Franz Knappik, Department of Philosophy, University of Bergen

UPED Basismodul, spring 2018, UiB

Teaching Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* to Undergraduates

In the following, I present a project in which I developed and carried out an undergraduate course on Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*. This course had a threefold goal: enabling students to access a demanding original text in modern philosophy; making them familiar with concepts and theories that they could draw on in the future, even if they do not pursue a career in academia; and increasing diversity in the teaching of the history of philosophy.

1. FIL123: background, challenges, goals

FIL123 "Eit filosofisk originalverk frå opplysningstida til 1900-talet" is an obligatory 5 ETCS-points course that BA students normally take in their third semester, parallel to an introductory course on modern philosophy. FIL123 consists of 6 weeks teaching, with 2 hours lecture and 2 hours seminar each week. According to the course description, the course is supposed to give students "the opportunity for in depth study of a central work in European philosophy written during the period stretching from the Enlightenment until the first half of the 20th Century"[1]. After completion of the course, students should be "well acquainted with the chosen work"[2], familiar with its context, problems, basic concepts, arguments and theories, and able to identify, analyze and discuss basic concepts, arguments and theories in original texts from the history of philosophy in general.

In preparing FIL123 for the fall term 2018, I identified the following main challenges and goals. First, I had often found it difficult in the past to motivate and enable students to work with historical texts in philosophy. A series of studies (reviewed by Lloyd 2015) suggests that undergraduate students' preparation of reading assignments is generally as low as 20-40% across various disciplines (cf. also Burchfield & Sappington 2000; Clump, Bauer & Bradley 2004; Hobson 2004; Brost & Bradley 2006; Walker 2017). If preparation of reading assignments is a general problem in university education, the situation in teaching original texts in the history of philosophy is even much more challenging, given the particularly demanding nature of these texts. Such texts are typically difficult to read, they often present views and arguments in a dense form and use a terminology and style that present readers are not familiar with. This tends to reduce the reading and preparation rate even further, thus making it even more difficult for students to achieve the "in depth study" and gain the familiarity with the text

---

that courses like FIL123 aim at. Moreover, the additional difficulty of historical texts tends to increase a familiar phenomenon that Brost & Bradley 2006 describe as follows:

> We feel compelled to cover assigned reading material because we cannot assume that a majority of the students have read and understood the material. They see no reason to read if instructors will, as students sometimes put it, 'tell them what they need to know' in class. (107)

A first goal for me in developing the course for fall 2018 was therefore the following: design the course from scratch in a way that would take into account both the generic difficulties with reading assignments, and the particular challenges presented by original works from the history of philosophy, and enable students as much as possible to get access to and to engage with the text.

Secondly, I have been educated to teach history of philosophy courses that were focused on scholarly knowledge and skills, and had as their main targets students who had an intense interest in such knowledge and skills. At the institutions where I taught before coming to UiB, this style of teaching made sense, since there actually were many students who matched this profile, and typically had an aspiration to an academic career in philosophy.

By contrast, I had come to realize that among the philosophy students whom I teach at UiB, there are extremely few students with this type of interests and ambitions. Instead, my students here have typically plans for careers outside academia, often as teachers at videregående skole, but also in fields completely unrelated to philosophy. They typically study philosophy out of a general interest and intellectual curiosity, not because they are excited by and want to take part in scholarly debates. The resulting mismatch between my attitude to teaching and students' interests and expectations was a likely source for frustration and lack of motivation for students.

A further goal I had in preparing FIL123 was therefore to select a text and identify topics that would be (a) engaging for students who have other reasons to study philosophy than a strong interest in a detailed scholarly engagement with historical texts, and (b) that could be useful for their future regardless what specific career path they were going to take after studying philosophy. More concretely, I decided that the course should offer the students opportunities for transformational learning through threshold concepts (Meyer and Land 2003; Meyer et al. 2010) that, in addition to improving their understanding of the history of philosophy, should increase their ability for critical thought about their own social environment and their role within it.

Thirdly, FIL123 is only one of two courses at our department where students get a chance to study historical texts in depth. Correspondingly, there is an expectation that this work be one from the canon of "classical" works in that period. At the same time, there is a growing awareness in the historiography and didactics of philosophy that this canon, which exclusively consists of works by white and male authors, is the result of systematic efforts to exclude everyone who is not white and male from careers and influence in philosophy (e.g. Alanen & Wit 2004; Walker 2005; Frank 2013; ~~Coleman~~ 2015; Van Norden 2017a, 2017b), that most members of this canon themselves held deeply sexist and/or racist convictions (e.g. Eze 1997; Valls 2005), and that uncritical reliance on this canon is one significant factor behind the extreme deficits in racial and gender diversity at philosophy departments across Europe, the U.S. and in many other countries (e.g. Penaluna 2009; Hutchinson & Jenkins 2013). My third goal was to design a course that, through its choice of readings, was sensitive to such issues, promoted gender and race diversity, and favored reflection on gender- and race-related topics.

2. Course design

2.1 Pensum selection and preparation

My choice of primary text fell on Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* (PS). The main motivation for this was that PS offers enormously rich and concrete analyses of social and historical phenomena, developing in this context concepts like "recognition", "master/slave-dialectic" and "alienation" whose huge potential as threshold concepts is evident from the transformative impact they had on many post-Hegelian traditions, such as Marxism and Critical Theory.

As a "canonical" white and male author with explicitly racist and sexist views (Bernasconi 1998, 2003) and an active role in the white-washing of the philosophy canon (Park 2013, 113ff.), Hegel can seem a bad choice when it comes to promoting race and gender diversity in philosophy teaching. However, thanks to a very productive legacy of PS both in feminist and in Africana philosophy, it is possible to teach PS with the aid of readings that not only make the curriculum more diverse, but also make students aware of rich philosophical movements beyond the predominantly white and male mainstream, and help to reflect (and to use Hegel and his threshold concepts in order to reflect) on race- and gender-related topics.

Finally, given the high degree of difficulty of Hegel's writing style, PS is particularly challenging when it comes to the goal of helping students to access an original work. Perhaps the most popular measure to face difficult texts in classes on the history of philosophy is the use of secondary literature. While I did make available texts from the secondary literature for each course week, and required students to use some secondary literature in the written course work, I did not want to use secondary literature as the primary tool to help students access the text, because it is not clear whether secondary literature can play that role efficiently. In a

closely related context, the design of a course about Kant's first Critique, it has been argued that intense use of secondary literature is likely to increase, rather than to reduce, barriers that keep students from working with the original text:

> Courses on Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* will inevitably include the primary text on the reading list, along with a mass of secondary literature. The trouble is that much of the secondary literature will have been written with the aim of making Kant's ideas as understandable as possible for university undergraduates. Faced with the choice between ploughing through Kant's turgid text and student-friendly summaries, students will opt for the latter, and merely pretend to have read the text through selective quotations and page references. (Ross 2009, 7)

In part, the same problem applies to classes on PS. In addition, most secondary literature on Hegel tends to be either too close to the primary text (just paraphrasing it and using its terminology without elucidation), or too remote from it (developing very free interpretations with little textual support), to provide a good understanding of what is going on in the text.

I therefore decided to develop an alternative tool for making the original text accessible to students—a "user-friendly", abridged and commented version of the text. First, I created files with those sections from the Norwegian translation of PS that I had selected for the pensum, and cut out redundancies and unnecessary bits, which abound in Hegel's text.[3] Second, I added footnotes that explain Hegel's terminology, relevant background, and his main claims and arguments. (See appendix 1 for a sample page.) The format of footnotes helped me to avoid that my commentary would have the same effect as secondary literature, and prevent students from reading the original text: to understand the context and meaning of the footnotes, students also need to read the main text.[4]

---

[3] Similar abridgments are used on a large scale by the platform www.earlymoderntexts.com, a corpus of student-friendly versions of Early Modern philosophical texts created by a leading scholar in the area, Jonathan Bennett. However, Bennett also makes radical changes to the texts—e.g. strong simplifications of formulations and language—without marking them as such. The result is that it is not transparent to the reader what is left from the original text, and what is Bennett's own paraphrase. By contrast, it was important for me that in my version of the PS, it was always completely clear where I had omitted text, and that those parts of the text that I kept were translated as closely as possible to the original text (cf. also the next note).

[4] In his 2009 paper cited above, Ross mentions that he has begun developing an online commentary for the *Critique of Pure Reason* which uses two parallel frames and hyperlinks to reach a similar goal: "Unlike the standard kind of textbook, which can be read without reference to the text, the commentary makes little sense without the text it accompanies" (Ross 2009, 7). I prefer the format of a PDF file with footnotes, as that file can be easily printed out, commented, highlighted etc. The main tool that Ross discusses in his paper is a new translation of his for parts of the first Critique, which is very free in its rendering of the text, and easier to read than existing translations. This, however, is a solution that I do not endorse, as I think that the translation used in class still ought to give students an experience of the author's style of writing and thinking that is as authentic as possible. Moreover, a free translation is likely to eliminate points of unclarity, ambiguity and tension in the original, which instead can and should be discussed in class. I therefore revised in my own "user-

The result of this process were about 100 pages with text and notes. In addition to making the text as accessible as possible to students, I also hoped that this form of (very time-consuming) preparation would communicate positive implicit messages to students which could help further reducing reading barriers—messages such as that I take the students and the course seriously, that I don't let the students alone with a difficult text, and that the difficulties they encounter when trying to read the text are due to the text and subject-matter, not due to their lack of knowledge or talent.

The selection from PS for the seminar readings was mainly focused on parts of the book that treat topics like recognition, master-slave dialectic, alienation, bad faith, and social institutions. Secondary readings included commentaries from the Marxist tradition and from Critical Theory. In addition, I dedicated one seminar session to authors who were inspired by Hegel's discussion of the master-slave dialectic. In preparing the session, students could choose among a text from the analytic tradition, a selection from de Beauvoir's *Deuxième Sexe,* and selections from writings by Frantz Fanon and W.E.B. Du Bois, who draw on Hegel's concepts and analyses in the context of racism and colonialism/decolonization. Furthermore, Hegel's chapter on master/slave provided also a good occasion to discuss Hegel's views on race and the Atlantic slave-trade.

2.2 Use of Canvas

In addition to meeting the specific challenges of a text like PS, I had the goal of reducing more generic obstacles to students' engagement in preparation and course discussion. I decided to use the Canvas environment of the course to implement several strategies for improving reading performance which are reviewed by Hobson (2004): be clear about the distinction between required and recommended readings, and flag as required reading only what is really needed (Hobson 2004, 3); use the syllabus to explain the relevance of reading assignments to course topics (Hobson 2004, 4f.); and use study questions to guide students' reading (Hobson 2004, 6).

Concretely, I used the "modulsider" function in mitt.uib to create a list with pages for each week that explained the topics and readings of each week (including information about whether a text was required or not, what the purpose of reading it was, and at what point of time students should read the text). In addition, I provided for each week a module page with guiding questions to assist with pre- and post-preparation (see appendix 2). I also sent students messages before the beginning of the course, pointing them to the information on the

---

friendly" text the Norwegian translation of the PS at many places, in order to bring it as close to the original text as possible.

modulsider, and after the first week, explaining to those who had not attended the first week how to find their way into the course.

2.3 Lectures and seminars

My main goal for the lectures was to introduce students to the overall structure of PS, its historical context, and the history of its reception. In addition to parts on the above-mentioned focal topics like recognition or slavery, or Marxist interpretations of PS, I also used the lectures to explain parts of the book which were not covered by those foci, and to enable students to get a sound understanding of the book as a whole.

In most seminar sessions, my overall goal was to use a mixture of group and plenum discussions to approach and analyze Hegel's text. I usually asked students to identify central terms or passages, and had them briefly discuss those in groups of 2 or 3, before discussing them together. We thus moved slowly through the key points of the part of PS that was scheduled for that week, discussing difficulties with the text, different possible interpretations, and the argumentative structure of the text. In doing so, I made sure that the discussion matched the study questions in Canvas. On some occasions, I used additional texts as starting point, e.g. a dictionary entry on various meanings of "anerkjennelse", or selections from Pericles' funeral speech as illustration for Hegel's account of ancient social life.

With this as a basis, I wanted to use two seminar meetings to go beyond the interpretation and analysis of Hegel's text, and to support processes of transformative learning with a wider scope than "just" the understanding of Hegel. One meeting was dedicated to the above-mentioned authors who were inspired by Hegel's discussion of master/slave (with "(struggle for) recognition" and "master/slave dialectic" as threshold concepts). Here, I asked students to first discuss in groups the text they had chosen to prepare from a list of options with short Hegel-inspired texts by de Beauvoir, Fanon, Du Bois and Brandom. Here, I used a group discussion of 30-40 minutes with relatively general guiding questions. My goal with this discussion was to enable students to explore in a free and creative discussion different ways of building on Hegel's text, and using his concepts and analyses in contexts that are different from those that he himself addresses (in particular, contexts of present societal relevance, such as women's oppression in de Beauvoir's case, and the postcolonial condition in Du Bois' and Fanon's case). After this group discussion, each of the group had 5 minutes to present their findings and ideas to the plenum, followed by 10 minutes of discussion in the plenum.

In the other "creative" seminar meeting, I attempted to go yet one step further, and to develop together with students new ways of exploring Hegelian threshold concepts, and

transferring and applying Hegelian analyses to contemporary issues. Here, students had prepared Hegel's chapter on "alienation" in feudal societies. In the seminar, I provided, as basis for discussion, more recent examples where structures similar to those described by Hegel could be detected—the museum scene from Woody Allen's "Manhattan", a recent text on the precariat in various European countries, and sexual abuse in Hollywood. I was careful to just present the examples, and then to leave to students the task of developing and discussing ways of applying Hegel's insights, and especially the threshold concept "alienation", in these contexts.

Finally, in order to better assist students in the process of writing their assignments, I used the last seminar group for a peer review of students' drafts.

2.4 Assignments

FIL123 has portfolio evaluation, with two graded assignments of 900-1200 words each, and written feedback on drafts for each assignment. I created a list of topics that students could choose from, including both topics on PS, and topics on authors like Fanon and de Beauvoir. Each option included several subquestions that students were supposed to answer in the text, and a recommended text from the secondary literature. My goal for these topics was to give students the flexibility to choose a topic and structure their text according to their own interests, and at the same time to give them a sufficiently concrete orientation on what aspects were important in each topic (see appendix 3 for an example).

3. Results

3.1 Lectures

When asked about their experience with the lectures in a web-based survey at the end of the course, 7 out of 13 respondents (out of 20 students who followed the course until the end) said that they could understand the lectures well, 2 said they were too difficult, and 4 that they didn't attend the lectures. The lectures were followed by 10-15 out of 20 participants. Given my and my colleagues' experiences from other courses, this a fairly good attendance rate.

3.2 Seminars

In the same survey, 10 out of 13 students indicated that they used the commentaries in the pensum file regularly, 3 from time to time. Several students wrote additional, very positive remarks on the footnotes. The seminar discussions were described by 11 out of 13 participants as "spennende og nyttige", by 2 as too difficult.

In my experience of the seminars, the two seminar groups (with separate seminar meetings) developed in quite different ways. In group 2, my impression was that most students

had prepared the text well. They were familiar with the clarifications that I had given in the commentaries, and we could discuss Hegel's views and arguments on that basis. In group 1, my impression was regularly that only 2-3 out of 8 students had read the assigned readings and my comments. Most students in that group came also regularly without a copy of the text, although I repeatedly explained that we needed that in order to discuss. Eventually, there were nevertheless good and constructive discussions in each of the sessions with this group, but overall, I had to spend more time explaining single words or sentences, and could use less time for group discussions and argument analyses than in the other group. Interestingly, even in the session for which they did not need to read Hegel, but a short extract from de Beauvoir or Fanon etc., 5 out of 6 students who attended that session in group 1 told me they had not read any of the texts (while in the other group, only 2 out of 9 students were not prepared for that session). In that meeting with group 1, I had to spend the first 45 minutes for having students read one of the texts, so that we could discuss (very productively) afterwards.

The selection of focal topics in the seminar seemed to have good results. When confronted with topics like recognition, alienation, racism, colonialism, women's oppression, cultural capital and the precariat, most students took actively part in the discussion, and discussions evolved that I experienced as very productive and genuinely insightful, both with regard to the understanding of Hegel and to philosophical thought about these topics. In particular, the discussions in the two "creative" sessions went far beyond what I had anticipated before these sessions. Some students told me that they found the discussions in those meetings particularly interesting. Two students chose to write an assignment on these more recent texts (one on de Beauvoir and one on Fanon), while one student wrote a brilliant essay that applied Hegel's notion of alienation to the present school system in Norway.

In section 1, I had cited a circular effect described by Brost and Bradley: students' low reading rate gives teachers the impression that they need to "tell" students "what they need to know", which further reduces reading rate. Interestingly, one student wrote in the online survey that (s)he experienced the seminar discussions as boring and hard to understand when (s)he was not prepared, and as interesting and exciting when (s)he was prepared—and this despite the fact that most seminar sessions contained *also* elements of "telling them what they need to know". This suggests to me that the combination of Hegel plus commentary as course reading may have created a balanced level of difficulty—too demanding to properly follow without having read text and commentary, but good to follow when one is prepared—which could be apt to avoid the dynamic described by Brost and Bradley.

3.3 Assignments/exam

The grades for the assignments were distributed as follows: A=15%, B=20%, C=35%, D=15%, E=15%, F=0%, with an average point sum (for A=5 points and E=1 point) of 3,05 (so roughly =C). A relevant comparison is provided by a very similar course, FIL122, which I had taught in spring 2018 on Leibniz's *Monadology*, with a substantial overlap between the groups of students who participated in both courses. In that course, the grades were distributed as follows: A=8,7%, B=17,4%, C=39,1%, D=4,3%, E=26,1%, F=4,3%, with an average point count of 2,65 (roughly, C-D). Hence, the course on PS overall had better results, even though this difference has not much statistical significance, given the relatively low number of students in both courses (20 in FIL123, 23 in FIL122).

A more informative measure is provided by the number of students who initially had signed up for the course and started participating, but then dropped out during the course of the term. In FIL122 in spring 2018, this number was 40%, in FIL123 12,5%. This finding is encouraging, as it suggests that the new course design in FIL123 really enabled students to find their way into the course topics and readings and to pass the exam (even though PS is in itself much more difficult than Leibniz's *Monadology*). Indeed, one student wrote in the survey: "Fotnotene [in the pensum file] var til enormt mye hjelp. Uten de […] kunne [det] kanskje endt opp med at jeg hadde gitt opp."

4. Remaining challenges

4.1 Lectures

The design of lectures was not my first priority in this course. In future editions, I am going to work more on this, in order to make the lectures even more accessible and motivate more students to attend them.

4.2 Communication of technical information

Two weeks into the course, a few students were still not aware of the "user-friendly" text file, despite several announcements in the course and via email. The only possible reason for this I was able to identify was that in the pensum list attached to the online course description on the department homepage, which I had to deliver months before the course started and which I could not change afterwards, I had not mentioned the user-friendly file yet because I was not sure if I would manage to prepare it in time. In future courses, I will have to make sure that any similar important information is already highlighted in that pensum list.

4.3 Assignments

Both in the online survey and in personal feedback, several students told me that they found the questions for the assignments vague. At the same time, I got feedback saying that the

subquestions disencouraged from developing an own structure for the text, something that I had told students I wished they would be doing. In future courses, I will have to rethink the way I formulate these assignment topics.

4.4 New format

From next year on, the two existing courses on original works, FIL122 and FIL123, will be replaced by a single, 13-weeks course, FIL129, probably without extra seminars. Given the overall very positive experiences I had with this course on PS, my plan is to adapt it to the new format when I will be teaching FIL129.

4.5 Preparation

The "user-friendly" version of the readings from PS and the Canvas-environment I designed for the course seemed to provide efficient tools for making the primary text more accessible to students, and for improving students' ability and motivation for preparing course readings. But my experience in seminar group 1 shows also that these tools are not necessarily sufficient for getting above the average 20-30% preparation rate found by the above-cited studies. One lesson for me to take away for the future is that I should try implementing additional strategies, such as journals (Hoeft 2012; Walker et al. 2017).

4.6 Diversity

The strategy of diversifying philosophy curricula by integrating female and/or non-white authors who *reacted* to canonical figures is problematic: the non-canonical thinkers tend to be merely "presented as offering a response to 'mainstream' (i.e. white [and male]) thought, rather than as thinkers who themselves, given the quality of their ideas, demand response" ('Why Is My Curriculum White?' Collective 2015, §6). In the case of this course, my impression was that students perceived de Beauvoir and Fanon as original thinkers who do demand response in their own right, and are in many respects more attractive than Hegel. Nevertheless, the issue of diversity requires more reflection—including reflection on the following questions: Would it be better to choose a non-canonical text as primary text in this course? If the course is on PS, how can the space and importance assigned to non-male/white authors in it be further increased? (E.g. should there be an obligatory writing assignments on that aspect of the course?) And last but not least: How can the department as a whole do more to open its teaching in the history of philosophy to non-white/male voices and traditions?

Cited literature

Alanen, Lilli, and Witt, Charlotte, eds. *Feminist Reflections on the History of Philosophy*. Dordrecht: Springer 2004.

Bernasconi, Robert. "Hegel at the Court of the Ashanti." In Stuart Barnett (ed.), Hegel After Derrida. London: Routledge, 1998, 41-63.

_____"Will the Real Kant Please Stand Up: The Challenge of Enlightenment Racism to the Study of the History of Philosophy." *Radical Philosophy* 117(2003), 13–22.

Brost, Brian and Bradley, Karen. "Student Compliance with Assigned Reading: A Case Study." *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 6:2(2006), 101-111.

Burchfield, Colin, and Sappington, John. "Compliance with Required Reading Assignments." *Teaching of Psychology*, 27:1(2000), 58-60.

Clump, Michael, Bauer, Heather, and Breadley, Catherine. "The Extent to Which Psychology Students Read Textbooks: A Multiple Class Analysis of Reading Across the Psychology Curriculum." *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 31:3(2004), 227-232

~~Coleman~~, Nathaniel Adam Tobias, "How Philosophy Was 'Whitewashed'", interview by Aaron Salzer. *Gender, Race and Philosophy: The Blog*, August 24th, 2015. URL= <https://sgrp.typepad.com/sgrp/2015/08/how-philosophy-was-whitewashed-an-interview-with-dr-nathaniel-adam-tobias-coleman-by-aaron-salzer-of-scienceorfat-t.html>, accessed November 30th, 2018.

Eze, Emmanuel Chuckwudi, ed. *Race and the Enlightenment. A Reader*. Malden et al.: Blackwell, 1997.

Hobson, Eric. "Getting Students to Read: Fourteen Tips", Manhattan (Kansas): The IDEA Center, 2004, URL = https://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA%20Papers/Idea_Paper_40.pdf, accessed November 30th, 2018

Hoeft, Mary. "Why University Students Don't Read: What Professors Can Do to Increase Compliance", *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 6:2(2012), article 12.

Hutchinson, Katrina and Jenkins, Fiona, eds. *Women in Philosophy: What Needs to Change?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Lloyd, Joshua, *Examining the Reading Choices and Reading Compliance of Students in Higher Education*. Washington: Washington State University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2015. URL=https://search.proquest.com/openview/7231c44b02d4331d9535684861b81dae/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y, accessed December 1st, 2018.

Meyer, Jan, and Land, Ray. "Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge: Linkages to Ways of Thinking and Practising." In Chris Rust, ed. *Improving Student Learning – Ten*

Years On. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development (OCSLD), 2003, 412-424.

Meyer, Jan, et al., eds. *Threshold Concepts and Transformational Learning*. Rotterdam et al.: Sense Publishers, 2010.

Park, Peter. *Africa, Asia, and the History of Philosophy: Racism in the Formation of the Philosophical Canon, 1780-1830*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2013.

Penaluna, Regan. "Wanted: Female Philosophers, in the Classroom and in the Canon." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 11th, 2009, URL=<https://www.chronicle.com/article/Wanted-Female-Philosophers/48729/>, accessed November 30th, 2018.

Ross, George Macdonald. "Translating the Critique of Pure Reason for Undergraduate Students." *APA Newsletter on Teaching Philosophy* 8:2(2009), 6-8.

Valls, Andrew, ed. *Race and Racism in Modern Philosophy*. Ithaca (New York): Cornell University Press, 2005.

Van Norden, Bryan W. "Western Philosophy is Racist." *Aeon*, October 31th, 2017a, URL=<https://aeon.co/essays/why-the-western-philosophical-canon-is-xenophobic-and-racist>, accessed November 30th, 2018.

_____*Taking Back Philosophy: A Multicultural Manifesto*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017b.

Walker, Mark et al. "The Socratic Note Taking Technique. Addressing the Problem with Students Not Engaging with Assigned Readings before Class." *Teaching Philosophy* 40:3(2017), 341-365.

'Why Is My Curriculum White?' Collective, UCL. "8 Reasons the Curriculum is White." *Novara Media*, March 23rd, 2015. URL=https://novaramedia.com/2015/03/23/8-reasons-the-curriculum-is-white/, accessed December 1st, 2018.

A. Selvbevissthetens selvstendighet og uselvstendighet; Herredømme og trelldom[337]

178. Selvbevisstheten er i og *for seg*,[338] idet og ved at den i og for seg er for en annen; det vil si at den bare er som noe anerkjent.[339] […]

5   179. For selvbevisstheten er det en annen selvbevissthet; selvbevisstheten er kommet *utenfor seg selv*.[340] […]

180. Selvbevisstheten må oppheve denne *sin annenværen* […]. [Den] må den gi seg til å oppheve *det andre* selvstendige vesen for derved å bli viss på *seg* som vesenet[341]. […]

10   182. Men selvbevissthetens bevegelse i forholdet til en annen selvbevissthet er blitt fremstilt som *den enes gjøren;* denne gjøren har imidlertid den dobbelte betydning at den er *selvbevissthetens gjøren* såvel som *den andres gjøren.* […] Bevegelsen er altså uten videre de to selvbevisstheters dobbelte bevegelse. […][342]

184. […] De *anerkjenner* hverandre som *gjensidig anerkjennende hverandre.*

15   185. Vi skal nå gå over til å betrakte dette rene begrep om anerkjennelsen, om selvbevissthetens fordobling i sin enhet, slik dets prosess fremtrer for selvbevisstheten. Denne prosess vil først fremstille den side der to selvbevisstheter er *ulike* […,] det ene […] er bare anerkjent og det andre bare anerkjennende.

---

[337] In English normally translated as "Lordship and bondage" or "Master and slave". It was a result of Force and Understanding (§164) that the protagonist of the development in PhG has turned from "consciousness" (note 31, file "PhG del 1.pdf") into self-consciousness. Cf. also notes 327 and 328 on the practical dimension of the notions of self-consciousness and certainty (of oneself).

[338] "Being in and for itself" means normally in Hegel "being fully realized", "having full-blown existence".

[339] A result from §§174-5. "Recognition [anerkjenelse]" is a central concept for this and later chapters. Recognition is normally a three-part relation for Hegel: subject A recognizes subject B as being/having some quality C (but it is often only implicit in a text what this "C" consists in). Very roughly, such recognition means that A understands B as being/having C, AND treats B accordingly in his actions.

[340] Self-consciousness now doesn't relate anymore only to itself and to an object that is dependent on it and has no proper own existence; rather, it relates now to something that exists independently from it.

[341] "Opphever": here: eliminate. "Det andre selvstendige vesen": the other self-conscious subject. "Bli viss på seg som vesenet": cf. note 327 .

[342] The way one subject recognizes another has an effect on how the other subject recognizes the first. Ideally (cf. §185: "dette rene begrep om anerkjennelsen"), this interdependence takes the form of a mutual symmetrical recognition as stated in §184. But in this chapter, this form is not yet realized. Instead, the relations of recognition that develop here are asymmetrical and therefore unstable.

Uke 42 Bakgrunn (1), "Den sansemessige visshet", "Persepsjonen"

I første uke skal vi skaffe oss en første orientering om Hegels prosjekt i *Åndens fenomenologi*, og komme i gang med de første delene i Hegels argument. Vi skal se på bakgrunnen til *Åndens fenomenologi* i den postkantianske idealismen, på Hegels drøfting av bokens prosjekt og metode i Innledningen, og på de første to "bevissthetsskikkelser", "Den sansemessige visshet" og "Persepsjonen".

- For å få en først overblikk over bokens formål og innhold kan du lese dette korte utdraget fra kommentarlitteratur.
- **Pensumet** for **forelesningen** er avsnittet "Innledning" (§§73-89 i filen "PhG del 1.pdf", både tekst og kommentar). Denne teksten drøftes i forelesningen og er obligatorisk lesing. Du kan velge selv om du vil lese dem før forelesningen, eller (rett) etterpå.
- **Pensumet** for **seminaret** er avsnittene "Den sansemessige visshet" og "Persepsjonen" (§§90-131 i filen "PhG del 1.pdf", både tekst og kommentar). Tekstutvalget for seminaret er grunnlaget for seminardiskusjonen. Det er nødvendig å studere disse avsnittene nøyaktig **før** seminarmøtet.
- Som **sekundærlitteratur** til pensumstekstene i denne uken anbefales K. Westphal, "Hegel's Phenomenological Method and Analysis of Consciousness", i K. Westphal, red. The Blackwell Guide to Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009 ↗ .
- Denne siden inneholder flere **spørsmål** om tekstene for forelesning og for seminar. Bruk disse spørsmålene både for å jobbe med tekstene på forhånd, og for å sjekke din forståelse etter denne uken.
- **Lysarkene** til forelesning ligger ut her.

Uke 42 spørsmål

De følgende spørsmålene er nøkkelspørsmål med hensikt til pensumstekstene, og kommer til å bli diskutert i forelesning og seminar. Bruk disse spørsmålene for å

- strukturere din lesing av tekstene
- forberede deg til seminardiskusjonen (som skal handle om disse og lignende spørsmålene)
- sjekke din forståelse etter denne uken.

Forelesning: Innledning

- Hva er Hegels hovedformål i PhG (Phänomenologie des Geistes = Åndens fenomenologi?)
- Hva betyr titlen "Åndens fenomenologi", og hva mener Hegel når han beskriver verket som "fremstilling av den fremtredende kunnskap" (s. 4 l. 10)?
- Hvordan kritiserer Hegel Kants erkjennelseskritikk i innledningen?
- Hvordan forholder seg Hegel til skeptisisme i innledningen?
- Hva er en "bevissthetsskikkelse"?
- Hvordan beskriver Hegel metoden som han bruker i PhG?
- Hva er "kriteriets problem", og hva er Hegels løsning i PhG?
- Hvorfor tenker Hegel at PhG fremstiller en *nødvendig* og *fullstendig* rekke av bevissthetsskikkelser?

Seminar: Den sansemessige visshet; Persepsjonen

- Hva er hovedkjennetegn ved Den sansemessige visshet og Persepsjonen, som de fremstilles på begynnelsen av kapitlene?
- Hvordan kan granskingen av Den sansemessige visshet og Persepsjonen inndeles? Hva er hovedskritt i argumentasjonen?
- Hvorfor begynner PhG med Den sansemessige visshet?
- Hvordan fungerer overgangen fra Den sansemessige visshet til Persepsjonen?

Appendix 3: sample assignment topic

1. Hegels kritikk av Kant i Innledningen til Åndens fenomenologi

Drøftingen bør ta stilling til de følgende spørsmålene: Hvordan forholder seg Hegel i denne teksten til Kants erkjennelseskritikk? Hvilke argumenter bruker han mot Kant? Hvilke rolle spiller hans diskusjon av Kant for prosjektet i Åndens fenomenologi? Kan Kant forsvares mot kritikken?

Litteratur: Eric Watson, «Hegel's Critique of Kant in the Introduction to the Phenomenology of Spirit», i Mario Egger (red.), Philosophie Nach Kant: Neue Wege Zum Verständnis von Kants Transzendental- Und Moralphilosophie. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014, 547-570.