

# ***9th International Workshop-Conference on Teaching Philosophy***

---

August 7 - 10, 1992  
University of Vermont  
Burlington, Vermont

## ***Program Chair***

Betsy Newell Decyk

## ***Program Committee***

James Cadello  
Grant Cornwell  
Helen Dwyer  
Kevin Galvin  
Sidney Gendin  
Susan Heineman  
Chuck Roades  
Gregory Weis

---

*Sponsored by: The American Association of Philosophy Teachers  
In cooperation with: The University of Vermont Conferences and Institutes*

---

# Program

## Friday, August 7

---

**8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. REGISTRATION**

**12:15 - 1:15 p.m. LUNCH**

**2:00 - 3:30 p.m. SESSIONS**

Judith Boss  
Paul Gallagher

Facilitating Moral Development in College Ethics Students (**Room A102**)

A Conspiracy of Goodness: Incorporating Pierre Sauvage's "Weapons of the Spirit" into an Introduction to Ethics Class (**Room A101**)

Richard Hart  
Arthur Ledoux

Multiculturalism and Philosophy: The Fiction of Charles Johnson (**Room A161**)

Using Meditation in the Teaching of Eastern Philosophy (**Room A140**)

Matthew McConnell

King Lear, Ivan Ilyich, Nora Helmer, The Prodigal Son and other Great Philosophers (**Room A162**)

**3:45 - 5:15 p.m. SESSIONS**

Richard N. Burnor  
J. Patrick Fitzgerald  
Rosalind Ladd  
Norman Lillegard  
Ben Llamzon  
Krishna Mallick

Computer Outlining as a Teaching and Learning Tool (**IBM lab**)

Saving the Past, Assessing the Present, and Anticipating the Future (**Room A101**)

Teaching About the Rights of Children (**Room 162**)

An Introduction to Agent Centered Moral Theory (**Room 102**)

East (Zen)-West Philosophies of Self and Non-Self (**Room 140**)

Multiculturalism in the Undergraduate Classroom (**Room A180**)

**5:30 - 6:30 p.m. DINNER**

**7:00 - 7:15 p.m. WELCOME ADDRESS (Room 115)**

**7:15 - 8:45 p.m. KEYNOTE ADDRESS (Room 115)**

Gareth B. Matthews

The Child as Natural Philosopher

**9 - 10 p.m. SESSIONS**

Terry Bynum  
Peter Facione  
T. Foster & P. English  
Carolyn H. Magid  
Ray G. Wright

Computer Ethics I (**Room A161**)

A Consensus Conceptualization of Critical Thinking: Report of the APA Delphi Project (**Room A102**)

Teaching Philosophy at the Academy: Gifted High School Students in Indiana (**Room A101**)

The "Values and Choices" Experience: Teaching Philosophy in an Innovative Interdisciplinary Context (**Room A162**)

The Evolving Research Paper (**Room A140**)

## Saturday, August 8

---

**7:30 - 8:30 a.m. BREAKFAST**

**8:30 - 9:15 a.m. PLENARY SESSION (Room 115)**

**9:30 - 11 a.m. SESSIONS**

Terry Bynum  
Cheryl Clark  
S. Farber & E. Klein

Computer Ethics II (**Room A180**)

Star Trek and Personal Identity (**Room A101**)

Taking Seriously the Art of Teaching Philosophy (**Room 161**)

---

# Schedule

---

## Saturday, August 8 (cont'd)

---

|                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| John Greco                     | First Year Teaching: A Conversation/Workshop for Beginning and Recently New Teachers ( <b>Room 115</b> )                                                                                         |
| Claire Elise Katz              | Bridging the Gap—Creating a Community Between the University and K-12 Using the Philosophy for Children Program ( <b>Room 102</b> )                                                              |
| Tom Krettek                    | Globalization in Philosophy—A New Course for College and Universities: Linking the Research of the Institute for Ultimate Reality and Meaning to the Teaching of Philosophy ( <b>Room A162</b> ) |
| Joel Marks                     | Cheating ( <b>Room 140</b> )                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Gareth Matthews                | <i>Special session for children of conference participants</i> ( <b>Room 216</b> )                                                                                                               |
| <b>11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.</b> | <b>SESSIONS</b>                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Terry Bynum                    | Electronic Philosophy I ( <b>Room A180</b> )                                                                                                                                                     |
| David Cooper                   | One Way to Teach the Importance of a Theoretical Orientation in Applied Philosophical Ethics ( <b>Room A101</b> )                                                                                |
| Richard Dewitt                 | Critical Thinking and Faculty Development ( <b>Room A102</b> )                                                                                                                                   |
| Walter L. Fogg                 | Socrates in the Classroom: A Nietzschean Reassessment ( <b>Room A140</b> )                                                                                                                       |
| Michael Malone                 | A Strategy for Building Confidence in Applied Logic ( <b>Room A162</b> )                                                                                                                         |
| George J. Marshall             | Computer Access to Philosophical Materials ( <b>MAC or IBM lab</b> )                                                                                                                             |
| Vance Mendenhall               | Getting Into Arguments ( <b>Room A161</b> )                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>12:15 - 1:15 p.m.</b>       | <b>LUNCH</b>                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>1:30 - 3:30 p.m.</b>        | <b>SESSIONS</b>                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| L. Ashley & M. Nash            | Exercises Designed to Help Students Understand Racism and Sexism ( <b>Room A101</b> )                                                                                                            |
| James Campbell                 | Teaching American Philosophy ( <b>Room A140</b> )                                                                                                                                                |
| Daryl Close                    | Using CompuServe ( <b>IBM or Simpson lab</b> )                                                                                                                                                   |
| Peter Facione                  | Critical Thinking Assessment—The Basic Ways and Means ( <b>A180</b> )                                                                                                                            |
| Roderick P. Hughes             | Teaching Philosophy and the Film ( <b>A162</b> )                                                                                                                                                 |
| Henry Nardone                  | Using the Film 'Twelve Angry Men' in a Critical Thinking Course ( <b>Room 102</b> )                                                                                                              |
| <b>3:45 - 5:15 p.m.</b>        | <b>SESSIONS</b>                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Betsy Decyk                    | The Frontiers of Epistemology: How Co-operative Learning Encourages Individual Creativity ( <b>Room A161</b> )                                                                                   |
| Peter Facione                  | Critical Thinking Instruction—Its Impact on Students ( <b>Room A102</b> )                                                                                                                        |
| Robert Hahn                    | An Interdisciplinary, Team-taught and First-hand Experience Approach to Teaching Ancient Greek Philosophy in Greece ( <b>Room A140</b> )                                                         |
| Claude St. Laurent             | Teaching Validity with Venn-Type Diagram Demonstration of a Computer Software ( <b>IBM lab</b> )                                                                                                 |
| George J. Marshall             | The Art of the Philosophy Assignment ( <b>Room A101</b> )                                                                                                                                        |
| Jean Mechanic                  | Teaching Bioethical Decision Making ( <b>Room A180</b> )                                                                                                                                         |
| Gregory F. Weis                | Getting Students to Make Strategic Distinctions ( <b>Room A162</b> )                                                                                                                             |
| <b>5:30 - 6:30 p.m.</b>        | <b>DINNER</b>                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>7:15 - 8:45 p.m.</b>        | <b>PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS</b> ( <b>Room 115</b> )                                                                                                                                                  |
| Terry Bynum                    | The Electronic Philosophy Teacher                                                                                                                                                                |
|                                | <b>ICE CREAM SOCIAL</b> ( <i>immediately following Presidential Address</i> )                                                                                                                    |
| <b>9:30 p.m.</b>               | <b>AAPT BOARD MEETING</b> ( <b>Room A101</b> )                                                                                                                                                   |

---

---

# Program

## Sunday, August 9

---

7:30 - 8:30 a.m.    **BREAKFAST**

8:30 - 9:15 a.m.    **PLENARY SESSION (Room 115)**

9:30 - 11:30 a.m.    **SESSIONS**

|                       |                                                                                         |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| James R. Bode         | Creating Argument Diagrams on Computers (MAC lab)                                       |
| J. Cadello & J. Haber | Philosophy Clubs (Room A140)                                                            |
| Anthony M. Coyne      | Demonstrating Program Effectiveness (Room A180)                                         |
| Thomas E. Gaskill     | Workshop for the Non-specialist in Teaching Indian (South Asian) Philosophy (Room A101) |
| Julie Gowen           | Narratives and Narrative Reasoning in Teaching Philosophy (Room 161)                    |
| Randy Richards        | Beyond the Groves: Ethics for Professionals Outside of the University (Room A162)       |

11:30 - 12:30 a.m.    **SESSIONS**

|                                       |                                                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Terry Bynum                           | Electronic Philosophy II (Room A180)                                                                                                |
| C. Haight, P. Tipton, &<br>J. Whitman | Citizens and Soldiers: Teaching Just War Theory at the United States Military Academy (Room 102)                                    |
| Albert W. Hayward                     | Teaching Aesthetics Using Family Resemblances (Room A101)                                                                           |
| Dennis Holt                           | On the Unfamiliar Art of Reading Philosophically: Introducing Philosophy Through the <u>Declaration of Independence</u> (Room A162) |
| Richard Holmes                        | Philosophy in Literature: Two Cases in Aid of Uncovering Our Pre-understanding of the World (Room A140)                             |
| Leah Savion                           | Educating the Naive Reasoner (Room A161)                                                                                            |

12:15 - 1:15 p.m.    **LUNCH**

**SUNDAY AFTERNOON FREE TIME** (*Lake Chaplain Boat Tour, extra charge*)

5:30 - 6:30 p.m.    **DINNER** (*Barbeque Picnic, tentative*)

7 - 9 p.m.    **SESSIONS**

|                    |                                                                                           |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rob Brady          | Designing Software for Teaching Philosophy (MAC or IBM lab)                               |
| Terry Bynum        | Computer Ethics III (Room A180)                                                           |
| James Campbell     | Dealing with Darwin (Room A140)                                                           |
| Ken Knisely        | A Swift Introduction Into the Theory and Practice of Philosophical Television (Room A102) |
| Ivor Pritchard     | Who Protects Human Research Subjects? (Room A162)                                         |
| Kenneth W. Walters | The 'Felt Sense' and 'Know Thyself' or "Gendlin and the Delphic Oracle" (Room A161)       |

9:30 p.m.    **AAPT BOARD MEETING (Room A101)**

## Monday, August 10

---

7:30 - 8:30 a.m.    **BREAKFAST**

8:30 - 9:15 a.m.    **AAPT BUSINESS MEETING (Room 115)**  
AGENDA

---

# Schedule

---

## Monday, August 10 (cont'd)

---

- 1) President's Report
- 2) Executive Director's Report
- 3) Treasurer's Report
- 4) Nominations for Vice President, At-Large Board Members
- 5) Conference Planning for 1993-4
  - a. 10th IWCTP
  - b. 1st International conference in Europe
- 6) New Business

**9:30 - 11 a.m.**

William Davie  
Beth Dixon  
William Garrett  
Myron Miller  
Santiago Sia

### SESSIONS

Stories for the Third Ear (**Room A102**)  
Stories from the Classroom: Teaching Gender, Race and Class in Philosophy of Mind (**Room A140**)  
Strategies for Teaching Asian Philosophy to American Postsecondary Students (**Room A162**)  
Using the Computer to Teach Philosophy (**MAC lab**)  
The Use of Philosophical Journals in the Teaching of Ethics (**Room A180**)

**11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.**

Betsy Decyk  
Victor H. Balowitz  
Janet Preston  
Charles H. Seibert

### SESSIONS

Classroom Assessment Techniques (**Room A101**)  
Extracting the Conclusion: Three Rules (**Room A162**)  
Techniques to Encourage Critical Thinking About Values (**Room A161**)  
On the Use of Adjunct (Part-Time) Teaching Staff: Conflict in the Academy (**Room A102**)

**12:15 - 1:15 p.m.**

### LUNCH

**1:30 p.m.**

**AAPT BOARD MEETING , if necessary (Room 101)**

**NOTE:** All workshops will be conducted in the Living/Learning Complex with the exception of the computer workshops. The computer workshops will be conducted in the Waterman Building, Academic Computer Services MacIntosh and IBM computer labs. Signs will be posted directing those interested in the computer workshops.

## ***A Special Thanks to All Our Program Presenters. . .***

**Larry Ashley**

**Victor H. Balowitz**

**James R. Bode**

**Judith A. Boss**

**Rob Brady**

**Richard N. Burnor**

**Terry Bynum**

**James Cadello**

**James Campbell**

**Cheryl Clark**

**Daryl Close**

**David Cooper**

**Anthony M. Coyne**

**William Davie**

**Betsy Decyk**

**Richard Dewitt**

**Beth A. Dixon**

**Parker English**

**Peter Facione**

**Scott Farber**

**J. Patrick Fitzgerald**

**Walter L. Fogg**

**Tom Foster**

**William Garrett**

**Thomas E. Gaskill**

**Julie Gowen**

**John Greco**

**Joram Haber**

**Robert Hahn**

**Catherine G. Haight**

**Albert W. Hayward**

**Richard Holmes**

**Dennis Holt**

**Roderick P. Hughes**

**Claire Elise Katz**

**Ellen Klein**

**Ken Knisely**

**Tom Krettek**

**Rosalind Ekman Ladd**

**Arthur Ledoux**

**Norman Lillegard**

**Ben Llamzon**

**Carolyn H. Magid**

**Krishna Mallick**

**Michael Malone**

**Joel Marks**

**George J. Marshall**

**Gareth Matthews**

**Matthew McConnell**

**Janevive Jean Mechanic**

**Vance Mendenhall**

**Myron Miller**

**Henry Nardone**

**Margaret Nash**

**Janet Preston**

**Ivor Pritchard**

**Randy Richards**

**Leah Savion**

**Charles H. Seibert**

**Santiago Sia**

**Claude St. Laurent**

**Paul E. Tipton**

**Kenneth W. Walters**

**Gregory F. Weis**

**Jeffrey P. Whitman**

**Ray G. Wright**



# *Session Abstracts*

---

**Ashley, Larry—*Exercises Designed to Involve Students in Understanding Racism and Sexism***—Our presentation will focus on presenting a few of the exercises that we utilize in our course titled “Philosophical Issues in Prejudice and Discrimination.” This course is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the injustices (violations of freedom, autonomy, equality) surrounding prejudice and discrimination. We concentrate on racism and sexism, discussing what these phenomena are (how best to define and explain them), how they have developed historically, how they are maintained, and what should and could be done in response to them. The course draws on perspectives and material from sociology, psychology, history, social theory and philosophy, especially moral philosophy and social/political philosophy. We both teach this course which satisfies a general education requirement in both “Prejudice and Discrimination” and “Analysis of Values” at our institution.

Our presentation will cover six exercises that we have found to be effective in helping our students to experience and to concretely engage with the problems that racism and sexism present to those who suffer from them. These exercises are very concrete and more or less force students to relate to and experience material that they might be defensive toward or not inherently interested in. **Saturday, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Balowitz, Victor H.—*Extracting the Conclusion: Three Rules***—Validity is not the only desirable property in a deductive argument; a deductive argument should also be persuasive. An argument where the conclusion is one with its premise, a circular argument, is valid but not persuasive. Nor is its exact opposite, a valid argument whose conclusion is not even implicitly, contained in the premise or premises. The following truth-functionally valid inference would be an example of the latter:

*I love my daughters. Therefore if I don't, I love my wife.*

A condition that is necessary to exclude such inferences from the class of persuasive valid arguments is that we accept a conclusion not when it is identical with the premise but only when it can be extracted from the premise or premises in which it is contained. This condition, however, cries out for clarification; since one ought to object on the same grounds that Quine objected to one of Kant's best known explanations of analyticity “...it appeals to a notion of containment which is kept at a metaphorical level.”

The requisite clarification may or may not be available for all cases in which the conclusion is contained in the premise; though the participants will be shown how it is available for syllogistic inferences.

Three rules will be presented to the participants that are jointly sufficient for maintaining that a syllogistic conclusion follows validly because it is contained in the premises; these rules are based on various conditions that are individually necessary for claiming (non-metaphorically) that a categorical proposition is contained in some other proposition or other propositions of the same type. The possibility of making these rules for non-

syllogistic inferences will then be discussed by the participants. **Monday, 11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Bode, James R.—*Creating Argument Diagrams on Computers***—The presentation will demonstrate the use of a pair of computer programs (a word processing program and a flowcharting program) as tools in creating argument diagrams. It will show the advantages of the use of argument diagrams to students and faculty. It will demonstrate that computer tools are available to assist in creating diagrams and that those computer tools offer a clear advance over the use of paper and pencil to do the same task.

All participants will learn to use the computer programs and will use them to analyze an argument. While the technique was developed and will be demonstrated on Macintosh computers, a handout will discuss how to implement the system on DOS computers. **Sunday, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.**

**Boss, Judith A.—*Getting Ethics Out of the Classroom***—The great moral philosophers have always held autonomous moral reasoning, universality and impartiality, as well as a concern for justice and mutual respect to be the hallmarks of moral reasoning. For many of these philosophers the ultimate purpose of studying ethics was not, to use the words of Aristotle, “as it is in other inquiries the attainment of theoretical knowledge; virtue is, but in order to become good, else there would be no advantage in studying it.”

Too many contemporary ethics teachers have lost sight of this goal. Indeed, studies have shown that, while college ethics classes are effective in getting students to memorize theoretical concepts, they have little effect on a student's actual moral development in terms of their becoming principled reasoners or more moral people. Ironically, the college experience tends to solidify students' ethical relativism rather than move them beyond this conventional stage of moral reasoning.

Developmental studies with college students show that the most effective means of helping students internalize the principles studied in class, and hence move to a higher stage of moral reasoning, are community service work, discussion of moral issues, and learning about the levels of moral development. The purpose of this presentation is to present these studies and to discuss effective ways of incorporating this information into the actual teaching of ethics. **Friday, 2:00 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Brady, Rob—*Designing Software for Teaching Philosophy***—First, several possible roles for the computer in philosophic education will be examined and evaluated. Next, a critique of some existing philosophic software will be given, and suggestions made of some requirements for successful computer assisted instruction. Finally, a proposal will be presented for further development in philosophy software. **Sunday, 7 - 8 p.m.**

**Burnor, Richard N.—*Computer Outlining as a Teaching and Learning Tool***—Excellent teaching requires conscientious class preparation—and a considerable quantity of time. Yet a little

known variant on word-processing software—the so-called outline or “idea processor”—can significantly streamline and stimulate class preparation. For instance, a good outline can quickly and conveniently create a pedagogically effective lecture in a format that promotes efficient review even years later. Further, some outliners feature “meta-outlining” capabilities—whereby a collection of lecture files can be conveniently accessed, edited, reorganized, and stored in what may well constitute the consummate lecture management system. Perhaps most importantly, the outline processor has potential as an effective classroom instrument for promoting critical thinking, improving writing skills, and even deepening students’ comprehension of philosophy. This presentation is planned as a lecture/demonstration of these and other applications of computer outlining as they pertain to teaching philosophy. **Friday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Bynum, Terry—Computer Ethics**—The teaching of computer ethics is presented by utilizing three video programs. The first program focuses upon ways to integrate computer ethics into the college curriculum via courses, modules and projects. A brief discussion of national accreditation requirements in computer science is also included. The second program focuses upon the questions: “What is computer ethics” and “What are some of the key “subfields” of this new branch of applied ethics?” The third program focuses upon classroom activities and strategies: What teaching strategies are the most effective? What kinds of examples and cases work the best? **Friday, 9 - 10 p.m. (I); Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m. (II); Sunday, 7 - 9 p.m. (III)**

**Bynum, Terry—Electronic Philosophy**—The first of two informal “round-table discussions,” examines the likely impact of computer technology upon philosophy teaching in the future. This first discussion will consider “multimedia/hypermedia” curriculum materials and their use in the classroom. I will discuss my present curriculum development project, then invite attendees not only to comment or ask questions, but also to describe their own experiences or projects—if any—using “multimedia/hypermedia.”

The second of the “round-table discussions,” examines the likely impact of computer technology upon philosophy teaching in the future. This second discussion will consider ways in which electronic networks can be helpful to philosophy teachers. I will discuss my own use of electronic networks, then invite attendees not only to comment or ask questions, but also to describe their own experiences—if any—using electronic networks. A brief discussion of electronic text analysis will also be included.

I hope that there will be a mix of people: some who have relevant projects or experiences and some who are “just curious” and want to learn more. **Saturday, 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m. (I); Sunday, 11:30 - 12:30 p.m. (II)**

**Cadello, James—Philosophy Clubs**—This panel will discuss the role of philosophy clubs in undergraduate education. Faculty advisors of two undergraduate philosophy clubs will discuss the development and the organization of their clubs. The advisors will consider their perceptions not only of the value to students and to

themselves of such clubs, but will also discuss the difficulties and the drawbacks of facilitating a philosophy club. Approaches to club organization—including ideas about reading selections, public presentations by club members, club activities, and club-sponsored journals—will be addressed. In addition, three student-members of philosophy clubs will examine and review their experiences of philosophy clubs. The students will appraise the extent to which these clubs have impacted their education, modified their conception of philosophy, and aided in their philosophical reasoning. **Sunday, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.**

**Campbell, James—Dealing with Darwin**—The impact of evolutionary thought upon Western consciousness is undeniable. Unfortunately, we seldom advance beyond the vaguest understanding of what the evolutionists—especially Darwin—wrote. Consequently, we cannot lead our students to a fuller understanding of what the evolutionary perspective is and what its acceptance means. This failure on our part to be able to raise the discussion of evolution to an intellectual level is felt particularly strongly at present. This workshop is designed to assist the participants to gain a fuller understanding of the evolutionary perspective and to explore ways in which a critical examination of evolutionary thought can become part of our students’ education. **Sunday, 7 - 9 p.m.**

**Campbell, James—Teaching American Philosophy**—America is one of the few cultures that does not attempt deliberately to pass on its intellectual and philosophical past. Although there are no doubt many reasons for this failing, one of the primary ones is that most American philosophers simply do not know their past well enough to offer a sympathetic yet critical presentation to their students. This workshop is designed for teachers interested in acquiring or developing such a critical sympathy. (Others are, of course, welcome). We will examine ways to structure courses in American Philosophy, materials which are available for classroom use, other materials which will be of assistance to teachers, and the introduction of some figures and topics from American Philosophy into other courses. **Saturday, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Clark, Cheryl—Star Trek and Personal Identity**—Mr. Data is an android capable of complex behavioral interactions with humans and members of other humanoid beings (Beta Zoids, Klingons, Forengi...), interactions subtle and varied enough that those around him develop complex, deep emotional attachments to him. He is, nonetheless, a constructed—not birth—being. Mr. Data holds the rank of Lieutenant Commander in Star Fleet. It happens that Bruce Maddox, a human engineer, wishes to disassemble Mr. Data in order to study the construction of his “brain.” It is obvious that the considerations surrounding the decision as to whether it is morally permissible to invade Mr. Data in this way are metaphysically, morally, epistemologically fertile. **Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**Close, Daryl—Using CompuServ**—This is a telecommunications workshop appropriate for all PC (and Macintosh) users. The focus is on learning to use CompuServ. No computer experience is required.

CompuServ is a general purpose information service which provides many services of specific interest to educators, including E-mail, file transfer, hundreds of discussion forums, including educational and philosophical forums, extensive database retrieval and journal abstract services, newspaper clipping services, etc. CompuServ also provides "gates" to Internet and BITNET. In short, every CompuServ user automatically has an Internet address (and consequently, a BITNET address). For faculty at smaller schools which cannot afford to provide Internet or BITNET access, this is a CompuServ feature of critical importance. With an inexpensive CompuServ account, faculty can communicate electronically with their colleagues throughout North America, as well as in much of Europe and the Far East. **Saturday, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Cooper, David—*One Way to Teach the Importance of a Theoretical Orientation in Applied Philosophical Ethics***—An interdisciplinary practical approach to teaching a gender blended interpretation of ethical theory as an introduction to applied ethics classes. We discuss why it is useful to organize an applied ethics course along the lines of analysis found in a decision model used in consulting work in applied ethics. First research from social and developmental psychology is used to establish a background context for explaining how a philosophical perspective can help people in pluralistic cultures avoid the banality of evil. Feminist theory is used to raise questions about voice in ethical theory, which prepares the way for a gender blended concept of moral autonomy to set the stage for presenting gender blended traditional theories as examples of the kinds of accounts that morally autonomous people would give to justify institutional policies. Professional codes of ethics are analyzed as examples of implementation strategies, and a decision procedure is used to solve a contractual dispute in business ethics. **Saturday, 11:15 - 12:15 p.m.**

**Coyne, Anthony M.—*Demonstrating Program Effectiveness***—Regional accrediting associations are commonly requiring universities to prove the effectiveness of their programs as part of their criteria for reaccreditation. Using the standards of the Southern Association as a model, this workshop will show ways that philosophy departments can easily meet this challenge. Through role playing as outside evaluators, participants will gain direct experience with the issues involved. Discussions of effectiveness can help philosophy departments to focus their programs in ways that can help them to teach better. The presenter's institution has just been through the reaffirmation process so a current experience will be available as an example. **Sunday, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.**

**Davie, William—*Stories for the Third Ear***—This presentation is about the use of short short stories, about two to five minutes on the average, which are presented at the end of the class period in large lecture classes. The profound communication effected by stories is well documented in the context of psychotherapy and the application of hypnosis in therapy. (I will provide a selected bibliography for those who are interested in the theoretical background). My presentation will discuss and demonstrate the importance of storyteller's attitude, pace, tone of voice, and so forth. Participants will get to experience several different types of

story and will have an opportunity to discuss their own reactions and their thoughts about possible applications in their own teaching. The presentation will include several observations about the benefits of using stories and parables in the philosophy classroom. **Monday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**Decyk, Betsy—*Classroom Assessment Techniques***—Most of us have become accustomed to teaching evaluations that are done at the end of the semester. But studying these results will, at best, only help the next semester of students. This workshop will introduce several simple techniques that you can use to assess student learning and improve your teaching during the semester. **Monday, 11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Decyk, Betsy—*The Frontiers of Epistemology: How Co-operative Learning Encourages Individual Creativity***—This presentation will display the creativity of students inspired by cooperative learning. In 1991 the members of a special topics course in philosophy explored together how feminism, cognitive science, and art are reshaping epistemology away from traditional theories of knowledge towards a theory of understanding ourselves and our world. Our interactive approach, unusual in philosophy, allowed us to express our ideas freely and to learn from one another. The approach not only generated thoughtful classroom discussions, but also sparked exciting creative contributions. A faculty/student team will discuss our experiences in the class and our own creative endeavors because of it. **Saturday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Dewitt, Richard—*Critical Thinking and Faculty Development***—Our university recently completed a two-year experimental project aimed at developing critical thinking skills in our freshman students. A handful of other professors and myself were involved in this project at all stages, from its initial conception, planning of the seminar content, through the final evaluation of the project. As a result of this experience, I am convinced that we need to rethink the usual approach to developing critical thinking skills. In particular, I want to argue that we should focus more of our attention on faculty development as a means of developing critical thinking skills in our students. In this discussion I want to share my reasons for this conclusion and solicit input about these claims. **Saturday, 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.**

**Dixon, Beth A.—*Stories from the Classroom: Teaching Gender, Race and Class in Philosophy of Mind***—In this workshop I describe my efforts to integrate issues of gender, race, and class into a Philosophy of Mind course. These issues are rarely discussed in the contemporary literature. I believe this is so because, historically, philosophical discussions about the nature of mind have been narrowly defined. The implicit assumption by most analytic philosophers writing in this area has been that the social context surrounding persons is irrelevant to the analysis of mind. This is not an implausible assumption since it can be argued that the philosopher should be seeking generalities about mental processes that transcend differences of gender, race, and class, rather than principles that apply to a particular person, located in a particular set of circumstances. Nevertheless, one of my objectives in teaching the Philosophy of Mind is to critique this

assumption by arguing that it is both appropriate and illuminating to broaden our discussions of mind to include issues relating to the social context of persons who have minds.

I will share with workshop participants course objectives, reading assignments, and paper topics, as these relate to issues of gender, race, and class. In addition, I will comment on the success of this approach by reading examples of student work, the student's own assessment of course content, and journal notes which I kept to record highlights of lectures and class discussion. I hope workshop participants will offer suggestions about how to improve the teaching of the Philosophy of the Mind. **Monday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**English, Parker—Teaching Philosophy at the Academy: Gifted High School Students in Indiana**—What is it like for a philosophy teacher to face a whole semester with a class of (high school) students composed entirely of gifted and talented students? What is to be expected? What should be taught? These and related questions are the focus of this meeting.

The format will be one of presentation, discussion, handouts, questions, and comments. Co-presenters are teachers of philosophy, each with experience in teaching the gifted, though neither claim expertise in this field. They expect to come not only with their presentation but also with questions, comments, and suggestions. Handouts concerning several kinds of results will be dispersed and discussed. Among these will be the Watson-Glaser pre- and post-critical thinking test, the Ennis-Weir test, and a discussion of the value of peer reviews. Invited to participate are those who are curious or who have themselves had experience in teaching the gifted. **Friday, 9 - 10 p.m.**

**Facione, Peter—A Consensus Conceptualization of Critical Thinking: Report of the APA Delphi Project**—What should we mean by the term "Critical Thinking?" This question motivated the Delphi Research Project. Sponsored by the American Philosophical Association, this two year study involved a panel of 46 experts and theoreticians from throughout the United States and Canada in an interactive program aimed at articulating a consensus conceptualization of critical thinking for purposes of college level education. This presentation summarizes the Delphi Project's methodology, major finds, and recommendations. Discussion and handout include a detailed definition of critical thinking, a list of core critical thinking skills and sub-skills, and a list of general and specific critical thinking dispositions. Key points of philosophical agreement and controversy are highlighted. Current uses of these Delphi finds, such as by the US Department of Education in *America 2000*, are highlighted. This session is interactive and questions from the floor are welcomed. **Friday, 9 - 10 p.m.**

**Facione, Peter—Critical Thinking Assessment—The Basic Ways and Means**—How can the individual instructor design and implement workable classroom level strategies to assess Critical Thinking? We will start with fundamentals such as developing a robust, clear, and operational concept of CT. In this collaborative and interactive workshop, we will critique specific examples of classroom assessment strategies (such as project assignments, self-

report prompts, essay test questions, and multiple choice items), and we will develop examples suited to our own teaching. We will consider the advantages and shortcomings of various assessment contexts (such as in-class vs. take-home, competitive vs. collaborative, and unannounced vs. scheduled). We will identify the criteria by which to compare published CT assessment instruments available for use at the classroom level. And, we will have some fun experimenting with unusual classroom assessment strategies such as team testing. **Saturday, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Facione, Peter—Critical Thinking Instruction—Its Impact on Students**—We know that instruction in critical thinking can sharpen students' thinking skills and affective disposition, but we're also discovering disconcerting data that the impact of CT instruction can vary according to student's gender, ethnicity, major, and other factors. How can we make CT instruction in the typical introductory logic or critical thinking course most beneficial for some of our students without unfairly affecting others of our students on the basis of protected characteristics? In this highly interactive workshop the model CT pedagogy, participants will interpret data, generate hypotheses regarding the effectiveness of various CT instructional methods, and weigh the merits of various approaches to CT instruction and testing. **Saturday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Farber, Scott—Taking Seriously the Art of Teaching Philosophy**—It is in fact nothing short of a miracle that modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry.

Albert Einstein

*Education in music and the arts is most potent because by their rhythm and harmony they sink most deeply into the soul.*

Plato

The activity of philosophy, especially that of teaching it, commonly focuses on the intellectual quality of critical analysis. Yet the "love of wisdom" denotes an emotional as well as intellectual component. This emotional factor—that which actually motivates the experience of philosophizing—is frequently neglected in the philosophy classroom. We believe we have discovered some interesting (and easily assimilable) ways of reuniting philo with sophia within the undergraduate philosophy classroom.

Following a brief account of the justification for incorporating art into the analytic classroom, we will present examples—this will be an interactive "hands on" presentation—and then hold an open forum for group discussion and "brainstorming." **Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**Fitzgerald, J. Patrick—Saving the Past, Assessing the Present, and Anticipating the Future**—The presentation is designed around an innovative summer program, which offered gifted and high-achieving community high school students an enriching summer experience utilizing the expertise and resources of their community college. Within the context of an interdisciplinary course in philosophy, journalism, historiography, desktop publishing, and video production, students in the program have produced two booklets and two documentaries over the past three years. Under

the umbrella theme of "Seminole County: Saving the Past, Assessing the Present, and Anticipating the Future," students from each of the county's six high schools have explored different aspects of the county's history and destiny.

In the last 25 years, Seminole County, Florida (one of the nation's fastest growing areas) has undergone a shift from a largely agrarian to a suburban bedroom community serving metropolitan Orlando. Projections suggest that the county will be completely developed within the coming decade. Along with the benefits which accompany this kind of rapid growth comes danger that, as we are swept up with the new, we will lose sight of the past. Driven by the suspicion that many of our new residents have no sense of what life was like in Central Florida before high tech, superhighways, and "Disney," and the fear that we are quickly losing the opportunity to find out, Seminole Community College has undertaken an ongoing community service project which originates from and extensively involves the entire community.

Classroom sessions in philosophy have helped them to identify methods by which specific cultural and ethnic groups have adapted to change in the county. Classroom discussions in value theory have helped students focus on ways in which groups have influenced their surroundings as well as ways in which surroundings have influenced groups. On-site training in video technology and journalism have helped the students plan, conduct, and edit taped oral histories into summary pieces which tell what they have learned about local culture and values. The resulting products are tangible evidence of a realistic application of philosophical theories in the assessment of modern society, not to mention how video is a suitable vehicle for communicating these discoveries to a vast audience.

This presentation will begin with portions of the video documentaries, along with handouts which explain the various steps involved in their creation. Subsequently, a workshop will demonstrate the application of video and desktop publishing in the development of a theme. Discussion will follow centered on the innovative combination of philosophy and modern technology, i.e., videos, computers, etc. **Friday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Fogg, Walter L.—*Socrates in the Classroom: A Nietzschean Reassessment***—Many instructors present Socrates as the quintessential philosopher and model of "doing philosophy." Introductory texts often use him as a model and inducement to the novice. This image, the student's first impression of philosophy, may to some extent settle questions early in the course about the philosophical enterprise. Since the Socratic model may have this importance, we should continue to critically examine that model, its use in class, and its effect on students. Metaphorically speaking, I propose that the pedestal which holds the bust of Socrates be turned at angles suggested by some of Nietzsche's comments. Nietzsche admired Socrates yet felt the need to constantly battle him and his influence. Through Nietzsche we confront a more controversial Socrates: he challenges the motives of Socrates, appreciates yet questions the value of Socratic gadflies and their methods, and, indirectly, reminds us of the use and abuse of

"dialectics" in the classroom. True or false to the historical Socrates, his view of Socrates may have some resemblance to many of our students' first impression of Socrates.

In addition, Nietzsche has some perceptive things to say about teaching and teachers that redirect our discussions of teaching philosophy in interesting ways. **Saturday, 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.**

**Foster, Tom—*Teaching Philosophy at the Academy: Gifted High School Students in Indiana***—What is it like for a philosophy teacher to face a whole semester with a class of (high school) students composed entirely of gifted and talented students? What is to be expected? What should be taught? These and related questions are the focus of this meeting.

The format will be one of presentation, discussion, handouts, questions, and comments. Co-presenters are teachers of philosophy, each with experience in teaching the gifted, though neither claim expertise in his field. They expect to come not only with their presentation but also with questions, comments, and suggestions. Handouts concerning several kinds of results will be dispersed and discussed. Among these will be the Watson-Glaser pre-and post-critical thinking test, the Ennis-Weir test, and a discussion of the value of peer reviews. Invited to participate are those who are curious or who have themselves had experience in teaching the gifted. **Friday, 9 - 10 p.m.**

**Garrett, William—*Strategies for Teaching Asian Philosophy to American Postsecondary Students***—As every philosophy teacher knows, assumptions that we bring to life are often invisible to us. An effective first step in teaching Asian philosophy to American students is to call attention to assumptions that they may bring to the enterprise—assumptions about consciousness, the personality, the self, the relationship between psyche and body, and generally about the nature of reality. A reasonable strategy to accomplish this might be a brief and non-technical presentation of Descartes' philosophy as a prolegomenon to the study of Asian philosophy.

Three important Asian philosophical concepts as these: (1) the Buddhist concept of *pratitya-samutpada*, a theory of non-linear causality which asserts the interconnectedness of all things and events; (2) the Taoist concept of *wu-wei*, which asserts that an attitude of non-interference and spontaneity is often superior to a commitment to control; (3) the Hindu conception of the relation of consciousness to both the mind and the self. Concrete strategies for communicating these concepts to American undergraduates will be the substance of the workshop.

The concepts listed are especially relevant because (a) they are likely to be encountered in any university-level engagement of Asian philosophy and because (b) they are particularly challenging to the typical American undergraduate student. In addition, the proposed concepts have a contemporary significance in that they complement emerging paradigms in Western philosophy, psychology, science (including systems theory), and religion—paradigms which are themselves challenges to traditional Western

ways of thinking. Monday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.

**Gaskill, Thomas E.—*Workshop for the Non-Specialist in Teaching Indian (South Asian) Philosophy***—This workshop is intended primarily for those with little or no background in South Asian thought who wish, nonetheless, that they could broaden their course offerings to include such thought. The workshop provides strategic and bibliographic support so that such teachers can, with a modest amount of preparation, feel reasonably confident in including some introductory South Asian thought in their courses.

The workshop will include: a very brief overview of varieties of South Asian thought; hands-on experience in analyzing some selections; discussion of how to read and employ South Asian thought; discussion of how to integrate that material with western thought; and an annotated bibliography of some widely-available and reasonably-priced materials. Emphasis is on hands-on experience and on practical discussion of how to prep and teach South Asian thought. Sunday, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.

**Gowen, Julie—*Narratives and Narrative Reasoning in Teaching Philosophy***—This presentation, in the form of a workshop, is designed to acquaint philosophy teachers with the theory and practice of narrative reasoning within the context of teaching introductory philosophy. The workshop is divided into three sections. In the first section, the theory underpinning the importance of narratives and narrative reasoning is presented. This theory is based on the work of Jerome Bruner and Walter Fisher. In the second section, a narrative taken from the televised program "L.A. Law" is viewed and analyzed by workshop participants. Results of these analyses are shared through discussion. In the final section, an empirical test and pilot study conducted in an introductory philosophy class are described. Examples of class assignments and hand-outs from this pilot class are provided to participants. Sunday, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.

**Greco, John—"First Year Teaching: A Conversation/Workshop for Beginning and Recently New Teachers"**—This conversation/workshop is for beginning teachers and recently new teachers, and will be conducted by a recently new teacher. The rationale behind the workshop is that beginning and recently new teachers share a different set of concerns than more experienced teachers. The purpose of the workshop is to address those concerns, as opposed to the concerns of experienced teachers trying to become better teachers. Accordingly, the workshop will focus on basic strategies for constructing syllabi, creating reading lists, creating exams, assigning papers, grading, preparing for class, using the blackboard, lecturing, and promoting class discussion. Participants will also discuss the pros and cons of different approaches to teaching. For example, we will discuss "the invitational approach" vs. "the coercive approach." Finally, we will discuss issues concerning sensitivity to gender and culture. For example, we will discuss problems involving the gender dynamics of class discussion. Much of the time will be devoted to questions and answers and to group discussion. The objectives of the conversation/workshop are to (a) provide valuable factual information; (b) provoke thought about different strategies for teaching; and (c)

relieve fears and anxieties associated with beginning teaching. Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.

**Haber, Joram—*Philosophy Clubs***—This panel will discuss the role of philosophy clubs in undergraduate education. Faculty advisors of two undergraduate philosophy clubs will discuss the development and the organization of their clubs. The advisors will consider their perceptions not only of the value to students and to themselves of such clubs, but will also discuss the difficulties and the drawbacks of facilitating a philosophy club. Approaches to club organization—including ideas about reading selections, public presentations by club members, club activities, and club-sponsored journals—will be addressed. In addition, three student-members of philosophy clubs will examine and review their experiences of philosophy clubs. The students will appraise the extent to which these clubs have impacted their education, modified their conception of philosophy, and aided in their philosophical seasoning. Sunday, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.

**Hahn, Robert—*An Interdisciplinary, Team-Taught and First-Hand Experience Approach to Teaching Ancient Greek Philosophy in Greece***—The teaching of Greek philosophy/science is often undertaken as a means to express the idea of western rationality. The idea of "western rationality" tends to be presented as the triumph of reason over the senses; contemplation and reflection are identified as the highest human virtues, while sense-experience and the knowledge that follows from it are regarded to be defective. On this view, since reason, in its proper exercise, transcends sense-experience when it grasps eternal ideas, the historical context in which the early Greek thinkers developed has generally been dismissed as irrelevant.

Recent work in the history and philosophy of science—especially *Science, Technology, and Society [STS]*—has challenged this familiar approach by adopting a point of departure that insists that philosophy/science—and consequently "western rationality"—must be understood as a cultural practice. Although the early Greek thinkers claimed to have sought and grasped eternal ideas underlying or behind the changing phenomena, the STS approach advocates an analysis of their claims as embedded within a socio-political framework. Consequently, historical evidence that is commonly neglected now becomes central; the result is an enriched study of ancient Greek thought, and illumination is provided from what has been generally supposed to be unlikely sources.

To examine ancient philosophy/science as a cultural practice requires a sensitivity to interdisciplinary studies, including religious practices, architecture and engineering, medicine and biological taxonomy, theater, and political practices, among other activities. This, naturally, places new demands on those who teach ancient Greek philosophy/science. The new method developed makes use of GREECE as a classroom. It makes use of a multimedia format, including slides, overhead projections, and video tapes, in order to provide the background context. But, a hands-on approach also proves to greatly enhance the broader understanding by undertaking activities *in situ*, in their historical

locations. This includes the construction of sundials and star-maps as part of an introduction to ancient astronomy, the reconstruction in clay of ancient temples now in ruins, with the help of local potters, in order to better understand the applied geometry and design in architecture and engineering, the recreation of religious rituals at temple and cult sites, the collection of medicinal plants at medical centers, and the performance of ancient Greek plays in ancient Greek theaters with costumes and mask we make ourselves. **Saturday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Haight, Catherine G.—*Citizens and Soldiers: Teaching Just War Theory at the United States Military Academy***—This presentation will focus on the philosophy program at the United States Military Academy, particularly the course of instruction in just war theory. We will begin by tracing the genesis of the philosophy program from its beginning in 1978 (arising from the West Point cheating incident of 1976) and its connection to the Cadet Honor Code. We will follow this with a discussion of the present form of the core philosophy program at West Point, to include the composition of the faculty, the structure of the course, and the goals and methods of the program. The mix of directive and non-directive moral education will also be discussed.

We will then attempt to demonstrate the role and value of teaching just war theory in an introductory ethics course, especially if the course is directed to the goal of showing how normative ethical theories apply to real world, public policy debates. In particular, it is our assertion that a discussion of issues in just war theory can serve as well, if not better than a discussion of issues in biomedical ethics, environmental ethics, legal ethics, business ethics, etc., in illustrating the practical applications of ethical theory. Also, introducing students to the basics of just war theory has the added benefit of making them a better informed citizenry when it come to evaluating and acting upon issues of war and peace, as well as the issue of morally justified actions during wartime. We believe that an informed citizenry (and we include in this class the citizen-soldier) is the best check against the excesses that too often accompany the decision to go to war and the methods political and military leaders use to prosecute wartime activity. **Sunday, 11:30 - 12:30 p.m.**

**Hayward, Albert W.—*Teaching Aesthetics Using Family Resemblances***—The concept of family resemblance can be a useful tool for acquainting students with aesthetic qualities and relations, important characteristics and categories of artworks, and the concept of art itself. It is employed here in a discussion-type situation using photos, literary excerpts, critical descriptions, art tokens and portions of musical works. The careful use of examples helps to enrich both cognitive understanding and aesthetic sensitivity by encouraging participants to articulate criteria for judgments of similarity and differences.

The workshop presents the concept of family resemblance using familiar and salient examples to illustrate the idea of a “network” of related objects. Distinctions are drawn between descriptive and evaluative uses of words, and between exhibited and nonexhibited characteristics. An elementary aesthetic vocabulary is then intro-

duced to facilitate discussion of novel and problem cases. Participants are asked to group items on the basis of shared, resembling and analogical properties, thus creating a network. Eventually a resemblance is recognized between the activity itself, and the language game of art. **Sunday, 11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Holmes, Richard—*Philosophy in Literature: Two Cases in Aid of Uncovering Our Pre-Understanding of the World***—I shall be presenting one of the ways that I use to introduce philosophical problems through literature. The first text is a page of nonsense, or so it appears, that I ask the audience to attempt to interpret into a meaningful pattern. Through a guided discussion I help them explicate the process they went through as it becomes apparent what this text is. In this portion of the discussion, it should become clear that we bring to any attempt to interpret a text an entire repertoire of techniques and presuppositions that enable interpretation. Thereby, I sensitize everyone to the possibility that even straightforward interpretations, of texts or any thing, are not necessarily free of assumptions and require criteria for legitimating them. For the next part I shall hand out a one page excerpt that captures extremely well some claims about the use of narrative to construct a self. Again, the aim is to loosen the hold that our ordinary way of conceiving the role of interpretation and storytelling has in our lives and bring home the need to make explicit the way we generate our claims about the nature of our self and world.

The aim of my presentation is to bring out the relevance of utilizing our reactions to literature as a tool to introduce and make salient certain philosophical problems. I am specifically interested in focusing attention on the problems that arise when we examine the way we come to grips with new objects, whether texts or ordinary physical objects, how we fashion objects out of the stream of experience, and how there is a continuum between literary texts, our selves, and objects of all kinds. Finally, I want to develop an appreciation for a view that contradicts our common sense belief that we are primarily and primordially a self who acts and who is engaged only in uncovering the pre-established meaning of a text, self, or object. **Sunday, 11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Holt, Dennis—*On the Unfamiliar Art of Reading Philosophically: Introducing Philosophy Through the Declaration of Independence***—Most students in my introductory philosophy classes are acquainted with The Declaration of Independence and recognize its historical importance. None are prepared to read it philosophically, with an understanding of its philosophical meaning and logical structure. Yet the Declaration provides a vital context in which to discuss ethical relativism, natural law, natural rights, equality, deism, majoritarianism, and argument structure, and to demonstrate the relationship of philosophy to real life. Furthermore, the process of writing and talking about these ideas shows students a style of reading that is less impressionistic and more critical than the one to which they are accustomed. Students are amazed, and often delighted, at the depth and complexity of a document whose meaning they have taken for granted. Using examples of reading and discussion exercises, and student responses to them, I illustrate the difficulties students have in reading philosophically and the progress they can make if properly guided.

Sunday, 11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

**Hughes, Roderick P.—*Teaching Philosophy and the Film*—**

The presentation will offer an unorthodox approach to raising philosophical and related problems in the classroom. It provides interested parties with an extensive list of films grouped within various problematics that provide alternative approaches to main-line philosophical issues, film aesthetics considerations, and in general both a critical and iconoclastic approach toward conventional society thinking.

More practically, the presentation will provide an opportunity to think through the construction of syllabi for courses that might variously be entitled "Philosophical Themes in the Film," "Film Aesthetics," or "Philosophy and the Film."

The presumption here is that philosophers and their philosophically inclined students should be aware of the innovative and riveting approaches to philosophical issues provided by film directors. Although admittedly these presentations are not as tightly argued as philosophical essays, they, nevertheless, provide an opportunity to see a philosophical artistry from another perspective and an impetus to further pursue critical issues in philosophy in more traditional ways. **Saturday, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Katz, Claire Elise—*Bridging the Gap—Creating a Community Between the University and K-12 Using the Philosophy for Children Program*—**

My presentation seeks to achieve a sharing of ideas and experiences that I have had over the past two years working with the Philosophy for Children (P4C) program at both the university and primary school levels. I have found that the methodology in the Philosophy for Children program, though intended for younger students, is quite effective at the college level.

I spent the last two school years using the Philosophy for Children methodology in my college classroom and I used the entire P4C curriculum in a private school located down the street from the university where I teach full-time. Both groups of students with whom I was working genuinely seemed to appreciate my being on "the journey" with them and responded quite well to the ultimate goal—becoming critical thinkers and taking responsibility for their own positions. In fact, they were so receptive to the P4C methodology that by the end of the semester both sets of students with whom I was working were able to come together for a meeting of the minds (together they were engaged in a discussion animal rights—their topic of choice) that as a teacher and a participant in the dialogue was one of the most exciting discussions I have ever experienced.

I would like to demonstrate the Philosophy for Children program (its curriculum and its pedagogy) in order to show how this program can be used at all levels—and ultimately how it can be an effective tool to teach students some fundamentals of a philosophical discussion (such as respect for the other and taking responsibility for one's position) so that they will be better able to engage in a philosophical discussion with anyone. As Matthew Lipman

(the founder of the P4C program) has stated, merely because children do not play the game (of philosophy) as well as some adults does not mean they do not play the game at all. Sometimes they just need to know the rules.

I would like to share with the other participants a video-tape of the discussion between the university and primary grade students and then discuss the impact the discussion had on everyone. **Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**Klein, Ellen—*Taking Seriously the Art of Teaching Philosophy*—***It is in fact nothing short of a miracle that modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry.*

Albert Einstein

*Education in music and the arts is most potent because by their rhythm and harmony they sink most deeply into the soul.*

Plato

The activity of philosophy, especially that of teaching it, commonly focuses on the intellectual quality of critical analysis. Yet the "love of wisdom" denotes an emotional as well as intellectual component. This emotional factor—that which actually motivates the experience of philosophizing—that which frequently neglected in the philosophy classroom. We believe we have discovered some interesting (and easily assimilable) ways of reuniting philo with sophia within the undergraduate philosophy classroom.

Following a brief account of the justification for incorporating art into the analytic classroom, we will present examples—this will be an interactive "hands on" presentation—and then hold an open forum for group discussion and "brainstorming." **Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**Knisely, Ken—*A Swift Introduction Into the Theory and Practice of Philosophical Television*—**Television is the most powerful tool of communication on the planet, and it is growing more pervasive each day. As well, this form is mutating into something that will partake of the computer, the telephone, and even the printed word, creating an electronic marketplace where goods will be sold and knowledge exchanged. Philosophers belong in this new agora, and must learn to ask their questions and kindle conversations using the technology of signal. Included will be a practical how-to guide for philosophers to use their local public or educational access facilities to start their own programs, as well as a review of current philosophical television and a look at the shape of things to come. **Sunday, 7 - 9 p.m.**

**Krettek, Tom—*Globalization in Philosophy—A New Course for College and Universities: Linking the Research of the Institute for Ultimate Reality and Meaning to the Teaching of Philosophy*—**The International Society for the Study of Human Ideas on Ultimate Reality and Meaning (URAM) researches and reviews those concepts, ideas, facts, things, axioms, systems, persons, and values that individuals, societies, and cultures throughout history have considered ultimate, i.e., that to which the human mind reduces and relates everything but which one does not reduce or relate to anything else, of supreme value, i.e., that for which one

would sacrifice everything but which one would not lose for anything else, at least for the present, and a horizon, i.e., that final hermeneutical principle which is not interpreted any further yet in the light of which everything else is interpreted.

The purpose of the presentation will be to identify and clarify the ways in which the work and ideas of the Institute for Ultimate Reality and Meaning can contribute to the revitalization and enhancement of the study of the Humanities in general and philosophical education in particular. Through its researches into the philosophy of understanding and its notion and practice of "Intellectual Democracy" the work of the Institute also will be seen to offer a way of incorporating the global and diverse reality of human existence into the scholarly and educational endeavor.

The presentation will seek to show that the love of wisdom has a positive content and how URAM's notion of a principle of ultimate reality and meaning can function as a norm for discussing the work of major philosophers and for establishing a dialogue between those philosophers and other figures, societies, and cultures.

The presentation will clarify its concept of "Intellectual Democracy," and the type of scholar, scholarship and intellectual community that such a notion requires. The URAM notion of "Intellectual Democracy" will also be shown to offer a partial reply to Rorty's claim that philosophy with a capital P is no longer possible. **Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**Ladd, Rosalind Ekman—*Teaching About the Rights of Children***—A workshop which presents the material from an upper-level undergraduate course on the rights of children. Discussion among participants will explore how such material might be used in other courses, e.g., introductory ethics courses, and the appeal of such a course both to philosophy majors and to non-philosophy majors, e.g., students in education, psychology and counseling, social services, medicine, and law. Much of the workshop will be a brain-storming session for ideas and materials that would introduce further inter-disciplinary and cross-cultural perspectives, as well as non-right-based ethical theory. Topics in the course include rights of children in the family, the juvenile court system, education, and medical care. **Friday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Ledoux, Arthur—*Using Meditation in the Teaching of Eastern Philosophy***—Eastern philosophy seems very exotic to most of my students. Sometimes the sense of the exotic lures them to the course, but more often students taking this course to fulfill a requirement find the content simply mystifying. I believe that this sense of the exotic is an obstacle to understanding for both groups of students.

Reading classic texts like the Bhagavad Gita, the Dhammapada, and the Tao Te Ching often reinforces a student's feeling of strangeness. One can help by drawing analogies between eastern themes and similar themes in the traditions they are most likely to know something about (Judaic-Christian religion and Greek philosophy), but I would also like them to have, in Russell's usage, knowledge by acquaintance as well as knowledge by description.

Since 1984 I have been using meditation in the classroom as a way of engaging students in eastern philosophy and deepening their understanding of it. There is strong academic reason for doing so since the texts are often written from the perspective of those experienced in meditation; the texts will likely be opaque to those without at least a taste of it. Additionally the style of meditation taught (vipassana or mindfulness) is so direct and simple that it reduces substantially the sense of the exotic.

In the workshop I will first describe how I have integrated meditation into the work of the class and then offer to demonstrate what I do by leading colleagues through a sample meditation leaving the remainder of the period for questions/discussion/sharing. **Monday, 11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Lillegard, Norman—*An Introduction to Agent Centered Moral Theory***—This presentation was designed for use in an introductory ethics course. It is aimed at:

- 1) Clarification of the difference between agent centered and act centered theory (some familiarity with the latter is presupposed)
- 2) Reflection on the following, or related, questions:
  - a. Do "good" people inspire our respect because of the principles they hold or because of the kind of people they are, or is this distinction not even tenable (or, is the "difference" mentioned in #1 illusory?)
  - b. Act centered theories often seem to focus primarily on ethical quandaries whereas (it has been argued) agent centered theories do not. What then *does* become of quandaries in an agent centered theory?
  - c. How do sentiments or feelings enter into moral life and moral assessment?
  - d. What differences, if any, in our conception of human life, might be reflected in the preference for agent centered, as opposed to action centered moral theories?
  - e. What sort of "habit" is a virtue and how is it that we admire people who seem to be good habitually while also admiring those who have to struggle to be good?
  - f. What is the role of the will in agent centered theory?
  - g. What is the role of reason and thinking in agent centered theory?

The focus for discussion is an edited version of the film *Weapons of the Spirit*, which consists of interviews with and descriptions of the people of Le Chambon sur Lignon, "rescuers" of Jewish "refugees" under the Vichy regime and the Nazi occupation of France. Textual resources for the discussion are from *Vice and Virtue in Everyday Life* (ed. Sommers) and include selections by Hallie (on Le Chambon), Bennet, Aristotle, Mayo, MacIntyre, Foot, Roberts, Wallace, Quinton, Coles and Sommers. **Friday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Llamzon, Ben—*East (Zen)-West Philosophies of Self and Non-Self***—How does one go about teaching Zen in light of its basic koan that "he who knows keeps quiet?" I "lead" this workshop only in the sense of starting off what I hope will be a lively exchange

of ideas on how to handle this basic difficulty. I sketch my approach to Western theories of the Self, with in depth analysis of reflective awareness, and of Language in interpersonal awareness and affection. Then a transition into science: the entropy of our technologized view of nature. Finally, the return to oneness and suchness with nature through (a) centering meditation and extension of ki in everyday life; (b) discussions around Zen anecdotes; and, one hopes, (c) personal enlightenment on "the sound of one hand clapping." No equipment. Just one hand used to clapping. **Friday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Magid, Carolyn H.**—*The "Values and Choices" Experience: Teaching Philosophy in an Innovative Interdisciplinary Context*—Consider a course with a primary focus on each student's exploration of his or her own values, choices, and goals. The course fosters that exploration through a variety of non-traditional pedagogical methods—a required service stint at a homeless shelter, study of the experience of fictional and non-fictional characters of different races, classes and genders, use of role-playing, and games. The course provides and reflects on the context for personal exploration by looking at alternative value systems, the constraints under which people operate, the role of power and empowerment, and utopian social alternatives. The course I am sketching is "Values and Choices" a very successful team-taught upper-level interdisciplinary course at Bentley College in which I have been the philosophy team member for 6 years.

My presentation has three parts: 1) a BRIEF overview of course structure, content, methodologies, goals, requirements and history; 2) comments on the course's most unusual feature, the required service placement in a homeless shelter, with special attention to the difficult questions this kind of assignment raises and the answers we offer; 3) discussion of the role of philosophy in the overall project, raising specific and general questions about the strengths and weaknesses of teaching philosophy in such interdisciplinary contexts.

In discussion I will look for dialogue, critique, and guidance on the specific questions I raise or on any other aspect of the course. I also hope to facilitate and encourage similar ventures at other institutions. (I will have syllabi and sample assignments for participants.) **Friday, 9 - 10 p.m.**

**Mallick, Krishna**—*Multiculturalism in the Undergraduate Classroom*—In the academic world multiculturalism has taken various forms. The focus of this workshop is how to include non-western perspective in different courses like Environmental Ethics, Business Ethics, Feminist Philosophy and Philosophy and Nonviolence. The specific topic of this workshop is the grassroots ecological movement of India called the Chipko or Hug the Trees movement which is based on Gandhian Satyagraha. The objective of this movement is to protect from exploitative commercial policies with regard to deforestation.

The aim of this workshop is to generate interest among educators to include the topics of Chipko movement in philosophy courses, both at the beginning as well as advanced level first, by discussing

how this topic can be approached from ecological, feminist and nonviolent perspectives and second, by explaining what is the ideology and philosophical basis of this movement. **Friday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Malone, Michael**—*A Strategy for Building Confidence in Applied Logic*—Students do need help in recognizing and evaluating the reasoning they encounter in textbooks and in everyday life. Unfortunately, traditional courses in introductory logic, which consider categorical syllogisms, sentential logic, informal fallacies, and some remarks on the nature of language, have served this end poorly. Some recent textbooks attempt to remedy this, but the length and the circumstances of most textbook exercises result in artificial, piecemeal tasks. And when students are confronted by their textbooks, magazine editorials or journal articles from their disciplines, the arguments are embedded in too much verbiage, are too various, and need too much paraphrasing for students to be able to apply with confidence the techniques they have learned from less than real exercises. Therefore we offer a strategy for integrating the elements of logic.

Nothing serves better the ends of teaching the identification and evaluation of real arguments than having students find them with a minimum of help from the teacher. In our introductory course in logic we require students to find on their own a variety of passages containing arguments and then to analyze them. We plan to describe some of these assignments and discuss ways in which they challenge students' judgment and insight. We will bring specimens for the audience to examine and discuss a strategy for dealing with the "extra" verbiage in which arguments are embedded; we will also hand out a student guide which supplements the strategy. **Saturday, 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.**

**Marks, Joel**—*Cheating*—I will relate my own experiences of student cheating in introductory philosophy courses I teach, as well as my students' experiences of their own and others' cheating in school and college, as they have reported them to me in a written assignment. Cheating is widespread—far more so than even a cynic may realize. After I have established this as a working premise, I will initiate dialogue with the other participants around three inter-related issues: 1) What is cheating? 2) What is wrong about cheating? and, 3) What can and should we teachers do about cheating? **Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**Marshall, George J.**—*Computer Access to Philosophical Materials*—This demonstration is limited to those who have or could have access through their university or college to Bitnet. While most academics are aware that they can use Bitnet as a means to send and receive e-mail and to participate in philosophy discussion groups, many academics are unaware that the same system can be used interactively. In the interactive mode (Internet), we have access to a large number of libraries, data bases, and assorted other networks throughout the world at **no cost**. While this interactive mode is still very much in its infancy, it provides a major resource which can assist in the teaching of philosophy. This demonstration will show how to hook on to the internet, ways to get protocols, and will illustrate some of the wide range of materials that are

available. Saturday, 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

**Marshall, George J.—*The Art of the Philosophy Assignment***—

While for most of us there is a real gap between our teaching activities and the assignments/tests that we give, there is also a sense that this is not how it should be. The assignments and tests we give ought to be an integral element of the whole teaching process. We have a sense that when we make up tests, give them, and correct them that we should be teaching in the truest sense of the term. The problem is that there is a real difference between what we deep down sense ought to be the case and what we actually find ourselves doing. The purpose of this workshop is to attempt to overcome the difference between this ideal and what we actually do.

Producing good assignments requires an awareness of what you are trying to achieve, the nature of your subject matter, and who you students are and what their needs are. In many respects, assignments require the same care and concerns that your lectures require. This workshop will, in very practical ways, investigate: the different ways we communicate to our students in giving an assignment, the purposes for which assignments are given, and what constitutes a good assignment. It is hoped that participants in the workshop will be willing to share their experiences even to the point of giving examples of assignments that really worked. **Saturday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Matthews, Gareth—*The Child as Natural Philosopher***—In my talk I will give both (1) examples of young children spontaneously making comments, asking questions, and even engaging in reasoning that professional philosophers can recognize as philosophical, and also (2) examples of philosophical dialogue with children in which the children have been deliberately engaged in trying to solve a philosophical problem.

The examples that I shall provide of children as philosophers help us both to understand children better and also to understand philosophy better. **Friday, 7:15 - 8:45 p.m.; “Special for Kids” Saturday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**McConnell, Matthew—*King Lear, Ivan Ilyich, Nora Helmer, the Prodigal Son, and other Great Philosophers***—My presentation would deal with a brief review of the work in which these characters appear, namely: 1) *King Lear*—Shakespeare; 2) *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*—Tolstoy; 3) *A Doll’s House*—Ibsen; and, 4) *The Return of the Prodigal Son*—Andre Gide. What I would seek to achieve in my part of the presentation would be to show that in a general introduction to philosophy course, a good way to make philosophy real to students is to make use of fairly well-known literary characters as auxiliary readings, and to determine how these characters achieved or failed to achieve wisdom. (The four characters and works listed as simply four out of any number of literary works—plays—novels—short stories—epics—poems.)

If philosophy is supposed to help us to gain some perspective on how to live our lives, and to separate out what is important from what isn’t, then I submit that these four characters among many,

can help students to achieve the goal of living a more philosophical existence. **Friday, 2:00 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Mechanic, Janevive Jean—*Teaching Bioethical Decision Making***—The workshop will begin with an introduction to Bioethics. This will include normative and non-normative approaches to Bioethics, a brief survey of teleological and deontological theories, invariant components of clinical cases, topics for the consideration of cases including medical indications, patient preferences, quality of life, and socio-economic factors. A procedure for resolving controversial cases will be offered. The participants will then be divided into small discussion groups. It is in these groups that they will have the opportunity to apply the information received to actual case situations. The case histories selected for discussion will include some which have received wide publicity. Each group will select a chairperson who will moderate the discussion and a recorder to detail the group’s considerations. The discussants will review the cases, apply the principles, theories, and other guidelines previously suggested by the presenter, and reach a “counsel” that the group believes could be offered to a practitioner seeking advice. In essence, the discussion group will be a “mock” ethics committee. The participants will then reconvene and indicate their decisions. **Saturday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Mendenhall, Vance—*Getting Into Arguments***—I will present a set of techniques and strategies for bringing students to see argumentation and critical thinking as transactions of a particular kind. These techniques and strategies make clear how an essential feature of argumentative texts is their capacity to generate other argumentative texts that involve reasoned, critical assent or dissent. They show, in other words, that even when we think of arguments in terms of war and of winning and losing, we have arguments only by producing other and new argumentative texts whereby we show that we see the original text is acceptable in so far as it makes sense and is reasonable. **Saturday, 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.**

**Miller, Myron—*Using the Computer to Teach Philosophy***—By using five or six specific lessons designed for student interaction with the computer, the presentation will illustrate the following:

1. Philosophical concepts, not merely logical form, can be taught in the computer interactive mode;
2. Two types of lessons are effective, the first being subject oriented and designed to prepare students to understand better the material presented in texts (primary and secondary) and lectures, the second being literature oriented, i.e., designed to assist students to think through classic material presenting philosophical issues and methods of problem solving;
3. How such interactive materials are designed to improve both classroom discussion and test results.

All of these lessons rest on an over riding commitment to the belief that philosophical problems, as problems, emerge from common sense, i.e., that students are encouraged to discover what beliefs they actually hold to be true but which contradict other beliefs which they also hold to be true. Once students are brought into the

discovery process, then they are ready to identify the usefulness and importance of theoretic activity, i.e., the process of eliminating the contradictions they as rational people do in fact hold.

The aim will be to obtain feed-back from colleagues on the effectiveness of the materials produced and the approach taken. **Monday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**Nardone, Henry—*Using the Film Twelve Angry Men in a Critical Thinking Course***—The film *Twelve Angry Men* is an exciting, suspenseful drama of jurors trying to reach a verdict in a murder trial. Eleven agree that the defendant is guilty, but one juror (Henry Fonda) believes the man is innocent and sets out to prove he's right. In addition to Fonda, the excellent cast includes Lee J. Cobb as his main opposition; Ed Begley as a hateful bigot; E.G. Marshall as a cold, indifferent stockbroker; Jack Warden as a baseball fanatic; and, Jack Klugman as a sympathetic peer of the defendant.

This session will first view the film and then discuss sequences to see how the jurors exemplify or fail to exemplify the character traits of a critical thinker. As Richard Paul has noted, critical thinkers exhibit "a passionate drive for clarity, accuracy, and fairmindedness, a fervor for getting to the bottom of things...for listening sympathetically to opposite points of view, a compelling drive to seek out evidence, and an intense aversion to contradiction, sloppy thinking, inconsistent standards, [and] a devotion to truth as against self-interest."

Given the importance of jury room decisions and the critical thinking (or the lack of it) that is required for such decisions, through the use of *Twelve Angry Men* students should more readily come to see the duty of jurors to weigh evidence carefully, to consider competing viewpoints and to put aside their prejudices so as to judge objectively and impartially.

Using sequences from the film, this session will review some basic fallacies committed by the jurors in their deliberations, consider the character traits of the jury members in the film to argue that critical thinking is more than a mere skill but a disposition difficult, if not, impossible to impart in one course, and conclude with considerations of the benefits and drawbacks of teaching critical thinking in the context of the jury room. **Saturday, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Nash, Margaret—*Exercises Designed to Involve Students in Understanding Racism and Sexism***—Our presentation will focus on presenting a few of the exercises that we utilize in our course titled "Philosophical Issues in Prejudice and Discrimination." This course is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the injustices (violations of freedom, autonomy, equality) surrounding prejudice and discrimination. We concentrate on racism and sexism, discussing what these phenomena are (how best to define and explain them), how they have developed historically, how they are maintained, and what should and could be done in response to them. The course draws on perspectives and material from sociology, psychology, history, social theory and philosophy,

especially moral philosophy and social/political philosophy. We both teach this course which satisfies a general education requirement in both "Prejudice and Discrimination" and "Analysis of Values" at our institution.

Our presentation will cover six exercises that we have found to be effective in helping our students to experience and to concretely engage with the problems that racism and sexism present to those who suffer from them. These exercises are very concrete and more or less force students to relate to and experience material that they might be defensive toward or not inherently interested in. **Saturday, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.**

**Preston, Janet—*Techniques to Encourage Critical Thinking About Values***—Critical thinking is an essential element of a philosophy professor's work in classrooms dealing with values and ethics. Students seldom know what their values really are; their actions often contradict their asserted values. Given the ethical crises manifest in industry, government, business and the professions, as well as in people's personal lives, academia must embrace effective means of encouraging students to think critically.

I have found a step-by-step process by which students may slowly uncover powerful ethical biases which unknown to them, run their lives. My presentation is an effort to share some of the techniques which have worked to increase students' awareness of the hidden values determining their attitudes and motivating their actions. **Monday, 11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Pritchard, Ivor—*Who Protects Human Research Subjects?***—This presentation will demonstrate and review the merits of a strategy for teaching a lesson in applied ethics, i.e., how moral principles currently influence efforts to protect human research subjects in federally-supported research in the United States. It will include (1) a summary account of the existing federally-regulated Institutional Review Board (IRB) system for reviewing research projects involving human research subjects, and the ethical principles underlying that system; (2) participation in a mock review of a research protocol to determine whether the proposed research project makes adequate provisions for the protection of human research subjects; (3) an evaluation of how the participants' deliberations actually relied on moral principles; and, (4) a discussion of what educational benefits might accrue from this kind of experience, in either actual IRB deliberations or in educational experiences designed to resemble them. **Sunday, 7 - 9 p.m.**

**Richards, Randy—*Beyond the Groves: Ethics for Professionals Outside of the University***—Numerous opportunities exist to teach philosophy outside a traditional academic setting to wider audiences, particularly to various professional groups. The differences in audiences and settings from an academic milieu require that instructional purposes, styles and techniques be adapted to the working adult audience concerned about their values and the decisions they must make in pursuit of their daily bread.

The purpose of this presentation is to discuss method, style and content issues related to teaching philosophy to working professionals. For the last four years, I have taught a state approved continuing education class to over 3,000 insurance agents entitled "The Ethics of Marketing Insurance."

My particular experience involves teaching ethics to insurance agents, but similar programs can be (should be) developed for lawyers, doctors, accountants, teachers and others.

My workshop presentation will cover the complete outline of the content and methods used in this ethics class. As the size of some of my classes has exceeded 150 participants, I have developed some techniques and skill at handling large group discussions that are a part of my presentation.

I will model the methods and techniques used in the class itself: readings, discussion, list building and quasi-lecture. I also intend to take the participants through the section on minicase scenarios, but I will change the scenarios to reflect exchanges and actions of instructors with students, other faculty and administrators. This will allow the participants to directly experience the method and group discussion techniques themselves and to see their applicability through participatory demonstration rather than instruction.

If time allows, I am also prepared to advise participants in the detailed specifics of how to get similar programs off the ground in their areas. **Sunday, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.**

**Savion, Leah—*Educating the Naive Reasoner***—Traditional view of human being as "rational animal" has been severely challenged by recent results of research in cognitive science. These results display, unequivocally, a disturbing picture of human inferential abilities. An alarming number of normal adults commit deductive fallacies when given simple ordinary problems. Repeated experiments show these deductive failures to be systematic and even predictable to a large extent. Cognitive psychologists, educators and students alike are reaching out to us, logic teachers, to restore our superior image.

The standard curriculum of elementary logic courses focuses on the introduction of formal systems. One may view the teaching of translation manuals and rules of inference as merely articulating knowledge our students already have; others may conceive of the task as that of engraving on "tabula rasa" minds, and the pessimist may claim that we are doomed to fail in the combat against systematic fallacious built-in inferential strategies. These perceptions reflect the most prominent models of human reasoning. The cognitive entity that logic teachers both enhance and combat is, I suggest **NAIVE LOGIC**. Naive logic is a theory that lay people have about correct reasoning. It contains rules of inference, logical and semantic concepts, biases and heuristics people utilize in their reasoning. Teaching logic, I believe, does not aim at modifying procedural knowledge alone, but also at correcting theoretical declarative knowledge embedded in the naive logic people employ. The talk centers on two major kinds of such elements: 1) Biases people are prone to have towards meaning, importance,

prototypicality, etc., and, 2) Conceptual confusions that seem to prevail among "untrained" reasoners, such as conflating the notions of validity and truth, confusing the notions of sufficient and necessary conditions, and mixing the verdict of "contradiction" with that of "incompatibility." **Sunday, 11:30 - 12:30 a.m.**

**Seibert, Charles H.—*On the Use of Adjunct (Part-Time) Teaching Staff: Conflict in the Academy***—There seems to be increasing reliance upon part-time teaching staff (sometimes called "adjuncts") in lieu of hiring full-time faculty at many higher education institutions. The trend is pronounced in some community colleges. Based on much experience as a "part-timer", I believe this trend generates conflicts of varying kind and intensity among teachers, students and administrators. I wish to clarify thinking about this trend and its alleged inherent conflicts. Ultimately, wisdom is sought about whether the trend bodes well or ill for the vitality of the teaching and learning process, as well as for the institutions which resort to the practice.

I present a set of arguments concerning the varying rights, interests and aspirations of full-time faculty, part-time teaching staff (adjuncts), students and administrators. For instance, I argue that when part-timers are expected to do work of equal importance as full-time faculty, and to do it with equal excellence, unequal rates of monetary reward are unfair. Other arguments concern alleged benefits and compromises regarding the interests of students and administrators.

The first half of this conversationally organized session will probe the strengths and weaknesses of arguments such as the above. The second half of the session will be devoted to arguments presented by participants. A report will be included concerning efforts in Illinois to limit or cut back the number of part-time teaching staff employed, especially at public institutions. The session is planned for a group no larger than 15 people. **Monday, 11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Sia, Santiago—*The Use of Philosophical Journals in the Teaching of Ethics***—This presentation attempts to share with colleagues my use of the philosophical journal as an assignment in the teaching of ethics. While the assignment itself may not be novel, this presentation will explain how I have incorporated it into my ethics classes. It will clarify the objectives, discuss the content, and explain the assessment of this assignment. Another reason for the presentation is to elicit comments from colleagues through a discussion of the merits and weaknesses of this assignment.

My use of the philosophical journal is to be seen within the context of the stated objectives of my Ethics course. These are: 1) to introduce the student to the ideas of some moral philosophers, and 2) to enable the student to reflect on morality and thereby develop his or her moral standpoint. Although the two objectives have a different focus, they complement each other. The philosophical journal (as distinct from the essay-type formal mid-term and final examinations which I give to them) provides the students with the ideas of the moral philosophers studied.

In my presentation I will elaborate on the guidelines given to the students to ensure that the students' entries are in keeping with the objectives of the course. I will also discuss the assessment used which invites the students to participate in evaluating their work. I will talk about my experiences and the effectiveness as well as the drawback of this form of assignment and its form of assessment. I will also refer to the students' own comments.

This presentation is meant to be "a sharing of information and experience" regarding the use of the philosophical journal. I also hope to get some feedback from colleagues in two ways: 1) the value, if any, of this assignment, and 2) its suitability for the teaching of other courses in philosophy. Participants will, therefore, be involved in an exchange of views and experiences. **Monday, 9:30 - 11 a.m.**

**St. Laurent, Claude—*Teaching Validity with Venn-Type Diagram Demonstration of a Computer Software***—This workshop will demonstrate a software program developed in 1989. The software program is designed for teaching and learning a method for testing quickly the validity of some types of inferences. It is the method of logical diagrams first developed by John Venn (Symbolic Logic, 1984). The premises of the inference are shown on the diagram and we see whether the conclusion can be derived from the premises.

The program allows for diagrams with 2, 3, or 4 terms and for compounded terms as in the proposition "Some (A and not-D) are not-(B or C)"; it can also test inferences including up to 7 terms.

A bank of 160 inferences is included as well as various types of exercises that improve logical skills. Moreover, the program lets the user analyze his/her own propositions and inferences. This allows for a wide range of teaching goals.

The program can help in teaching the main concepts of modern logic: truth/validity; natural language/symbolic language; diagram/proof; logical laws, logical consequence, logical equivalence, etc. **Saturday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Tipton, Paul E.—*Citizens and Soldiers: Teaching Just War Theory at the United States Military Academy***—This presentation will focus on the philosophy program at the United States Military Academy, particularly the course of instruction in just war theory. We will begin by tracing the genesis of the philosophy program from its beginning in 1978 (arising from the West Point cheating incident of 1976) and its connection to the Cadet Honor Code. We will follow this with a discussion of the present form of the core philosophy program at West Point, to include the composition of the faculty, the structure of the course, and the goals and methods of the program. The mix of directive and non-directive moral education will also be discussed.

We will then attempt to demonstrate the role and value of teaching just war theory in an introductory ethics course, especially if the course is directed to the goal of showing how normative ethical theories apply to real world, public policy debates. In particular,

it is our assertion that a discussion of issues in just war theory can serve as well, if not better than a discussion of issues in biomedical ethics, environmental ethics, legal ethics, business ethics, etc., in illustrating the practical applications of ethical theory. Also, introducing students to the basics of just war theory has the added benefit of making them a better informed citizenry when it comes to evaluating and acting upon issues of war and peace, as well as the issue of morally justified actions during wartime. We believe that an informed citizenry (and we include in this class the citizen-soldier) is the best check against the excesses that too often accompany the decision to go to war and the methods political and military leaders use to prosecute wartime activity. **Sunday, 11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Walters, Kenneth W.—*The "Felt Sense" and "Know Thyself" or "Gendlin and the Delphic Oracle"***—My workshop is a presentation of the role of feeling in my teaching of philosophy. My method presents both a reflective and a participative experience. The reflective includes an explanation of the "felt sense" as presented in the works of Eugene Gendlin. The participative includes actual "focusing." The "focusing" activity will include a session in which I function as guide for the participants' learning to identify the "felt sense" and learning how to stay with it until there is a "shift." "Focusing" will also include experiencing the "felt sense" of a number of works of painters and poets, two or three ethical issues, and some of the central aspects of decision-making, e.g., anxiety and the question of rights.

I will guide the participants here in the same way as I work with the students in my classes. My technique includes helping the students to set aside their deeply ingrained habit of instantly trying to evaluate and explain their feelings and assisting them to become first of all good observers of their own feelings. Very few of my students, if any, have had systematic assistance in the task of using their own feelings to achieve self-understanding and self-guidance.

The classes in which I am able to make the greatest use of Gendlin's insights and method are Aesthetics, Existentialism, and Introduction to Ethics, classes in which I have used this approach since 1982. **Sunday, 7 - 9 p.m.**

**Weis, Gregory F.—*Getting Students to Make Strategic Distinctions***—My presentation has two parts. First, I argue that there are certain strategic distinctions that students should learn in philosophy courses. I identify several distinctions that I believe are essential in an introduction to philosophy course. I invite participants to criticize and correct me. Second, I argue that distinctions are not well learned by simply being heard or read. Rather, to be properly appreciated, a distinction should be imagined against the particular kind of obscurity that it remedies. Distinctions are born as solutions in situations in which, prior to the distinction, it is difficult to understand what is going on. I describe some techniques I have developed to get students themselves to draw the strategic distinctions in philosophy. My methods involve asking students to imagine specific kinds of situations and real-world confusions that make the need for a distinction urgently felt. I

explain why I believe this concrete method of teaching distinctions is superior to more straightforward methods, ones that rely upon asking students for examples of an abstract distinction the teacher has just clearly identified for them. **Saturday, 3:45 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Whitman, Jeffrey P.—*Citizens and Soldiers: Teaching Just War Theory at the United States Military Academy***—This presentation will focus on the philosophy program at the United States Military Academy, particularly the course of instruction in just war theory. We will begin by tracing the genesis of the philosophy program from its beginning in 1978 (arising from the West Point cheating incident of 1976) and its connection to the Cadet Honor Code. We will follow this with a discussion of the present form of the core philosophy program at West Point, to include the composition of the faculty, the structure of the course, and the goals and methods of the program. The mix of directive and non-directive moral education will also be discussed.

We will then attempt to demonstrate the role and value of teaching just war theory in an introductory ethics course, especially if the course is directed to the goal of showing how normative ethical theories apply to real world, public policy debates. In particular, it is our assertion that a discussion of issues in just war theory can serve as well, if not better than a discussion of issues in biomedical ethics, environmental ethics, legal ethics, business ethics, etc., in illustrating the practical applications of ethical theory. Also, introducing students to the basics of just war theory has the added benefit of making them a better informed citizenry when it comes to evaluating and acting upon issues of war and peace, as well as the issue of morally justified actions during wartime. We believe that an informed citizenry (and we include in this class the citizen-soldier) is the best check against the excesses that too often accompany the decision to go to war and the methods political and military leaders use to prosecute wartime activity. **Sunday, 11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

**Wright, Ray G.—*The Evolving Research Paper***—Essentially, I am presenting a new method of incorporating the research project into the material covered in a course. I am convinced that oftentimes the research paper simply becomes a sort of appendage to the rest of the academic work going on in the course. It is written and turned in late in the semester; it does not evolve with the instructor's exploration of the material in the course. Frequently the student may see little relation between his research project and the lectures and discussions he encounters in the classroom. I know that there are undoubtedly many ways to overcome this problem, but I have found one way that seems to work well for me: implementation of my method creates a cohesiveness for all the elements of the course, and my students have commented upon its effectiveness.

In my presentation, I will explain my approach and pass out to the participants at the conference the handouts that I give to my students to help them understand the writing project. The participants will then be exposed to at least one more way of integrating their course content and research activity. They will also have at their disposal a way of showing how writing is not just a separate

discipline but has cross-disciplinary application, how the instructor can link philosophy and composition skills. My research project is especially valuable to those instructors who work with students who have for whatever reason never developed their writing skills. My writing project is a carefully structured step by step plan which the student can easily follow with check points along the way so that the student and the instructor can work together on developing a project that the student can learn from and be proud of. **Friday, 9 - 10 p.m.**

---

## *Notes*

---

# AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHILOSOPHY TEACHERS

## 1991-92 EXECUTIVE BOARD

### *PRESIDENT*

Terrell Ward Bynum  
Department of Philosophy  
So. Connecticut State University  
New Haven, CT

### *VICE PRESIDENT*

H. Phillips Hamlin  
Department of Philosophy  
University of Knoxville  
Knoxville, TN

### *TREASURER*

Richard Hart  
Department of Philosophy  
Bloomfield College  
Bloomfield, NJ

### *EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR*

Richard A. Wright  
Biomedical Ethics Program  
University of Oklahoma HSC  
Oklahoma City, OK

### *AT-LARGE BOARD MEMBER*

Paul Eisenberg  
Department of Philosophy  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN

### *AT-LARGE BOARD MEMBER*

Grant Cornwell  
Department of Philosophy  
Saint Lawrence University  
Canton, NY

### *PAST PRESIDENT*

Rosalind Ekman Ladd  
Department of Philosophy  
Wheaton College  
Norton, MA

### *CO-EDITOR AAPT NEWS*

Mark Lenssen  
Department of Philosophy  
Ohio Northern University  
Ada, OH

### *CO-EDITOR AAPT NEWS*

Daryl Close  
Department of Philosophy  
Tiffin University  
Tiffin, OH

### *9TH IWCTP PROGRAM CHAIR*

Betsy Decyk  
Department of Philosophy  
California State University  
Long Beach, CA

---