

《臺灣教育哲學》第五卷第二期 刊登文章篇名、作者、
中、英文摘要

皮德思 (R. S. Peters) 的「理性與習慣：道德教育的弔詭」：

回顧與批判/蘇永明教授

皮德思在 1963 年在〈理性與習慣：道德教育的弔詭〉一文裡宣稱「要進入理性的殿堂，必先經過習慣和傳統的中庭」，之後陸陸續續至少有五篇正式發表的文章對該文做反應。本文從事後的觀點重新回顧皮德思的和那五篇文章，後見之明或許能溫故而知新。本文的發現為：1、皮德思的文章有拼湊的成分。2、皮德思的比喻取自歐克夏對專科的職業教育與大學教育的區隔，但這兩者並沒有先後的關係。而皮德思卻將習慣置於理性之前，是逐步漸進的。3、皮德思的文中自稱是在解決亞里斯多德倫理學的困境，卻隱藏著康德倫理學的架構，將習慣比喻為他律，而理性則是自律。4、亞氏倫理學中並沒有自律與他律的區分，他以追求幸福為德行的目標，照康德的標準應該都屬於他律。5、後續的五篇評論，只有 Kristjánsson 明確地站在亞氏倫理學的觀點做較正確地詮釋。6、在將近 60 年的期間，對此文的解讀仍受制於康德倫理學的框架，只有在風向轉向亞氏倫理學時才逐漸看出皮德思該文的缺失。

關鍵詞：皮德思、自律與他律、亞里斯多德倫理學、康德倫理學

On R. S. Peters' "reason and habit: the paradox of moral education
": retrospection and criticism/ Yung-Ming Shu

R. S. Peters delivered a paper called *Reason and habit: a paradox of moral education* in 1963, and in the paper, he mentioned that "they (young children) can and must enter the palace of reason through the courtyard of habit and tradition". More than a decade later, five articles were published to discuss this statement. The aim of this article is to review Peters' article and the responses in the five articles. The discoveries are as follows: 1. there were adoptions of habit and reason from conflicting origins; 2. while Peters used a metaphor from Michael Oakeshott by dividing vocational education

and university education, the metaphor was not appropriate for resolving what Peters called paradox of moral education, given that Oakeshott's metaphor was separate and Peters' was sequential; 3. Peters declared to resolve the paradox in Aristotelian ethics, but his resolution was in a framework of Kantian ethics, where habit was compared to heteronomy, and reason was autonomy; 4. there were no division of autonomy and heteronomy in Aristotelian ethics, and Eudaimonia was the end of moral action in Aristotelian ethics which was classified as heteronomous; 5. the author perceives that in the five review articles, only Kristjánsson appropriately criticized from the stance of Aristotelian ethics; 6. in nearly 60 years, Peters' article was read from mostly the perspective of Kantian ethics, only after the renaissance of Aristotelian ethics changed the view point of criticism was changed.

Keywords: R. S. Peters, autonomy and heteronomy, Aristotelian ethics, Kantian ethics

我們應該特意進行愛國或打造民族性的公民教育嗎？

環繞 John White 等的相互論辯/簡成熙教授

愛國主義或民族主義在西方自由世界一直有正負面的爭議。有些學者認為愛國是一項美德，民族主義可促進團結。另有些學者則擔心會造成民族的狹隘與對外擴張。這項爭議也同樣反映在公民教育上。英國自由主義教育哲學學者 J. White 認為建立英國民族性的教育與自由主義不衝突，其他學者如 P. Enslin、D. Archard、D. Stevens 則站在自由主義立場持慎重立場，加以質疑。而 White 也一一加以回應。本文即檢視前述學者的相互論辯得失。筆者在結論中歸納兩項公民教育的理念型態，其一是接近 White 模式，學校可進行溫和的愛國教育，但是應秉持自由主義的精神，重視批判反思，重新更新民族傳統，正視民族的不義。其二是貫徹自由民主精神、規範各式權利義務，致力於國內不同族群地位平等，但落實普世人權價值、促進國際合作，不必特意進行愛國教育與打造國族意識。雖然本文也無法完全定奪以上兩項模式孰優孰劣，但是經由本文的分析，無論是何模式，正視愛國主義或民族主義的可能弊端，慎防國家公權力的誤用，假愛國之名，行擴權之實。這對於當下的臺灣，族群撕裂造成的政治紛爭，仍值得公民教育有心者

深思。

關鍵詞：公民教育、民族主義、國家認同、愛國主義

Should we Attempt to Promote Patriotism or Nation-building in Civic Education ? Some Debates around J. White and Others

/ Cheng-Hsi Chien

Patriotism or nationalism has constantly been faced with the disputes over its positive or negative aspects in the western world. While some scholars hold that patriotism is a kind of virtue and nationalism contributes to solidarity, others worry that they might bring about parochial nationalism or territorial expansions. This debate could be found in civic education as well. J. White, a British liberal educational philosophy scholar, believed that utilizing education to establish British nationality was not in conflict with liberalism, whereas other scholars, such as P. Enslin, D. Archard and D. Stevens, took a cautious stance on the liberal side and questioned patriotism and nationalism. This paper examines the gains and losses of the aforementioned scholars' mutual debates. In conclusion, the author summarizes two ideal types of civic education. The first one is similar to White's mode, where schools could conduct moderate patriotism education and are supposed to uphold the gist of liberalism, lay stress on critical thinking, renew national traditions and defy national injustice. The second type does not focus on patriotism or nationality, but pursues the spirit of liberalism and democracy. Schools should regulate all kinds of rights and obligations, and strive for the equal status of different ethnic groups in the nation. At the same time, we should implement the universal value of human rights and promote international cooperation. There is no need to carry out patriotic education and nation-building. Although this paper could not completely determine which of the above two models is better, it can be seen that both models look squarely at potential defects of patriotism or nationalism, especially of the misuse of state power under the disguise of patriotism. This is worth pondering for those who are interested in civic education in the current political disputes caused by ethnic cleavage in Taiwan.

Keywords: civic education, nationalism, national identity, patriotism

從 Barnett 「生態型大學」觀點探究大學社會責任的實踐理念

/陳玲玲博士候選人

大學與社會之間的互動，已經超越教學和研究的範疇，而擴展到促進社會和經濟的發展。實踐大學社會責任（University Social Responsibility）成為高等教育的任務與趨勢。本文簡述大學社會責任的內涵，並提出 R. Barnett 生態型大學（ecological university）的三項特色作為論點：一、強調「多元生態」及與外界的互動關係；二、追求人類「永續發展」及「福祉」；三、重視「存有」及「生成」的概念。最後，以「生態型大學」觀點探究大學社會責任的實踐理念，從三個面向進行論述：一、實踐社會責任的「主動性」；二、秉持大學的「自主性」和「批判性」；三、強調社會實踐的「智慧探究」。

關鍵詞：Barnett、大學社會責任、生態型大學、高等教育

Exploring the Practical Concept of University Social Responsibility from Barnett's Perspective of "Ecological University"

/Ling-Ling Chen

The interactions between universities and the society have transcended the scope of teaching and research, and which expanded to promote social and economic development. Practicing university social responsibility became the task and trend of higher education. This article briefly describes the connotation of university social responsibility, and proposes three features of Ronald Barnett's ecological university to argue for: (1) emphasis on multi-ecology and interaction with the outside world; (2) pursuit of human sustainable development and well-being; and (3) emphasis on the concept of being and becoming. Finally, this article discusses in three aspects that are related to university social responsibility: the first is the initiative to practice social responsibility; the second is the autonomy and criticality of universities; and the third is the wisdom inquiry of social practices.

Keywords: Barnett, university social responsibility, ecological university, higher education

物哀與玉碎：《鬼滅之刃》背後承繼的民族性與時代精神/黃盛譽

獨霸漫畫銷量排行榜、上映 73 天後成為日本影史票房榜第 1 名的爆紅作品——《鬼滅之刃》，儘管故事本身簡單，但細思其爆紅原因，似乎不僅是市場的推波助瀾，也提供了一條認識日本民族性、美學觀念與文化研究的進路。

本文將扮演拋磚引玉的角色，探討「物哀」與「玉碎」這兩個概念如何成為《鬼滅之刃》故事的基底，以及《鬼滅之刃》爆紅的背後，其意象與對白如何與日本人特有的精神性與美學觀點互相輝映？什麼價值被凸顯了？我將延伸詮釋的進路至日本文化中對於義理、恩情乃至民族性的呈現。試圖從中理出一條《鬼滅之刃》爆紅背後可能代表（或承繼）的時代精神。

關鍵詞：民族性、玉碎、物哀、時代精神、鬼滅之刃

“Mono no aware” and “Gyokusai” :

The National Character and Zeitgeist behind the Comic Demon

Slayer/ Sheng-Yu Huang

As the blockbuster which monopolized the comic selling ranking, Koyoharu Gotoge's *Demon Slayer* became the most popular manga, animation and movie in 2020. The story itself seemed simple, however, if one asked the reason why *Demon Slayer* became viral, it may not be as simple as it seemed. This article argues that the huge success of *Demon Slayer* could not simply be due to the marketing strategy, but instead, it provides an approach to the culture studies in the national character of the Japanese from their innermost aesthetic view.

By discussing two concepts “Mono no aware (物哀)” and “Gyokusai (玉碎),” this

article aims to explore how these two concepts became the infrastructure of *Demon Slayer*. How do the conversations and images in *Demon Slayer* echo with Japanese's specific national character and aesthetic values of the Japanese? What values were revealed and prevailed others? The author extends the analysis towards the studies of Japanese culture, trying to explore a plausible approach toward to the success of *Demon Slayer* and the Zeitgeist it portrayed or coincided.

Keywords: national character, Gyokusai, Mono no aware, Zeitgeist, Demon Slayer