

UGEC2857 烏托邦與惡托邦 UTOPIA AND DYSTOPIA

2022-2023 Summer Session W 8-10; F 8-10 (LSK LT2)

楊德立 博士 Dr Tyler Yeung (cuhk.tlyeung@gmail.com)

課程簡介 course overview

本課程從跨學科角度，哲學地探索烏托邦與惡托邦的 1) 概念內容、2) 分析其形成理由、3) 反省及評論其論據。我們會思考烏托邦與惡托邦如何幫助我們了解人性、法律與公義？人類是否可能創造「理想世界」與「完美社會」？烏托邦思想或實驗，如何幫助我們面對當代社會的挑戰？惡托邦文學、電影及藝術等，給予我們甚麼警世啟示？

We will philosophically explore 1. conceptual content, 2. reasons for formation, and 3. arguments about utopia and dystopia in an interdisciplinary manner. We will consider how utopia and dystopia can provide insight into human nature, law, and justice. We will also examine whether it is possible for humans to create “ideal worlds” and “perfect societies”. Through exploring utopian ideas and experiments, we will attempt to understand how they can help us face contemporary societal challenges. Finally, we will analyze what we can learn about the world through studying utopian literature and films.

評核方式 assessment scheme

Assessment component	Description	Weight (%)
1. Group presentation	1. Present assigned topic.	1. 20
2. Participation and discussion	2. Active participation encouraged	2. 10
3. Mid-term test	3. Concepts analysis	3. 30
4. Paper	4. Under 2500 words in Eng or 5000 words in Chinese. Self-selected topics.	4. 40

講授大綱

- 總論：烏托邦和惡托邦的意義和影響
 - 烏托邦和惡托邦的概念來源
 - 烏托邦和惡托邦的文化表象
 - 烏托邦和惡托邦思想的意義
 - 如何從哲學角度思考烏托邦與惡托邦？
- 一、烏/惡托邦與哲學
 - 哲學家如何思索他們心目中的烏/惡托邦？他們理想中的形象，跟其哲學主題和論證有何關係？

- 包括：柏拉圖《理想國》（Republic）、莊子《莊子》、《新大西島》（New Atlantis）、霍布斯《利維坦》（Leviathan）、康有為《大同書》、布洛赫《希望的原理》（The Principle of Hope）…
- 二、烏/惡托邦與美學
 - 引介文學、電影、動漫、視覺藝術等等關乎烏/惡托邦的文化表象，感受作品呈現的美學，分析當中的哲學議題。
 - 文本包括：《烏托邦》（Utopia）、《大陽之城》（The City of the Sun）、《烏有鄉訊息》（News from Nowhere）、《基督之城》（Christianopolis）、《動物農莊》（Animal Farm）、《一九八四》（Nineteen Eighty-Four）、《美麗新世界》（Brave New World）、《我們》（We）、《生態烏托邦》（Ecotopia）、《大都會》（Metropolis）、《人吃人》（Soylent Green）、《妙想天開》（Brazil）、《銀翼殺手》（Blade Runner）、《大逃殺》（Battle Royale）、《V 煞》（V for Vendetta）、《廿二世紀殺人網絡》（The Matrix）、《太空奇兵·威 E》（Wall-E）、《飢餓遊戲》（The Hunger Games）、《銃夢：戰鬥天使》（Alita: Battle Angel）、《人間樂園》（The Garden of Earthly Delights）、《安樂鄉》（The Land of Cockayne）…
- 三、烏/惡托邦與政治
 - 思考主線：烏/惡托邦思想與政治現實有何關係？烏/惡托邦思想會帶來幸福還是災難？如何面對政治理想和反理想中的希望與絕望？
 - 主題包括：現實烏托邦在哪？共產社會是烏托邦？極權主義如何在美好社會裡盛放？誰的開放社會及其敵人？

參考資料選錄

Claeys, Gregory & Sargent, Lyman Tower. ed. *The Utopia Reader*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Claeys, Gregory. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Edited by Gregory Claeys. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Claeys, Gregory. *Dystopia: a Natural History : a Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Cziganyik, Zsolt, Vera Benczik, András Bozóki, Gregory Claeys, Zsolt Czigányik, Ákos Farkas, Dmitry Halavach, et al. *Utopian Horizons : Ideology, Politics, Literature*. Budapest : Central European University Press, 2022.

Goodwin, Barbara. ed. *The Philosophy of Utopia*. London: Frank Cass, 2001.

Kumar, Krishan. ed. *Utopia and Anti-utopia in Modern Times*. Oxford Blackwell, 1987.

Kumar, Krishan. *Utopianism*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1991.

Kant, Immanuel. *Religion and Rational Theology*; Translated and Edited by Allen W. Wood, George Di Giovanni. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Kateb, George. *Utopia and Its Enemies*. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- Kateb, George. ed. *Utopia*. New York: Athena Press, 1971.
- Levitas, Ruth. *The Concept of Utopia*, New York: Philip Allen, 1990.
- Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia*. London: Routledge, 1979.
- Manuel, F.E. ed. *Utopias and Utopian Thought*. London: Souvenir Press, 1973.
- Manuel, F.E. and F.P. Manuel. *Utopian Thought in the Western World*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1979.
- Pleij, Herman. *Dreaming of Cockaigne*. Trans. Dian Webb. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Sargent, Lyman Tower. *Utopianism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Suits, Bernard. *The Grasshopper: Games, Life and Utopia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Tod, Ian and Wheeler, Michael. *Utopia*. London: Orbis Publishing, 1978.
- Vieira, Patricia & Marder, Michael ed. *Existential Utopia: New Perspectives on Utopian Thought*. London: Continuum, 2012.
- Walsh, Chad. *From Utopia to Nightmare*. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- 陳正名、林某銓:《中國古代大同思想研究》。香港:中華書局, 1988。
- 康有為:《大同書》, 鄭柏林譯註。瀋陽:遼寧人民出版社, 1994。

學術誠信

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。

- 如屬小組習作，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（不論有否簽署聲明及不論有否直接或間接抄襲）均須負上集體責任及受到懲處。
- 如作業以電腦製作、內容以文字為主，並經由大學「維誠」系統(VeriGuide)提交者，學生將作業的電子檔案上載到系統後，便會獲得收據，收據上已列明有關聲明。

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。

學生將作業或作業的一部份用於超過一個用途（例如：同時符合兩科的要求）而沒有作出聲明會被視為未有聲明重覆使用作業。學生重覆使用其著作的措辭或某一、二句句子很常見，並可以接受，惟重覆使用全部內容則構成問題。在任何情況下，須先獲得相關老師同意方可提交作業。

Grade Descriptors for Essays

	Argument	Theory Analysis	Writing Style
[Excellent] A (85–92) or [Very Good] A- (80–84)	<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.
[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75) or B- (68–71)	<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 are not considered, or the response is weak or too brief. Theoretical and/or practical implications are not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. 	<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. Use of quotations is sometimes missing or erratic or without proper citations. Some key concepts are not defined, or are defined carelessly. 	<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 made clear. Illustrative examples are used rarely or not at all.
[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63) or C- (56–59)	<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 	<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. 	<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>only a straw-man version, or the response is ineffective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications are not identified, or they are asserted without explanation. • The argument is likely to contain contradictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of quotations is missing or erratic or without proper citations. • Key concepts are not defined, or are defined incorrectly. 	
<p>[Pass]</p> <p>D+ (53–55) or</p> <p>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]</p> <p>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 almost no effort in representing the theory accurately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is more unintelligible than not and the meaning of the language is very hard to discern. 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]</p> <p>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>[Excellent] 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”.