

中文大學通識教育課程
幸福論 (Human Happiness)

課程資料 Course information
科目編號： UGED2321 Section Code: TBC 科目名稱： 幸福論 (Human Happiness) 上課日期： Jan 12, 2021 - Apr 13, 2021 上課時間： 星期二 下午 14:30 - 下午 17:15 上課地點： TBC (Zoom class) 授課語言： 廣東話 講師： 關瑞至博士 Dr KWAN Sui Chi Email： suichikwan@cuhk.edu.hk

科目簡介 Course overview
本科旨在以哲學觀點討論幸福的意義。第一部份介紹中西文化傳統中有關幸福的重要理論。第二部份探討幸福的理論問題：幸福的定義、快樂與幸福的區分、幸福的獲致、享樂思想與幸福理想，及現代世界中幸福的問題。 *哲學主修生不得選修本科。

學習成果 Learning outcomes
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 能辨認幸福的不同面相與詮釋。 2. 能掌握幸福的概念在中西思想史上的發展。 3. 能比較幸福諸種理解的差異。 4. 能欣賞幸福諸種理解的優點。 5. 能批判幸福諸種理解的缺點。 6. 能培養對幸福與人文價值的關懷。

評核方法 Assessment scheme		
性質 Task nature	描述 Description	比重 Weight
1. 課堂表現：	課堂與網上討論區均設討論問題或討論材料，學生須積極參與及表達意見。	10%
2. 小組報告：	全學期小組報告共分八次 (第四至第十一課)，	20%

	從報告列表中(見後附)，選其中一題，加以探討，製作成powerpoint 一套 (15 到 20 頁)，並於課堂上作少於30分鐘的口頭報告，再帶領簡短討論。 Powerpoint 提交日期：不遲於報告前一晚，以 email (suichikwan@cuhk.edu.hk)遞交。	(ppt: 5% 口頭報告：10% 帶領討論：5%)
3. 報告後短文	每一成員，對所報告課題，表述個人立場，輔以簡單論證。口頭報告完結後，一週之內以 email 呈交，字數不得超過500字。	5%
4. 個人期末論文	學術論文一篇，題目自訂，1,500 至 2,500字之間。論文必須要有單一可爭議論題，並以清晰論據予以論證。	25%
5. 期終考試：	考核範圍包括所有課堂之內容。 考核形式：短答二題，長答一題，共三題。 提交日期：第13堂 (20/04, Tue) 當天下午11時59分前。	40%
For Grade Descriptors, see the last section of this document.		

小組報告題目列表：

專題報告 01：反生育主義與幸福
專題報告 02：孔子論復禮歸仁與群體幸福
專題報告 03：安樂死與幸福
專題報告 04：老子小國寡民觀與群體幸福
專題報告 05：古希臘式的享樂主義與幸福
專題報告 06：佛家論苦的解脫
專題報告 07：斯多葛學派論苦的解脫
專題報告 08：孟子論人生至樂
專題報告 09：亞里士多德論德福一致
專題報告 10：莊子論魚之樂
專題報告 11：吃喝玩樂打機唱 K 索 K 與人生幸福
專題報告 12：演化論、腦神經科學與幸福
專題報告 13：商品經濟下假性需要的滿足與幸福

課程進度：Course schedule				
Class / Week	Date	Topic	Interactive Activities	Readings

W01/ L01	12/1	導論： - 幸福的意義 - 幸福與快樂之異同 - 課程概要 - 評核簡介	問卷調查與討論 I: 自我分析	郭柏年 (2020) 「幸福不必快樂」,《定見之外》,香港: 牛津。 Adler, M. (1985) “Happiness and Contentment”, in <i>Ten Philosophical Mistakes</i> . New York: Touchstone.
W02 / L02	19/1	人生之實相 (I) - 大眾心理學 (folk psychology) - 演化心理學 - 腦神經科學	問卷調查與討論 II: 分析他人	Harari, Y. (2015) <i>Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind</i> . Section I. New York: Harper Collins.
W03 / L03	26/1	人生之實相 (II) - 苦多樂少 - 卡繆的薛西弗斯	- Youtube: 哲學有偈傾 2020: 幸福提提你 (link) 討論： - 人生苦多抑或樂多？ - 人生苦多是利多抑或弊多？	關瑞至 (2017) 「西緒弗斯神話導讀」,《西緒弗斯神話》,香港: 商務。 郭柏年 (2020) 《定見之外》,香港: 牛津: - - 「有意義的薛西弗斯」 - 「其實人生遠比你所想的痛苦」
W04 L04	2/2	人生之實相 (III) - 反生育主義 - 安樂死	專題報告一	Benatar, D. (2006) <i>Better Never to Have Been: The Harm of Coming into Existence</i> . Oxford: OUP. Pp. 28-59.
W05 / L05	9/2	幸福與快樂 - 享樂主義 - 功利主義 - 欲望的層次與意志自由	專題報告二	Frankfurt, H. (1971). Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person. <i>The Journal of Philosophy</i> , Vol. 68, No. 1 (Jan. 14, 1971), pp. 5-20.
W06	16/2	Lunar New Year Holiday (NO CLASS)		
W07 / L06	23/2	幸福與人生態度 - 道家 - 斯多葛學派	專題報告三	Irvine, W. B. (2008). “Negative Visualization: What’s the Worst That Can Happen”. <i>A Guide to the Good Life: The Ancient Art of Stoic Joy</i> Oxford University Press.
W08 / L07	2/3	幸福與價值之實現 - 柏拉圖 - 亞里士多德	專題報告四	Warburton, N. (2001). “Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics”. <i>Philosophy: The Classics</i> . Routledge.

W09 /L08	9/3	幸福與道德 - 孔子 - 孟子	專題報告五	李敬恆 (2020) 「孟子論樂」,《立場新聞》。 (link) 方穎嫻(1979),〈論語之「仁」義〉《東方文化》,香港:香港大學,1979年。卷17第1、2期。收入1986《先秦之仁義禮說》,臺北:文津出版社。
W10 /L09	16/3	宗教的觀點 - 佛教的啟示 - 個案例示:佛門高僧 - 基督教的啟示	專題報告六	邵頌雄(2019.6.25),佛家的「無我」,香港:立場新聞。 (link)
W11 /L10	23/3	幸福與現代世界 - 商品化經濟 - 新馬克思學派及其分支的觀點	專題報告七	Wolf, J. (2002). <i>Why Read Marx Today?</i> Oxford: OUP.
W12 /L11	30/3	幸福與政治 - 個體與群體的張力 - 廢校論	專題報告八	Illich, I. (1971, 2000). Chapter 1. <i>Deschooling Society</i> . London: Open Forum.
W13	6/4	The day following Easter Monday (NO CLASS)		
W14 /L12	13/4	總結 / 測考提要 / 期末論文提交		
W15 /L13	20/4	期終測考提交		

參考書目：

中文

1. 方穎嫻(1979),〈論語之「仁」義〉《東方文化》,香港:香港大學,1979年。卷17第1、2期。收入1986《先秦之仁義禮說》,臺北:文津出版社。
2. 葛兆光(2003),《中國古代社會與文化十講》,香港:商務印書館。
3. 徐復觀(2014),《中國人性論史——先秦篇》,武漢:湖北人民出版社。
4. 徐復觀(1966),《中國藝術精神》,台北:學生書局。
5. 金耀基,1993,《中國社會與文化》pp. 128-53,香港:牛津出版社。
6. 關瑞至(2017),「西緒弗斯導讀」,《西緒弗斯神話》,香港:商務。
7. 李敬恆 (2020) 「孟子論樂」,《立場新聞》。[\(link\)](#)
8. 牟宗三(1983),《中國哲學十九講》,臺北市:臺灣學生書局。
9. 勞思光(2005),《新編中國哲學史》,桂林:廣西師範大學出版社。
10. 邵頌雄(2019.6.25),佛家的「無我」,香港:立場新聞。[\(link\)](#)

11. 唐君毅(1973),〈孔子之仁道(上)〉《中國哲學原論·原道篇》,香港:新亞書院研究所。
12. 王邦雄、岑溢成等(2010),《中國哲學史》修訂版,台北,里仁書局。

英文

1. Adler, M. (1985) "Happiness and Contentment" , in *Ten Philosophical Mistakes*. New York: Touchstone.
2. Aurelius, M, *Meditations*. (open source [link](#))
3. Benatar, D. (2006) *Better Never to Have Been: The Harm of Coming into Existence*. Oxford: OUP.
4. Frankfurt, H. (1971). Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person. *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 68, No. 1 (Jan. 14, 1971), pp. 5-20.
5. Frank, V. (1959) *The Meaning of Life*. Boston: Beacon Press.
6. Harari, Y. (2014). *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. Harper.
7. Helliwell, J., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. World Happiness Report. (2019). New York: Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
8. Illich, I. (1971, 2000) *Deschooling Society*. London: Open Forum.
9. Irvine, W. B. (2008). *A Guide to the Good Life: The Ancient Art of Stoic Joy*. Oxford University Press.
10. Lai, K. (2006). Learning from Chinese philosophies : ethics of interdependent and contextualised self. Routledge.
11. Leakey, R. (1994, 2008). *The Origin of Humankind*. Basic Books.
12. Pinker, S. (2016). *The Blank Slate: The Modern Denial of Human Nature*. New York: Penguin.
13. Warburton, N. (2001). "Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics" . *Philosophy: The Classics*. Routledge.
14. Wolf, J. (2002). *Why Read Marx Today?* Oxford: OUP.

網站：華文哲學百科 http://mephilosophy.ccu.edu.tw/explor_now.php

請注意大學有關學術著作誠信的政策和規則，及適用於犯規事例的紀律指引和程序。詳情可瀏覽網址：<http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/>。

學生遞交作業時，必須連同已簽署的聲明一併提交，表示他們知道有關政策、規則、指引及程序。如屬小組作業，則組內各學生均須簽署聲明；如作業有任何抄襲內容，所有組員，不論已否簽署聲明，均須負上集體責任。未有夾附簽署妥當的聲明的作業，老師將不予批閱。學生只須提交作業的最終版本。

Grade Descriptors for Essays

Argument	Theory Analysis		Writing Style
<p>[Excellent] A (85–92) or [Very Good] A- (80–84)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You provide a detailed and specific thesis statement that clearly describes the main claim(s) you will be arguing for and indicates how what you plan to say adds something to the discussion, rather than mostly repeating the material we have read. • You defend your claims in a well-developed way by giving and explaining your reasons for your position. • You identify likely objections, present them charitably and respond to them effectively. • You carefully explain the theoretical and/or practical implications of your argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You provide an accurate account of the relevant parts of the theory. • You illuminate the relationship between the theory’s conclusion(s) and its arguments. • You quote relevant key passages with proper citations. • You define key terms, and explain their role and how they relate to each other. • You discuss what the thinker would probably have said about an issue by drawing on what he/she did say about other related matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You choose your words carefully. The language is precise rather than vague, natural rather than awkward, straightforward rather than ostentatious. • Each piece of the essay is presented in a way that makes it clear to the reader how it is relevant to your thesis. • Where appropriate, you use real or hypothetical examples to help illustrate abstract points.
<p>[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75) or B- (68–71)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis statement is clear, but general and unambitious. • The reasons given to support claims are occasionally weak or too brief. Some claims in need of defence are merely asserted. • Some key objections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are minor inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some small points are overlooked. • The theory’s arguments for its conclusion(s) are described, but the relationship between them is not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is generally clear, but occasionally lacks precision or naturalness or desirable simplicity. • The relevance of small parts of the essay is not

	<p>are not considered, or the response is weak or too brief.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical and/or practical implications are not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of quotations is sometimes missing or erratic or without proper citations. • Some key concepts are not defined, or are defined carelessly. 	<p>made clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illustrative examples are used rarely or not at all.
<p>[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63) or C- (56–59)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis statement is absent or insignificant or confused. • The reasons given to support claims are usually weak or too brief. Many claims in need of defence are merely asserted. • Objections are not considered, or they are only a straw-man version, or the response is ineffective. • Implications are not identified, or they are asserted without explanation. • The argument is likely to contain contradictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are significant inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some major points are overlooked. • The theory’s conclusion(s) are described without reference to its arguments. • Use of quotations is missing or erratic or without proper citations. • Key concepts are not defined, or are defined incorrectly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is often unclear, due to being vague or awkward or ostentatious. • The relevance of significant parts of the essay is not made clear. • Illustrative examples are used incorrectly or not at all. •
<p>[Pass] D+ (53–55) or D (50–52)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You demonstrate an awareness of what an argument is, and try to make one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You grasp at least the main features of some of the theory’s most important points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is intelligible more often than not.
<p>[Fail] F (0-49)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You show little awareness of what an argument is, fails to make an argument, and shows almost no effort to make one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You fail to grasp <i>any</i> of the major features of the theory. You have a fundamentally flawed and distorted understanding of the major points of the theory. On the whole, you demonstrate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is more unintelligible than not and the meaning of the language is very hard to discern.

		almost no effort in representing the theory accurately.	The essay is thoroughly unorganized.
--	--	---	--------------------------------------

Grade Descriptors for Essay Examinations

<p>[Excellent] A (85–92) or [Very Good] A- (80–84)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You faithfully reconstruct the author’s positions, and prove this knowledge by knowing the argument(s) supporting the theses in the text. • You evidence independent and self-initiated thinking and understanding of the arguments and philosophical problems through your ability to present your own counter-arguments and possible replies to counter-arguments. <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You exhibit thorough understanding of the relations of the themes presented in the various texts. • You demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the relations between the various subjects and authors discussed in the course. • You demonstrate an above-average facility in judgment by applying the various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.
<p>[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75), or B- (68–71)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You can faithfully reconstruct the author’s positions, and demonstrate a basic comprehension of the arguments supporting those positions. • You show some independence in thinking, but have difficulty developing your own criticisms and rebuttals to criticism. <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You exhibit relatively complete understanding of the relations between the authors and the themes presented in the various texts. • You show some basic, though average, facility in judgment by applying the various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.
<p>[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63), or C- (56–59)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You demonstrate an ability to properly relay information about the various texts and the positions contained therein, but have difficulty re-constructing the arguments, presenting counter-arguments, and criticism. • You can faithfully relay information, but you show no independence in philosophical thinking, fail to show basic competence in philosophical argumentation and have a difficulty understanding arguments.

	<p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You show an incomplete understanding of the relations between the authors discussed in the course as well as the themes presented in the various texts. • You demonstrate competence to memorize information, but you have some difficulty applying various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.
<p>[Pass] D+ (53–55), or D (50–52)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You demonstrate some understanding of the course content, but have difficulty relaying accurate information about the positions and the arguments for such positions in the text. <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the answers are readable, you exhibit seriously incomplete understanding of the content as well as the relationships between authors and themes covered in the readings and discussed in class. • You fail to demonstrate facility in the application of various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.
<p>[Fail] F (0-49)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You demonstrate no understanding of the course content. You relay inaccurate information about the positions and arguments for those positions in the text. <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The answers are unreadable, and your answers exhibit a complete lack of understanding of the relationships between authors and themes covered in the readings and discussed in class.

Grade Descriptors for Tutorial Performance

<p>A (85–92) or [Very Good] A- (80–84)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You concisely explain the relevant material in a way that clarifies how the various pieces are meant to fit together. • You raise and clearly explain your own insightful questions of interpretation about the material. • You raise and clearly explain your own challenging yet fair objections to the material. • You construct charitable replies on the author’s behalf to your points, and provide your own rejoinders. • You carefully discuss the significance of your points and their theoretical or practical implications. • In discussion, you demonstrate a willingness to share newly formed ideas, and you effectively begin to develop ideas on the spot through constructive yet critical interaction with others.
<p>[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75) or B- (68–71)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of material contains minor errors, or is correct but adds little or nothing. • Questions/objections are relevant, but obvious. • Author’s reply is absent or oversimplified. • Implications are not discussed or are only briefly explained. • Good effort at discussion, but hesitant to take risks and has difficulty developing ideas on the spot.
<p>[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63) or C- (56–59)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of material contains significant errors or oversights. • Questions/objections are often confused or unclear. • Author’s reply is absent or mistaken. • Implications are not discussed or are confused or unclear. • Little or no effort at discussion.
<p>[Pass] D+ (53–55) or D (50–52)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You attend and show a reasonable interest in the discussion and a willingness to participate minimally if called upon.
<p>[Fail] F (0-49)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You rarely attend or do not attend at all. You show little or no interest in the discussion and a general lack of willingness to participate if called upon.

Note: Marks cannot be given for mere “attendance”, but may be deducted for “absences”.