers is akin to exchanging ideas, but this will not make it true. While I recognize the value of 3,000 years of philosophical scholarship and will probably never abandon the great books approach to philosophy altogether, I now know that I can do more for my students than assign and explain readings. I can at least try to generate a genuine understanding of the questions that drive philosophers.

In one of our early seminar discussions we considered the suggestion that our goal as teachers is to enlighten our students by teaching them to think philosophically. Just as I had initially doubted that the Teaching Seminar would be inspirational for me, I likewise doubted that my courses could be inspirational for my students. I have since then changed my mind. In the business of pursuing my career, the philosophical questions that once kept me awake at night got shifted to the back burner. Fortunately, the AAPT conference helped me recapture the enthusiasm I did not even realize I was losing. Throughout the conference I found myself exchanging ideas — about teaching, about philosophy, about impending dissertations and recently completed dissertations, about forthcoming papers, about books already read and new books to read, and so on — as an accepted member of a community of inquiry rather than, as is so often the case for graduate students (and no less for undergraduates), an outsider seeking approval from an academic elite. Through this process I once again experienced the love of philosophy that drew me to this career in the first place. If one conference could do so much for me, then it is certainly possible that a whole semester might do something similar for at least some of my students.

Mimi Marinucci  
Temple University  
Philadelphia, PA 19122

CALL FOR BOOK REVIEWS

Although many journals have sections dedicated to reviewing new books in philosophy, rarely (if ever!) is there an opportunity to discuss how well those books actually work in the classroom, or how a certain software program (or movie, video, game, novel, etc.) can be used in the classroom to deepen understanding and enhance discussion of philosophical issues. So, here's the chance! Whether you have been using a text (film, etc.) for years or have only experimented with it for one semester, we are interested in whether you would recommend it and why. General guide lines we have for submissions to the new review section are the following:

- materials reviewed must have actually been used by you in the classroom; and reviews should include:
  - a description of the use you made of the materials
  - a discussion of student responses to the materials
  - a summary of the results
  - reviews should be 500 to 1000 words long.*

That's it! Please send submissions to:

Nancy Stolnenger, Book Review Editor  
AAPT  
Transylvania University  
300 N. Broadway  
Lexington, KY 40508  
Internet: aapt@music.transy.edu

*If you are interested in commenting on what you have found to be useful in the classroom, but do not wish to write a full-length (i.e., 500-1000 word) review, you might consider writing a summary for “The Bulletin Board” in this newsletter.
“USER FRIENDLY” LOGIC: TACTICS FOR TAKING THE TERROR OUT OF INTRODUCTORY LOGIC

Natalia Moehle Rushing
Salem College

In this article I will summarize the contents of a paper I delivered in August 1994 at the 10th International Conference on Teaching Philosophy.

I would like to begin with a brief autobiographical introduction which will reveal why I have a good measure of sympathy for the student of Introductory Logic. Unlike most of you, perhaps, I came to philosophy by a rather circuitous route. That is to say, it was only after obtaining a bachelor’s and a master’s degree in sociology that I recognized the shadows on the wall, clambered up out of the cave into the daylight, and realized that my deepest interests had always been philosophical. As a result of that moment of enlightenment, I decided, with unbelievable audacity, to “change horses in midstream” and seek a Ph.D. in philosophy. For some reason which still remains a mystery to me, I had no previous background in philosophy, I was admitted to the graduate program at the University of Texas at Austin. This apparently benevolent act by the Department was counterbalanced by the equality malevolent act of requiring that I take symbolic logic during my first semester. With respect to this topic I was completely and totally a “tabula rasa.” Nothing in my prior experience had prepared me for this encounter, not even the courses in statistics and research methods required in sociology. I was, of course, in over my head, and I knew it. I decided, therefore, to do the reasonable thing—that is, to seek help, and that decision culminated in the penultimate traumatic event of my graduate school career (second only to the infamous dissertation orals). Since I was, understandably, awed and intimidated by the professors, I chose to approach the Academic Assistant for the course who was a graduate student like myself. I suppose the fact that he had taught himself logic over the summer for fun should have been a warning that he would not be sympathetic to my plight. When I asked him to explain a particular problem, he examined it briefly, handed the text back to me, responded that the answer was self-evident, and stalked away, leaving me dumbfounded, discomfited, and as befuddled as ever. After that episode I took my confusions and sympathies for the professor, who, despite the fact that he had been a child prodigy in logic and mathematics, was always willing to try to help. In any event I persevered and survived that course. However, the memory of the agony I endured as I struggled to make sense of the very basics of logic is the source of the empathy I have for my students and it is that which motivates my attempts to devise nonthreatening, “user-friendly” exercises.

One example of this sort of exercise consists of crossword puzzles that summarize important concepts. The puzzles I devised appeared in the Fall 1992 issue of the American Philosophical Association’s Newsletter on Teaching Philosophy. Since the particular course I teach includes sections on both informal and formal logic, I have created puzzles for each of those areas. I introduce the first puzzle at the end of the section on informal logic. This puzzle reviews key definitions and concepts such as “premise,” “conclusion,” “argument,” and so on, as well as several informal fallacies. The second puzzle is distributed following an introduction of the basic elements of sentential logic and serves to enhance recognition and retention of the various types of statements, e.g., conjunction, disjunction, etc. I use the third puzzle for the same purpose subsequent to the initial description and explanation of the Rules of Inference. Thus, that puzzle reviews the implicational and equivalence Rules. For further information on these puzzles, please refer to the Fall 1992 issue of the APA Newsletter on Teaching Philosophy.

As indicated in the preceding, the puzzles are primarily used at the end of a section to summarize and review basic concepts in each area. However, I have also sought to devise non-threatening and enjoyable exercises that can serve as the initial introduction to a subject area. One of these, presented as Addendum #1, is an exercise in the discovery of the valid argument forms Modus Ponens, Modus Tollens, Hypothetical Syllogism, and Disjunctive Syllogism. The handout has three parts. In Part I the four rules are depicted in terms of geometric shapes: □, ◻, △, ▽. Part III, at the bottom of the page, provides a key in which a geometric shape is paired with a specific sentence. The actual exercise appears in Part II where the student must replace each sentence with its corresponding geometric form, and then match the overall pattern of each of the four problems to one of the valid argument forms in Part I, thus identifying the appropriate Rule of Inference. Looking at problem #1 in Part II, we see that the pattern is:

If □, then △.
If △, then ◻.
Hence, if □, then ◻. (Which is HS.)

In constructing the sentences I have found it helpful to use words that begin with Ps, Qs, and Rs because that begins to establish early on the importance of those variables. Using the geometric forms serves two purposes: it helps the student visually identify patterns of argument, and introduces the concept of special symbols that represent sentences.

I continue with this system of constructing sentences that utilize words beginning with P, Q, R, S and pairing them with geometric shapes when I introduce the entire set of implicational and equivalence rules. The explanatory handouts I devised for this section of the course present each rule of Inference in three different ways:

continued on page 15
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symbolically -------- in terms of Ps, Qs, Rs, Ss
linguistically -------- in terms of a set of sentences pictorially -------- in terms of geometric shapes

Each student, moreover, is required to construct her own example of each rule. Thus, Modus Ponens is introduced from left to right as follows:

(symbolically)  (linguistically)  (pictorially)
P ⇒ Q If Hypatia was a philosopher, then she was a questioner.

P It's true that she was a philosopher

Q Hence, it's true that she was a questioner.

Similarly, with regard to the equivalence rules, Double Negation is introduced from left to right as follows:

(symbolically)  (linguistically)  (pictorially)
P ≡ ¬¬P "Hypatia is a philosopher" is logically equivalent to

"It's not the case that Hypatia is not a philosopher."

I have used all of the techniques described thus far for several years and have found them to be considerably more effective than reliance on a standard text alone. Last fall I added yet another way of presenting the Rules of Inference which is a modification of the basic idea of demonstration through use of visual images and narrative. The images and associated narratives I decided to use are, I believe, archetypal, and thus proved to be easily understood. The one image that is probably most familiar is the happy face ☺. The ones that may not be familiar to respectable academics are elements of the system of divination known as the "Tarot". I use images from eight Tarot cards and the happy face to initiate my students into the mysteries of the Rules of Inference.

First, I provide a key which associates each image with a specific narrative. Thus examining the key you would find that:

1. ☺ means "I am happy."

3. ☀ means "The sun is shining."

7. ☹ means "I am sad."

9. ☨ means "I dance."

Secondly, I introduce the Rules in terms of those images and associated statements. Thus, Modus Ponens appears as follows:

(i) If the sun is shining, then I am happy.

(ii) It is true that the sun is shining.

(iii) Hence, it is true that I am happy.

In other words:

(i) If the sun is shining, then I am happy.

(ii) It is true that the sun is shining.

(iii) Hence, it is true that I am happy.

continued on page 16
For Modus Tollens the example is:

(i) If the sun is shining, then I am happy.

(ii) But, it is false that I am happy.

(iii) Hence, it is false that the sun is shining.

In other words:

(i) If the sun is shining, then I am happy.
(ii) But, it is false that I am happy.
(iii) Hence, it is false that the sun is shining.

For Disjunctive Syllogism I use the following example:

(i) Either I am happy or I am sad.
(ii) It is false that I am happy.
(iii) Hence, it is true that I am sad.

That is:

(i) Either I am happy or I am sad.
(ii) It is false that I am happy.
(iii) Hence, it is true that I am sad.

With respect to the equivalence rules, I've used the following illustrations:

Double Negation:

"I am happy" is logically equivalent to "It's not the case that I am not happy."

DeMorgan's:

It is not the case that both I am happy and I am sad, is logically equivalent to:

"It is not the case that both I am happy and I am sad" is logically equivalent to "Either I am not happy or I am not sad."
In other words, "If I am happy, then I dance" is logically equivalent to: "If I do not dance, then I’m not happy."

I was eager to implement this latest innovation because I had had much positive response to a somewhat similar method in the past. That previous method also consisted of visual images and associated narratives, but its efficacy was undermined by the obscurity of the images produced by my artistic ineptitude. Fortunately, the pictures of the Tarot proved to be much more obvious and pedagogically useful than my drawings— which infallibly elicited the question: “What exactly is that supposed to be?”

Justification & Conclusion:

"Tell me and I forget, Teach me and I remember, Involve me and I learn."

The key line here is, of course, the last. I suggest that we learn best when we are involved because to be involved in a subject is to participate directly in it, to become united with it, to assimilate it into oneself; and thus to come to know it at a deep level. I suggest, moreover, that the strategies I’m recommending engender involvement because: (1) they are enjoyable; (2) they introduce abstract concepts by means of particular examples; (3) they are related to life experience; and (4) they simultaneously engage several different intellectual skills. The importance of enjoyment has been emphasized by many philosophers including Whitehead (in Lynchburg, 1982: p. 248), Comenius (in Ulich, 1982: p. 344, #4), Locke (in Ulich, 1982: p. 374, #144), and by Plato in Book VII, Part XVI of The Republic where he says:

"... a free soul ought not to pursue any study slavishly; for while bodily labours performed under constraint do not harm the body, nothing that is learned under compulsion stays with the mind." (in Ulich, 1982: p. 59).

Both Comenius (Ulich, 1982: p. 345, #5) and Whitehead, moreover, advocate demonstration of abstractions by means of particular examples. This strategy, according to Whitehead, precludes an education that consists of merely "inert ideas" (in Lynchburg, 1982: p. 247, 251). Thirdly, from Whitehead and Dewey (in Lynchburg, 1982: p. 252). Finally, I would like to point out that the techniques I’ve developed promote involvement by simultaneously engaging three of the six different intelligences of “intellectual competencies” identified by Howard Gardner in Frames of Mind. In that work Gardner proposes that human beings exhibit the following distinct types of intelligence: linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, and personal (either intra-personal or interpersonal) (Gardner, 1985: p. 8, 55, 77, 104, 137, 173, 206, 239). The methods I’ve presented elicit the linguistic mode via the use of narrative, the logical-mathematical mode via use of logical symbols and principles, and the spatial mode via use of geometric figures and archetypal pictures of the Tarot.

In conclusion, my experience shows that students are more successful in Introductory Logic when the subject is presented in a way that not only alleviates their anxiety but is pleasurable as well. I recommend the strategies I’ve described as ways to facilitate that end.

Natalia Moehle Rushing
Department of Religion & Philosophy
Salem College
Winston-Salem, NC 27108
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Addendum #1

DISCOVERING VALID ARGUMENT FORMS

Part I: Four of the Rules of Inference or valid argument forms are given below:

1. Modus Ponens (MP)

   (i) If □, then Δ.

   (ii) It’s true that □.

   (iii) Hence, it’s true that Δ.
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2. Modus Tollens (MT)
(i) If □, then △.
(ii) But it's false that △.
(iii) Hence, it's false that □.

3. Hypothetical Syllogism (HS)
(i) If □, then △.
(ii) If △, then ○.
(iii) Hence, if □, then ○.

4. Disjunctive Syllogism (DS)
(i) Either □ or △ is true.
(ii) But □ is false.
(iii) Hence, △ is true.

OR
(i) Either □ or △ is true.
(ii) But △ is true.
(iii) Hence, □ is false.

Part II: The Exercise: Using the Key in Part III and the argument patterns stated in Part I, identify the valid argument forms used in the passages below:

1. (i) If [Paula is a pilgrim], then [she is on a quest]. If ___ then ___
   (ii) If [Paula is on a quest], then [she is righteous]. If ___ then ___
   (iii) Hence, if [Paula is a pilgrim] then [she is righteous]. If ___ then ___

2. (i) If [Paula is a pilgrim], then [she is on a quest]. If ___ then ___
   (ii) It is true that [Paula is a pilgrim]. ___ is true
   (iii) Hence, it is true that [Paula is on a quest]. ___ is true

3. (i) Either [Dr. Jekyll is a real physician] or [he is a quack]. Either ___ or ___

   (ii) It is false that [Dr. Jekyll is a real physician]. ___ is false
   (iii) Hence, it is true that [he is a quack]. ___ is true

4. (i) If [Paula is a pilgrim], then [she is on a quest]. If ___ then ___
   (ii) But it is false that [Paula is on a quest]. ___ is false
   (iii) Hence, it is false that [Paula is a pilgrim]. ___ is false

Part III: The Key:
“Paula is a pilgrim” = □
“Paula is on a quest” = △
“Paula is righteous” = ○
“Dr. Jekyll is a real physician” = □
“Dr. Jekyll is a quack” = △
Letter from the Executive Director
Nancy Slonneger
Transylvania University

AAPT BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

The meeting was called to order on August 2, 1996, at 8:31 a.m.

1. Betsy Decyk (President) reported on recent activities of the AAPT:

   a. The National Office of the AAPT has been established at Transylvania University in Lexington, Kentucky.
   b. Daryl Close and Nancy Slonneger updated the mailing/membership list. Members are asked to report any difficulties or questions to Nancy Slonneger.
   c. A listserv has been established to promote the ongoing discussion of issues related to the teaching of philosophy. The list is called “AAPT-L.” To subscribe send the one-line message “Subscribe AAPT-L <firstname> <lastname> to listserv@lsu.uky.edu.
   d. A homepage on the Web has been established by Bob Timko at Mansfield University. To access the page, point your Web browser to http://www.mnsfld.edu/depts/philosophy/aapt.html.
   e. The AAPT co-sponsored with the APA a preconference workshop on teaching philosophy at the Central Division APA in Chicago this past April. Over 35 people attended the 6 workshops offered. We are hoping to expand in the future to other division conferences of the APA.

2. The membership elected the following people to the Nominating Committee: Arnold Wilson (Chair - 513-961-3852), Sandra Dwyer (slwyer@ualr.edu), Anthony Coyne (coyne@unca.edu), and Phil Hamlin (hamlin@utk.edu). The Nominating Committee is responsible for soliciting nominations for the positions of Vice President and 3 At-Large Members, soliciting biographical information from nominees, compiling the ballot, and conducting the fall election. Anyone interested in making a nomination should contact one of these committee members as soon as possible. Elections are to be conducted and ballots returned by October 31, 1996.

3. Betsy Decyk announced the formation of the Publications committee, consisting of the AAPT News editor(s) and the Electronic Media Editor. The AAPT is currently looking for members to fill both of these positions.

   a. AAPT News Editor(s):
      Daryl Close and Mark Lenssen, who have served 12 productive years as newsletter editors, are retiring as soon as a new editor is appointed. Daryl Close described the duties of the editor. The editor(s) will need the following resources from his/her institution: a phone budget of approximately $50 per year; an overnight mail budget of approx. $50 per year; e-mail capability; APA membership (source of information); and a personal computer with Windows and word processing capability. The primary job of the editor(s) is to provide news and information (gleaned from other sources) of interest to our members, and to solicit submissions for regular features of the newsletter. These include the Philosophy Teaching Exchange, Book Reviews, Letter from the President, and Letter from the Executive Director. The newsletter is published in the fall, spring, and summer.

   b. Electronic Media Editor:
      Nancy Slonneger described this position and solicited inquiries from the membership. The E-Editor will serve to coordinate the use of electronic media to further the goals of the Association. For example, s/he will coordinate the AAPT Web Page and AAPT-L with other activities of the Association (e.g. publicizing upcoming activities), and will access other Internet resources to disseminate information about the AAPT to others and gather information of interest to our members.

4. Several amendments to the Constitution were brought before the membership for outlined in the Constitution into line with current practice. Each of the amendments passed unanimously. The new language of each section amended or added is shown below in its entirety.

   a. Article VI, Section 3: “The Vice President shall serve for two years, and upon expiration of his or her term shall become President for two years. In the event of the death, resignation, absence or disability of the President, the Vice President shall exercise the powers and perform the duties of the President.”

   b. Article VI, Section 4: “The Executive Director shall serve for five years, and shall be elected by the Board of Officers of the Association. The Executive Director shall be the chief executive and operating officer of the Association, and shall exercise general supervision over the day-to-day affairs of the Association. In the absence of the President and Vice President at full meetings of the Association, the Executive Director shall preside. The Executive Director shall maintain the national office of the Association, keep membership records, and serve as
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secretary and as a signatory on all financial accounts of the Association. The Executive Director shall also carry out such other duties as the Board of Office may require of him or her. In the event that the position of Treasurer is vacated the Executive Director shall remain as signatory until the Board of Officers appoints a new Treasurer.”

(c) Article VI, Section 4.1 (new section): “The Treasurer of the Association shall serve for five years, and shall be elected by the Board of Officers of the Association. The Treasurer shall be the chief financial officer and a signatory on all financial accounts of the Association. The Treasurer shall be the primary person responsible for disbursement of funds in payment of the Association’s bills. The Treasurer shall keep records of all financial transactions of the Association, provide quarterly financial reports to the Executive Director, and as requested by the Executive Director. In the event that the position of Executive Director is vacated, the Treasurer shall remain as signatory until a new Executive Director is appointed by the Board of Officers.”

(d) Article VI, Section 4.2 (new section): “The past Executive Director shall be a member of the Board of Officers. The past Executive Director shall serve on the Board in this capacity for a term of two years.”

(e) Article VI, Section 5: “The Board of Officers of the Association, herein after sometimes called “the Board,” shall be composed of the above officers, the immediate past President, the chairpersons of any standing committees of the Association, and two other members of the Association (designated “At Large” members of the Board of Officers). The Chairpersons of any standing committees shall be appointed by the Chairperson of the Board and confirmed by a majority vote of the Board; the At Large members of the Board shall be elected by the members of the Association by a majority of those voting. The two At Large members shall serve concurrent terms. The Chairperson of the Board of Officers shall be elected by a majority vote of the Board, and shall serve a two year term.”

(f) Article VI, Section 5.1 (new section): “The elected officers of the Association will take their offices on January 1 in the year following the election, which ordinarily takes place in even-numbered years.”

(g) Article VII Sect. 2: “There shall be a Nominating Committee consisting of four members of the Association, elected by majority vote of members at regular full meetings of the Association and serving two year terms. The Nominating Committee shall nominate at least one person each for the positions of Vice President and each At Large member of the Board of Officers. Election of Officers shall be by mail ballot sent by the Nominating Committee to members of the Association not less than three months in advance of the beginning of the terms of the Officers being elected.”

(h) The motions to amend Article VI included renumbering the sections of the article. [For the convenience of the reader, renumbering is not shown above. Sequencing is indicated by decimal notation. — Editors]

5. Announcements:

- Betsy Decyk called the members’ attention to the AAPT membership category of “Honorary Member.” As stated in Article IV Sect. 3 of the Constitution, “Any philosopher or teacher of philosophy, entitled to the highest recognition within the power of the Association to confer, shall be eligible for election as an Honorary Member, provided that such a person shall have demonstrated a distinguished career in teaching, research or service in philosophy. Nominations for Honorary Membership shall be proposed in writing to the Board of Officers of the Association by at least five Regular Members of the Association. Such nominations shall be supported by appropriate biographical and bibliographical information. Nominees for Honorary Membership, upon receiving endorsement of a three-fourths majority of the Board of Officers voting, shall be declared elected. Honorary Members shall not be assessed dues.”

- Arnold Wilson announced that the Philosophy Documentation Center’s publication “Cyberspace” is a good source for Internet addresses of interest to philosophers. He also encouraged members to look at Teaching Philosophy’s 20-year retrospective bibliography.

- Phyllis Woloshin inquired about whether a conference site had been chosen for the 1998 conference, and mentioned that the original idea was to avoid large cities which would draw people away from the conference. Betsy Decyk responded that we are soliciting inquiries.

6. The Board of Directors met twice during the conference to discuss Association business. The minutes of those meetings are available to any member who wishes to see a copy. E-mail your requests to me at aapt@music.transy.edu or write me at AAPT, Transylvania University, 300 N. Broadway, Lexington, KY 40508-1706.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Sonneger, Ph.D.
Executive Director
“Out of the Mouths of Babes”
or
“Quotable Quotes”

Have you ever tried to explain to one of the head honchos at your institution that teaching Intro to Philosophy to most first year college students is more difficult than teaching nuclear physics to your dog and more time-consuming and frustrating than trying to explain to your cat how to rebuild a car engine and that that is why you should have to teach only one section of Intro per century or receive a 100% salary increase for every section of Intro you are forced to teach over and above that one? If you have presented such an argument and you still have a job, that’s probably because you quoted the QQs Center’s researcher who always says, "Keep in mind that these are my personal feelings and should not be accepted as a general view.”

However, through you were right to quote our researcher (assuming you wanted to continue your job as a teacher of Intro to Philosophy), we know darn well that you think otherwise. Especially because you are the sort of teacher who is not chummy wumny with your students (if you were, you wouldn’t have brought up the difficulty of teaching Intro in the first place) and who revels in students complaining about you. For instance, if they think your paper assignments are too difficult, a complaint like this one would make you the envy of your teaching buddies:

“I think it should be easier to write papers for philosophy. I am in an honors english class, so I know I write well. I think we should be able to write a practice paper before the graded one.”

Speaking of knowledge in the Should-Be (a.k.a. Moral) Department (where Wright and Wrong are determined) immediately brings to mind the question whether knowledge of what is moral is plausible. If, however, you think this is a question that has no obvious or apparent answer, well, you can just think again; here is the view of one of our experts on the issue:

“Knowledge of what is moral is not plausible. This is obvious and apparent. If knowledge of what was moral was plausible, the world would be a very boring place. You may know that in America it is not moral to eat with your fingers, but when you take a trip to Africa NOT eating with your fingers is morally wrong. How would you know that??”

We are sorry to have to report that this talented staff member quit the challenging and intellectually fun job offered by the QQs Center and is now a travel agent who specializes in dealing with customers who do not want to live in a world that would be boring and who raise the age old question, “When in Africa, should one eat as the Africans do?”

Fortunately for you, we still have plenty of other good researchers on board who are eager to assist you with the numerous pedagogical problems you confront teaching Intro. The researchers here at the QQs center are responsible for all the advice we are going to give you. You can bet your great-great-great grandmother’s life that we are appreciative beyond words.

A common problem with teaching Intro is how to simplify important concepts so that even the most philosophically disabled students will think philosophy is really easy on account of your making everything so simple that you’ll get great evaluations every year and big merit raises to boot. So let’s use Knowledge as an example of an important concept and give you some ideas about how you might simplify it.

First you start off with a statement such as:

“Knowledge must be true. Knowledge must contain truth. Truth is that which is not false.”

This will lead students to ask about Truth, so what you tell them is why it’s important to have access to theories of truth. You might explain it this way:

“If no theories of truth were accessible and philosophers did not add to the body of corpus truths, then there would not be a body of corpus truths!”

We should stress the importance of this claim being expressed with the “!” because it indicates that what you said is really exciting and nobody will ever question what “corpus” means.

Next you explain why someone shouldn’t establish a theory that doesn’t have any PRACTICAL application:

“Someone should not establish a theory that does not affect him or others because it would be merely for the sake of argument.”
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Obviously someone who DOES establish such a theory is very difficult to get along with, being as how they just want to ARGUE.

Since your lecture should proceed only as fast as a three toed sloth can run, you need to make sure your students are comfortable with trying to grasp a complex theory. (In case you don’t know, part of your job is to provide a safe environment for Stupidity because this contributes to their self-esteem; in other words, you’re supposed to make them think they are really smart even if they appear to have the brains of a turnip.) To prepare them for learning a complex theory, tell them:

“We try to conceive the more complex theories by grasping the simple parts of its composure.”

Then explain the simple parts of knowledge by using an analogy. Here is the best one we have found:

“On an elementary level, knowledge can be looked at as a sandwich. You have to have three parts to make a sandwich – bread, meat, and fixings. Without one of these you cannot have a sandwich. Knowledge fits this idea. You must have all three ingredients, truth, belief, and justification to have knowledge.”

But be aware that students who are vegetarian will find the mention of meat as necessary for something to count as a sandwich to be a touchy subject. This in turn will evoke much discussion over the Platonic Form of Sandwichiness, which by all means you should encourage because there’s always the chance they will become so distraught that they will decide the topic should be totally abandoned and will treat you to pizza and beer after class to make sure you never bring up the concept of “sandwich” again.

Some students will discover there are other touchy subjects. For instance, a researcher at the QOs Center pointed out that skepticism is one:

“The phrase ‘I know for certain’ is a touchy subject when it comes to discussing whether skepticism is plausible.”

In light of this, we hardly need to tell you that one reason teaching Intro to Philosophy is difficult is there are way too many touchy subjects to avoid; if you haven’t been careful to avoid them, it’s no wonder students find you offensive and arrogant and call you mean names.

The next topic related to Knowledge you will introduce is Reality. By now students should have started to believe that philosophy is so simple that any ol’ body can be an expert, even their pet rock. So it’s time to give them a Brain Whack. This is easily accomplished by saying something like the following:

“What is real and what really exists have very fine lines between them. The criteria for seeing of something is real has about a thin of a line as possible.”

And before anybody has a chance to ask you what that means, go on to say that

“Emotions and feelings fall into a gray category when looking at reality. Here, the sense-test does not always work well. The reason is that this is the part of every person that is unique to himself/herself. My view is that reality in this sense must be individually determined. What is real to one person may not have any substance in another’s eyes. In my opinion, the emotional things one considers to be real are influenced by those things that his/her senses tell him/her are real. So, in a sense, the physical detects the imaginary.”

Even though most of your students will find this incomprehensible, what they will really like about this means, you should encourage because there’s always the chance they will become so distraught that they will decide the topic should be totally abandoned and will treat you to pizza and beer after class to make sure you never bring up the concept of “sandwich” again.

One topic students like to discuss (i.e., emote about) is abortion and of course they want to know YOUR view. However, that falls into the Touchy Subject category; so even through you can mention your view, you should never actually discuss it. Let’s pretend you bring up this popular topic but you are wise enough to know (1) it is in the Touchy Subject category and (2) your own view is pro-choice but if you tell them that there will be at least one or a dozen or fiftyseven of them (depending on where you teach and the size of the class) who will go to the dean and demand that you be fired (in which case in all likelihood you will be). So after mentioning what your own view is, you hurriedly get them off the track. For instance, you might say something like this:

“My belief on abortion is pro-choice. I don’t believe that you are killing the baby by aborting it inside the womb since the spirit is the living essence, not the physical body, and many times the spirit doesn’t enter its chosen body unless it is certain that it should be there.”
Quotable Quotes . . .
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Now you must immediately throw out some questions to make sure they don’t come back to the Touchy Subject. Here are just a couple suggestions:

What do YOU think the spirit is?

If YOU were the spirit, how could you BE CERTAIN that your chosen body is where you should be? (But remember we noted earlier that, among your students who like skepticism, “being certain” is in the Touchy Subject category.)

Another topic that falls into the Touchy Subject category, if you allow it to be brought up in class, is Religion. (But you need not allow it to be brought up; we are obligated to remind you of the Rule of Degree—the person with the highest degree gets to make the rules; we assume that is you.) Suppose a discussion arises over whether all children should be indoctrinated with Christianity or whether they should be allowed to decide on their own when they get to high school. If you happen to be teaching at an institution where most students would agree with the indoctrination-of-Christianity position, which you think is a strong candidate for the Stupidity Prize of the Year, you can be diplomatic by saying:

“In the elementary or middle school years, the children may have never had the opportunity to be exposed to Christianity, but by the time they enter high school, many of the students can drive or have friends that drive and thus have had the opportunity to explore religion for themselves."

Students who don’t have grass growing under their feet will immediately latch on to the benefits of this argument, i.e., the importance of being allowed to drive when in high school. For those who didn’t drive while in high school and who didn’t have friends who could drive and thus who didn’t have the opportunity to explore religion for themselves, they are now in a position to blame their parents if the parents object to these students’ religious beliefs.

Before our altruistic feeling exhausts itself, we want to help those of you are having Identity-Decision Problems. So first things first:

“When embarking on the task of deciding an identity one first must conclude that someone exists.”

To help you out with this, we will enlist the help of an Adjunct Staff Member’s (see End Note) relevant exposition on Descartes and Locke:

“Descartes is a naturalist and Locke’s a behavioralist. I say this because Descartes said cogito ergo sum, I think therefore I am, while Locke believed that ideas come from 2 sources — inflection and impression. Inflection is when you look back at the occurrence or remember. Impression is when an outside occurrence ‘stamps’ an idea in your mind kind of like a footprint in the mud.’

If both positions apply to you, then we guarantee you that you can conclude someone exists, and that someone is YOU.

Finding out the cause of your identity-Decision Problem is essential to a cure. According to one of our researchers:

“In today’s society there are many organizations that try to determine our identities and tell us the way we should be.”

We know for a FACT that those so-called “organizations” are COMMITTEES. However, what you need to know to resolve your identity-Decision Problem is this:

“Agreement is the consistency of identity. Whether it is agreement in society or agreement within yourself someone must decide your identity.”

So the point is, you only have to make sure that Society (a.k.a. your Institution) or the Self Within You is consistent about Who You Are. Your Identity-Decision Problem will then be solved.

We were just about to shut off our Altruism Valve when Dr. Reality popped in from Reality City and told us,

“Philosophy, in reality, is colorless.”

We hope that Philosophy is also odorless; otherwise we’ll have to blame Philosophy for all the stench around the QQs Center.

Mary Ann Carroll, the Sometimes Real Director of the QQs Center, where Reality is just an Unreal Stone’s throw away, and where there is Truth and Knowledge for all, located at the Seemingly Real Appalachian State University. (Some Independent QQers out there provided us with a couple of the QQs in this column: Joram Graf Haber, Nick Zangill, Samuel Gorovitz, Mark Debellis, and Natika Newton. Thanks, Comrades. We’d be interested in finding out if Philosophy is indeed odorless or, if it isn’t, whether you think it can account for any malodorous aroma you might have noticed when reading Intro papers.)
December 27-30, 1996 - American Philosophical Assoc. (APA), Eastern Div., Atlanta Marriott Marquis, Atlanta, GA.

December 28, 1996 - Topic: Why is Philosophy Marginalized in Higher Education? Society of Philosophers in America. With APA. 11:15 AM - 1:15 PM, Trinidad Rm. Chair, Nancy D. Simco; Presenters, Nicholas Capaldi and Charles Scott; Respondents, Eric Hoffman and John A. Loughney. December 28, 1996 - Panel on Children, Rights, and Education. APA Committee on Pre-College Instruction in Philosophy. With APA. 2-5 PM, Chardonnay Rm. Chair, David Martens; Speakers, Rosalind Ekman Ladd, Lynn Pasquerella, and Michael Pritchard.

November 28, 1996 - Assoc. for Philosophy of Education. With APA. Topic: Hobbes, Aristotle, and Education. 2-5 PM, Quebec Rm.


December 29, 1996 - Special Session: Is Critical Thinking Domain-Specific? APA Committee on the Teaching of Philosophy. With APA. 9-11 AM, Hall Rm. Chair, Rosalind Ekman Ladd; Speakers, Betsy Decyk and Robert Ennis; Commentators, Richard Haan and John Hoagland.


These listings are drawn in part from Nancy Simco (ed.), The Philosophical Calendar, published by The Conference of Philosophical Societies.