1989

John Dewey's 1932 Ethics Aristotelian?

Patricia Haggard
Loyola University Chicago

IS JOHN DEWEY'S 1932 ETHICS ARISTOTELIAN?

by

Patricia Haggard

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

November

1989

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I must gratefully acknowledge that it is due to the unfailing kindness and the challenging and challenged patience of Fr. Walter Krolikowski, S.J., that this work was undertaken and completed. I consider him my mentor as well as my dissertation director, and I hope we are also friends.

Then, I thank Gerald Gutek, Ph.D., and Steven Miller, Ph.D., who undertook to act on my behalf as members of my dissertation committee. Although the topic was not one of their interests, their disinterested enthusiasm helped me make clear much that I could not have seen alone.

There are many members of the faculty in the Philosophy Department who answered my seemingly random questions and guided me in more ways than I can recall. Members of the faculty in The School of Education made me welcome even though it was clear that my goal was to quickly complete this work. The opportunity to study and teach at Loyola University Chicago has rewarded me in more ways than I can possibly express.

Last, but by no means least, I owe this work to the love and support of my family and my family of friends, living and dead, none of whom laughed when I said I was going back to school. They all know who they are.

PREFACE

This dissertation is the culmination of an ongoing interest in the two philosophers who are its subject. As a child, I knew of John Dewey as the man who had something to do with the plan of the elementary education that I experienced in Oak Park, Illinois. Later, at the University of Chicago, I had many friends who were the "products" of the Laboratory School, and although we never thought we might be influenced by Dewey, we discovered surprisingly mutual ways of thinking and living as students. Later, as a student at a British teacher training college, I amazed myself and others by the chauvinism with which I defended "Deweyan" ideas of education in a democracy. At the same time, I also enthusiastically embraced and later applied in my own teaching project method in an integrated curriculum, even though unaware that the "new" techniques owed much to Dewey's ideas as manifested by William Heard Kilpatrick.

In 1985, I began graduate study in the Philosophy Department at Loyola University of Chicago with a view to concentrating on applied ethics. Studying ancient, classical modern, and modern analytic philosophy with little or no previous background was arduous, but I began my second year with a course on John Dewey, during which reading his Quest for Certainty put my own struggles with "moral theory" in

perspective. I also discovered that understanding different "philosophies" was made easier by comparing and contrasting common themes found in the work of any two philosophers. Thus, I wrote about such things as autonomy in Kant and Rawls and, for a course on the topic of virtue mounted by Thomas Wren from the Philosophy Department and Walter Krolikowski from the School of Education, virtue in Aristotle and Rawls. Still pursuing my interest in applied ethics, I wrote for that first Dewey course a piece on "Work as Art," the philosophical underpinnings of which drew heavily on Aristotle in support of John Dewey's views on work in a technological society.

During my second year of graduate study, I registered for a philosophy of education course with Fr. Krolikowski, first, in order to bone up on Plato, Rousseau, and Dewey for my master's oral to complete the general program in philosophy; second, in order to get a better taste of Dewey, whose views were compelling; and, finally, in order to have the opportunity to work with Walter Krolikowski. It was over coffee after one of those classes that one of us said to the other -- neither Fr. Krolikowski nor I can recall which of us it was -- "Dewey is really very Aristotelian," to which the other replied, simply, "Yes." Two years later, I completed the Philosophy Department's master's program in applied ethics with a paper on virtue in Dewey and Aristotle, produced in another of Fr. Krolikowski's courses for

which we read both the 1908 and the 1932 editions of James Tufts' and John Dewey's Ethics. I then entered the doctoral program in the School of Education's Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies with a concentration in the philosophy of education. My interest in applied ethics continues, as, after all, at the end of Chapter 24 in Democracy and Education, John Dewey did assert "that philosophy is the theory of education as a deliberately conducted practice."

As I said at the beginning of this Preface, my interest in Dewey and Aristotle is ongoing, and this dissertation represents to me one culmination, that is, an "end-in-view" of formal academic study.

VITA

The author, Patricia Alison Louise Haggard, is the younger daughter of the late Ashley Peabody Haggard and Barbara Alison Rogers Haggard Matteson. She was born in Oak Park, Illinois, where she obtained her elementary and secondary education in the public schools.

After working as a lighting and set designer in theaters in both the United States and abroad, she entered Bulmershe College, Reading, England, and obtained her British teaching qualification in 1967. She taught all subjects including remedial classes in primary and secondary modern schools.

In 1969, she returned to Chicago and was employed as a writer and editor in educational publishing, as the drama and restaurant critic on several publications, and as a building rehab carpenter and painter. She continued her interest in theater by designing and constructing sets for local community groups.

She returned to college in 1979, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Arts in liberal studies at DePaul University in 1980 and the degree of Master of Arts in religious studies at Mundelein College in 1982. In 1985, she enrolled at Loyola University Chicago and received the degrees of Master of Arts in philosophy in 1987 and in applied ethics in 1989.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is to show that John Dewey's 1932 Ethics[1] is Aristotelian. I will try to establish that Dewey's thought is congruent or consistent with that of Aristotle, in particular, with Aristotle's thought as found in the Nicomachean Ethics.

Primary source

The subject matter in this work will concentrate on the 200-odd pages that make up Dewey's share of a revised text he wrote with James H. Tufts. Dewey and Tufts wrote the original edition in 1906, but, as will be seen, their separate contributions can easily be distinguished by the organization of both editions. This dissertation will not deal with Tufts' material nor will it speculate on whether the close collaboration of the two men might have resulted in some overlap of their ideas, whichever one actually happened to express them.

---

[1] The edition I will be using is the twenty-seventh volume of The Collected Works of John Dewey, 1882-1953, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 7: 1932, Introduction by Abraham Edel and Elizabeth Flower (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985). The form of footnote reference will be: Dewey, 1932 Ethics.

While there will be occasional reference to the 1908 Ethics, this dissertation is in no way intended to compare Dewey's views in the two works. A note by Abraham Edel and Elizabeth Flower in the Introduction to the definitive edition of the 1932 Ethics to the effect that such an undertaking "is at least complex enough for post-doctoral research,"[2] somewhat piqued my interest, but not enough to engage in such a study.

Secondary sources

There is a vast amount of secondary reference material on Aristotle and on Dewey. It is also easy enough to find material, both in the field of education and in the field of philosophy, that refers to the work of both men. In the area of ethics, however, while there is an abundance of secondary sources on Aristotle, there is much less on Dewey. Discussions of Dewey's thought on ethics refer to a great number of his writings; they rarely refer to those works entitled Ethics. Further, what few references there are deal almost exclusively with the 1908 edition.[3]

---

[2] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. viii.

[3] Except for Darnell Rucker's article, "Dewey's Ethics" in Guide to the Works of John Dewey, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), and excerpts in James Gouinlock, The Moral Writings of John Dewey (New York: Macmillan, 1976), I have gleaned only one further reference to the 1932 Ethics, a note in J.E. Tiles, Dewey (London and New York: Routledge, 1988), p. 231.

There are three possible reasons for the paucity of references to the 1932 Ethics. First, the 1908 Ethics was written as a textbook, and, as such, scholars may be less likely to take notice of a joint effort by Dewey and Tufts. Second, although the revision in 1932 was almost total, the Ethics was still only a cowritten textbook and received the attention of only six reviewers.[4] Although it remained in print until 1952, scholars seemingly did not consider it a fruitful source of Dewey's ideas. Finally, there is the matter of "fashion." Dewey has been out of fashion in philosophy, if not in education. Ethics has been out of fashion in education, if not in philosophy. Both Dewey and ethics are becoming fashionable again, and it is just my good fortune to have picked a field, in both topic and primary source, that is relatively unplowed.

Philosophical systems of Dewey and Aristotle

This study is not a discussion of the systems developed by each philosopher. Irwin argues that "Aristotle changes his mind on some fundamental issues about the nature of his argument...[even though] his later works develop views that are connected enough to count as systematic."[5]

---

[4] See Bibliography. The SIU Press' definitive edition of the 1932 Ethics, [LW: 7] in The Collected Works of John Dewey was reviewed by Darnell Rucker, Journal of Social Philosophy, Volume XVII, Number 3 Fall 1987, pp. 64-66.

[5] Terence Irwin, Aristotle's First Principles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 480.

Something very similar may be true of Dewey, as Horace Kallen says;

> ...if you wanted Dewey to state a system, he'd have to contradict himself. He'd have to set up a number of fixed points and a structural order of the universe, and deny practically all the fundamental concepts with which he is identified. He thinks the functional thoughts, and he writes the functional thoughts. And it doesn't matter what field you enter into...all [of those other fields] turn on the fact that they want to use rigidities, to deny process.[6]

Well, then, the two philosophers do not seem to have an overall system of philosophy. Do they each have a systematic ethical theory?

In the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle provides a "most detailed analysis of Greek attitudes and aspirations, modified and criticized from his own point of view."[7] His philosophical approach is the method of dialectic brought to bear on any issue, including the moral life. John Dewey maintains:

> No fundamental difference exists between systematic moral theory...and the reflection an individual engages in when he attempts to find general principles which shall direct and justify his conduct.[8]

It seems, then, that each philosopher has a way of going about ethical decision-making, but, as indicated and

---

[6] Corliss Lamont, ed., Dialogue on John Dewey (New York: Horizon Press, 1959), pp. 51-52.

[7] Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Terence Irwin, tr. (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1985), p. xi. This translation will be my primary source but other translators will be indicated when used. All references to the works of Aristotle will be by Bekker numbers which are standard in all translations.

[8] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 163.

as we will see further, neither has a "prescriptive" set of rules about what one ought and ought not do. Morton White is critical of what he believes is an attempt by Dewey to derive normative ethical statements from descriptive ones -- making an "ought" from an "is" -- but White is mistaken;[9] Dewey does no such thing. In fact, the "moral theory" of either philosopher is beyond easy access by analytic methods. Rather, the entire structures of Aristotle's and Dewey's ethics need to be examined to determine if there are any points of similarity. Those points can then be presented for further comparison and discussion.

A structuralist approach

What I propose is not so much a method of analyzing the ethics of Aristotle and of John Dewey as a way of examining and discussing similar points. These points of similarity overlap in many ways--much as members of a single human family may resemble one another. A family resemblance may be as obvious as red hair and freckles, or, less obvious, the timbre of voice or the tendency to weep with anger. Some points of resemblance can be traced to genetics and others to environment. Thus, a structural approach to ethics must take into consideration not just intellectual and psychological elements but also biological and physical

---

[9] Morton G. White, "Value and Obligation in Dewey and Lewis," The Philosophical Review, LVIII, 1949, pp. 321-29.

elements, including the variety of actual circumstances in which both the individual and the society exist.

In brief, the structure of ethics that is examined in this dissertation is comprised of the activity of human persons in terms of both society and the individual. All human activity is informed by the character and conduct of the individual in and by society, just as the character and conduct of society is informed by individuals. Further, the structure of ethics is also comprised of processes or the operational means by which individuals and society function, such as Dewey's reflective morality and Aristotle's virtue. Finally, there are ways of "becoming" by habituation and approbation, that must be included in the structure of ethics. None of these elements is inclusive of any other; some may occasionally be in opposition; but all, and perhaps some more not presented here, are essential to the whole. These particular elements have been chosen because they are each important to any description of human activity, and can also be identified in both Dewey's and Aristotle's ethics.

My task, then, is to see how all of these elements contribute to the wholeness of Dewey's and Aristotle's respective ethical structures, and, if their structures are sufficiently similar, to argue to the conclusion that Dewey's 1932 Ethics is Aristotelian.

CHAPTER I

COMPARING DEWEY AND ARISTOTLE

An examination of the relation between Aristotle and John Dewey must begin with a discussion of their works that are available to us. To attempt a comparison of the ethical thought of two men whose lives were separated by more than 2000 years is daunting, particularly because, as one philosopher lived so long ago and the other lived so long, there is an enormous body of literature that deals with the thought and ideas of each man. In those works concerned with John Dewey, there are many tantalizing references to Aristotle (occasionally, by contemporary writers, the other way around). In Chapter II, I will call upon many of the biographers of and the commentators on Dewey's life and thought to attempt a case for Dewey's Aristotelianism. This chapter deals with the works of my two protagonists and with narrowing the focus to Dewey's ethical theory in the 1932 Ethics. Such a narrow focus cannot be attempted with regard to Aristotle. Although the Nicomachean Ethics does provide the substantial points of reference, it is the Politics that provides the "proving ground" for Aristotle's ethical theory as part of a larger political science.[1]

---

[1] Irwin, Aristotle's First Principles, p. 24.

Review of the literature

The reference material for this dissertation can be found in the bibliography. A number of these sources will be quoted, and these references also will be found in the footnotes. I would like, however, to call attention to the definitive edition of John Dewey's work published by the Dewey Center in Carbondale and Southern Illinois University Press under the editorship of Dr. Jo Ann Boydston.[2] The Collected Works of John Dewey consists of five volumes of the Early Works, fifteen volumes of the Middle Works, and, when completed, sixteen volumes of the Later Works. All volumes have excellent introductions by contemporary philosophers and educators. Access to such a collection makes the writing task much easier and provides the necessary reference support for several works of biography titled, simply, John Dewey.

In another work, titled simply Aristotle,[3] John Herman Randall asks many more questions than he answers, but, in doing so, he makes some intriguing references to John Dewey.[4] Randall also reminds us that Aristotle's work

---

[2] References to volumes other than the 1908 and 1932 Ethics in this Collected Works edition will take the short form [MW: 5], and accompany references to earlier editions.

[3] John Herman Randall, Jr., Aristotle (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960).

[4] Ibid. Referring to the different forms and versions of Aristotle's thought, Randall says "...it appears quite as useless to attempt to harmonize all the writings [of Aristotle]...as to endeavor to harmonize, say, the early

is fragmentary and repetitious.[5] While the latter part of this description may in fact be applied to John Dewey, his work is by no means fragmentary -- we have it all -- from 1882 to 1953.

The works of Aristotle

Unlike Dewey's work that was written, or rather typed, by the author and published in his lifetime, Aristotle's work has come to us in the form of brief treatises and lecture notes, taken down and copied first by his students, and arranged, preserved, and rearranged into the form that was finally settled in the nineteenth century. There is no need to enter into a discussion of which works are more or less "Aristotelian" than others.

Not all of the Aristotelian concepts to which I refer come from the Nicomachean Ethics. That is, when Aristotle says that thus and so is the case in the Ethics, it often will be necessary to refer to another treatise, such as the Politics or Posterior Analytics to discover what he says about how thus and so comes to be the case. In addition, and although I rarely quote him, Thomas Aquinas' Commentary on

---

Hegelian writings of John Dewey with Experience and Nature and his subsequent books." p. 27.

[5] Aristotle himself makes reference to digression in his account at NE, 1095b14.

the Nichomachean Ethics [6] has helped me clarify some of my own thinking about Aristotle.

The works of John Dewey

While this paper deals specifically with Dewey's ethical theory in the 1932 Ethics, it is still necessary to place that work in the context of Dewey's corpus of philosophical and social thought. Between 1925 and 1934, Dewey entered the seventh decade of his life and retired from full-time teaching at Columbia. During this time, he also reached what some have considered the "height of his powers and influence."[7] He gave lectures and speeches, wrote literally hundreds of essays and articles, and published four major works -- Experience and Nature (1925), The Public and Its Problems (1927), The Quest for Certainty (1929), and Art as Experience (1934). In addition, he was engaged sporadically throughout this period in writing Logic: The Theory of Inquiry (1938).[8] About halfway through this extraordinarily active period, Dewey also undertook the

---

[6] St. Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics (Chicago: Regnery, 1964).

[7] Paul Kurtz, The Collected Works of John Dewey, The Later Works, 1925-1953 Volume 5: 1929-1930, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Introduction by Paul Kurtz (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985).

[8] Textual Commentary in Logic: The Theory of Inquiry in The Collected Works of John Dewey, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 12: 1938, Introduction by Ernest Nagel (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985), p. 534.

revision of the textbook Ethics, which he had originally written with James H. Tufts in 1908. In 1931, when the revision was begun, John Dewey had been widowed for five years and was seventy-two years old.

The 1908 Ethics

Dewey and Tufts had been colleagues at both the University of Michigan and the University of Chicago. Tufts remained at Chicago until his retirement in 1930. After Dewey's move to Columbia University in 1904, the two men undertook to produce a textbook on ethics, presenting the ideas they had developed both jointly and independently during the years at Chicago.[9] It was agreed that the work would be in three parts. Tufts wrote the historical Part I: The Beginnings and Growth of Morality; Dewey, Part II: Theory of the Moral Life and the first two chapters of Part III: The World of Action; and Tufts, the remainder of the book. Published in 1908, the Ethics became a popular university textbook[10] and was reprinted at least twenty-five times before 1930.[11] In that year, although it is not clear

---

[9] Textual Commentary, Ethics in The Collected Works of John Dewey, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, The Middle Works, 1899-1924, Volume 5: 1908, Introduction by Charles L. Stevenson (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985), pp. 549-550.

[10] James T. Farrell recalls using Dewey and Tufts'1908 Ethics as an undergraduate at the University of Chicago in the early 1920s. Dialogue on John Dewey, p. 131.

[11] Textual Commentary, 1908 Ethics, p. 553.

what prompted them to do so,[12] Tufts and Dewey undertook a revision of the textbook.

The 1932 Ethics

Tufts made changes in three chapters (1, 3, and 6) and added an entire new chapter on the Romans (8) in his first part of the revision. There are still nine chapters in Part I, but, in addition to the new chapter, what was Chapter 8 in the 1906 Ethics, "The Modern Period," has been "almost entirely rewritten" and become Chapter 9 in the 1932 Ethics, "Factors and Trends in the Modern Moral Consciousness."[13] The old Chapter 9, "A General Comparison of Customary and Reflective Morality," no longer appears in the first part.

Although there is no comment, much less explanation, in either the Preface to the 1932 Edition or in the otherwise excellent Textual Commentary as to why this was done, the topics of customary and reflective morality are taken up by Dewey in Part II. One can only assume that as Part II was "recast; the method of presentation...changed and the material practically all rewritten,"[14] the two

---

[12] I speculate that this may have been a "retirement project" for the two men, perhaps planned by Dewey. Tufts was three years Dewey's junior and apparently ill at about the time of his retirement (see Textual Commentary, 1932 Ethics, p. 473), but he recovered to write his share of the text and died in 1942, aged 80.

[13] Preface, 1932 Ethics, p. 4.

[14] Ibid.

authors agreed to this rearrangement of material from Tufts' section to Dewey's. In fact, their close collaboration makes it impossible to distinguish which of them contributed which ideas in the original arrangement. One can, however, suggest that these topics more properly belong in a section on the theory of morality than in the historical section. As for Part III, the entire section "with the exception of [five] pages...is new."[15]

Part II and the first two chapters of Part III are Dewey's contribution to the 1932 Ethics and will be the focus of this dissertation, although some reference will be made to the 1908 Ethics in support of ideas in the later work. However, I will not enter into any discussion of the differences found between the 1908 and 1932 versions, as there is ample evidence that Dewey revised and rewrote all the material. The later edition, therefore, can be said to constitute his considered ideas on ethics as of 1932.

---

[15] Ibid.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is an attempt to construct a methodology for the comparison of Dewey's and Aristotle's ethical thought. While it cannot be denied that there may be some similarities in the thinking of these two philosophers, such similarities cannot be argued solely on the basis of words used. Neither philosopher, and one did not write in English, offers examples of applications of moral theory whose congruency is immediately apparent by comparing terms. Nor is it possible to argue analogical likeness. That is, even if the attributes, circumstances, or effects of the moral "theory" of each philosopher were found to be analogous, it would also be necessary to consider moral "practice" or the processes of moral thinking and action in society, which would require setting up a whole new lot of analogies because of the vast historical distance between the two philosophers. Since the matter at hand is to establish whether Dewey's 1932 Ethics is Aristotelian, one can only identify a few points that the two philosophers seem to have in common and connect those points with processes they appear to have in common. If the resulting structures of points and processes are similar, that similarity will

enable one to argue that it is possible to show that Dewey's 1932 Ethics is Aristotelian.

For a method with which to compare the ideas of Dewey and Aristotle, I propose to take Dewey's own method of inquiry as a general framework. This chapter will offer material from Stephen Toulmin for specific method, consider Dewey's view of the places of inductive and deductive reasoning, and draw on Peter Achinstein for a discussion of what constitutes evidence and probability. Finally, Dewey's concept of warranted assertibility will be presented in support of my methodology.

The objective is to set up a method whereby the identified points and processes in the structure of ethical thought of Dewey and of Aristotle can be examined using the same methodological approach to discover what, if any, similarities can be found and the extent to which such structural similarities lead to the confirmation of thesis of this dissertation.

Dewey's Pattern of Inquiry

The objective of inquiry, according to John Dewey, is to resolve an indeterminate situation into a unified one. The first steps are to identify the "problem situation" and to determine a "problem solution." Reasoning or rational discourse determines the meaning of the situation, and that situation's relation to ideas that arise as further hypothe-

ses are developed. This operational relation between facts and meanings can then be subject to methods of common sense and scientific inquiry depending on subject matter rather than any basic logical forms or relations.[1] Propositions about subject contents or facts thus undergo independent development just as do propositions about meanings and their relations. Subject contents can be called material means and meanings and their relations called procedural means, it being remembered that both are operational since they are both means of determining the final situation and judgment.[2]

Dewey uses the term "relation" to describe the matter of inquiry, defines it, and redefines it throughout the text of the Logic. According to Gail Kennedy's rather succinct summary, there are four key types of relation in inquiry, connection or involvement, inference, implication, and reference.[3] The first two are existential, the actual subject matter of the problem situation is connected to the meaning that may be inferred from that subject matter or data. The third term, implication, refers to the relation between the meanings of various data, and the last term designates the relating or reference of such meanings to

---

[1] Dewey, Logic: The Theory of Inquiry, The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 12: 1938 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), [LW: 12] pp. 108-122.

[2] Ibid., p. 139.

[3] Gail Kennedy, "Dewey's Logic and Theory of Knowledge," in Guide to the Works of John Dewey, pp. 74-75.

existential subject matter. What inquiry is concerned with is the threefold correspondence between a relational structure of data and meanings and a set of inferences "which in their turn depend upon a complex of brute existential connections or involvements."[4] Or, in Dewey's classic definition of inquiry:

> Inquiry is the controlled or direct transformation of an indeterminate situation into one that is so determinate in its constituent distinctions and relations as to convert the elements of the original situation into a unified whole.[5]

While this is a summary of what this dissertation sets out to do, transform points and processes into unified and comparable structures, Dewey does not really clarify the steps by which the investigator treats material in the process of inquiry. For this, one needs to find a more straightforward method for the undertaking, and I have chosen the work of Stephen Toulmin exemplify such a method.

Toulmin's method

The thesis of this piece of work makes the assertion that Dewey's Ethics is Aristotelian. In order to establish grounds for such an assertion it is necessary to make certain claims about the similarity or correspondence of particular concepts and ideas that are common to Dewey and Aristotle. The method by which I propose to do this in

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Dewey, Logic, [LW: 12] p. 108.

subsequent chapters will be to follow the pattern or structure of argument laid out by Toulmin.[6]

Each chapter will make a claim and data will be gathered relevant to that claim. Primary data will consist of "facts," that is, what is actually stated by Dewey and by Aristotle on specific matters. Secondary data will consist of what others have said about Dewey's and Aristotle's statements on these matters. These are the "material means" of Dewey's pattern of inquiry.

Then, based on these data, I will offer "general, hypothetical statements, which can act as bridges, and authorize the particular argument" to which the claim of a chapter is committed.[7] These "warrants" take the form of assertions about the data as, for instance, both Dewey and Aristotle appear to say the same things about the nature of habit. Warrants also are subject to qualifiers, such as the difficulty of comparison of the terse clarity of Aristotle's text to the sometimes convoluted density of Dewey's writing. Some rebuttals to the warrants also will be pointed out and argued to some conclusion, generally on the basis of additional facts that "can serve as further data, or they can be cited to confirm or rebut the applicability of a

---

[6] Stephen Toulmin, The Uses of Argument (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).

[7] Toulmin, p. 98.

warrant."[8] Arguing warrants, qualifiers, and rebuttals are the "procedural means" of Dewey's pattern of inquiry.

Toulmin gives a very compelling argument for the impossibility of making a distinction between "conclusions [that] can be inferred necessarily or certainly and those conclusions [that] can be inferred only possibly or with probability."[9] He argues that the attempts of some theorists to identify analytic arguments with the former and substantial arguments with the latter are unjustified. It seems appropriate to digress briefly at this point to a short discussion of formal reasoning and to offer some of John Dewey's consideration of the matter.

Inductive and deductive reasoning

Dewey says that while our moral judgments are often intuitive, such intuitive judgment is not due to some separate faculty of moral insight[10] but is the result of bringing our past experience to bear on the immediate situation using our ability to reason. In this way we can form general ideas or principles to "bring...to deliberation on particular situations.[11]Using the material of experience to discover principles is called inductive reasoning. The

---

[8] Toulmin, p. 102.

[9] Toulmin, p. 136.

[10] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 266.

[11] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 276.

theory of induction holds that there is an intellectual process whereby we move from knowledge of particulars to knowledge of universals. On one theory we perceive essences[12] and engage in collective generalization (adding instances) leading to intellectual principles being grasped through insight or formed by applying some general principle of intelligibility to particular instances. Because the specific and intelligible necessity of connection may not be apparent, some hold experimental generalization or inductive argument just probable, unlike syllogistic deductive argument where a conclusion follows of necessity.

Although perfect induction would involve canvassing all instances, experimental generalizations may arise out of connections that are not always reproducible or even demonstrable, but theoretical repetition may at least indicate probability. Dewey maintains that the problem is often one of finding representative cases and, for him, in fact, one representative instance may be sufficient to continue inquiry.[13]

The most important issue for Dewey is to avoid any inductive/deductive dualism, which, he claims, was a later historical development when classic syllogistic logic was

---

[12] See a further reference to this in the conclusion of this chapter.

[13] Dewey, Logic, [LW: 12] p. 432.

found inadequate for the new scientific inquiry. The logic of deduction, then:

> ...was supplemented by superimposition of an inductive logic supposed to formulate the methods employed in physical investigations. In consequence, both the so-called deductive and inductive logics suffered in their own contents.[14]

In effect, both inductive and deductive logic are for Dewey just one tools of inquiry, and neither constitute the sole method by which inquiry may be undertaken any more than inductive logic is the sole means by which contemporary scientific investigation is undertaken. Although inquiry has "in our own culture taken on the character of an institution," particularly in the activities of scientists, it is, in fact, a way of behaving when we encounter a problematic situation.[15] Types of inquiry develop within a matrix of a particular culture as part of our "common sense" day-to-day activities. While developing a theory of logic may not be a common activity of most persons in most cultures, a few, such as Aristotle, if not Dewey, have attempted it. Logical forms are, after all, the product of human thought, "constructed during the process of inquiry as means of carrying out an inquiry."[16]

---

[14] Ibid., p. 479.

[15] Kennedy, "Dewey's Logic...," Guide to the Works of John Dewey, pp. 70-71.

[16] Ibid.

Dewey further maintains that a distinction between induction and deduction is irrelevant to the processes of inquiry.

> Sagacity in evaluation, scrupulous care in notation and record, cherishing and development of suggestion, a keen eye for relevant analogies, tentative experimentation, physical and imaginative shaping of material so that it takes the form of a diagrammatic representation, are all demanded whether the subject-matter in question is inductive or deductive...the objective is determination of effective existential data or relevant and effective conceptions.[17]

Here Dewey is expressing what Toulmin concludes when he says we "have occasion in practice to classify some arguments as substantial and conclusive, or as both analytic and tentative."[18] After all, Dewey is not really offering a theory of logic (in spite of the title of the work), but rather a theory of inquiry. What is more, inquiry for Dewey is at all times ultimately existential, even though formal methods of logic may be used in the process, and Toulmin's statement of the classification of arguments is practical, and, further, it is certainly existential in our common sense understanding of everyday life. This tentative view about the present state of things can be subject to further verification in the process of inquiry that in turn leads to making a warranted assertion about the matter. For Dewey such an assertion represents a conclusive argument with regard to the solution of the immediate problem situation.

---

[17] Dewey, Logic, [LW: 12] p. 478.

[18] Toulmin, p. 137.

Dewey's Warranted Assertibility.

In this dissertation certain claims are made about the congruence of Dewey's and Aristotle's ethical theory. The process of making judgments involves, as Dewey says:

> ...estimation, appraisal, assigning value to something; a discrimination as to advantage; serviceability, fitness for a purpose, enjoyability, and so on.[19]

That is, using what Dewey calls the process of inquiry, a judgement about a claim must somehow take into consideration all those things that we possibly can determine to be true about the matter.

The truth of a claim that is asserted as a result of Dewey's process of inquiry has what he calls "warranted assertibility." This is more than simply stating something to be the case, a formulated proposition that this or that is how we are aware that this or that is so. A perspectival view is adequate as far as it goes but offers us no way to determine the truth of a proposition, if our awareness cannot sufficiently determine how things actually are.

How then can we define "truth"? Dewey uses Charles Sanders Peirce's coherence definition rather weakly at one point,[20] but then, unfortunately, never provides a simple

---

[19] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 264.

[20] Dewey, Logic, [LW: 12] p. 343. "The opinion which is fated to be ultimately agreed to by all who investigate is what we mean by truth..." Charles Santiago Sanders Peirce, Pragmatism and Pragmaticism. Vol. V. Collected Papers. ed. by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931-1958), p. 268.

definition of "warranted assertion." What he does propose is a whole theory, a logic intended to warrant knowledge.[21] That is, by his method of inquiry, which was discussed earlier in this chapter, knowledge results from "the directed or controlled transformation of an indeterminate situation into a determinately unified one."[22] But is such "knowledge" merely propositional in that the application of a method results in the resolution of some situation merely to the satisfaction of the applier? One can object to such an experiential approach on the grounds that it is still perspectival to the user, and while it may give knowledge that relates the individual to the truth or falsity of a particular proposition, it tells nothing about whether something actually is the case. Any knowledge gained is only that of the experiencer.

However, it is essential to Dewey's thought that knowledge must always be considered in view of the process of reaching that knowledge. A result called "knowledge" may be "true" or "false" in a propositional sense, but if it does not further the process of inquiry, such knowledge cannot be said to have warranted assertibility. In a sense,

---

[21] There are a few paragraphs (Logic, [LW: 12] pp. 7-8) where Dewey expresses a preference for the words "warranted assertibility" to "knowledge" or "belief" to express the state of affairs in which doubt is removed as a result of inquiry, but the passage goes on to suggest and then deny that "truth" and "knowledge" are synonymous. This material is not particularly useful or relevant to my purpose.

[22] Dewey, Logic, [LW: 12] p. 121.

this is the "how" of our awareness that this or that is so: we have applied the theory.

Further, the operation must also include temporal and physical qualities that are modified and rearranged in the process of inquiry. Thus, the final product is a "truth-bearer" in the sense that it is a statement or object reached as the result of applying the method of inquiry in the fullest sense of a dynamic process of "transformation."

What all this may mean requires that we must continue to plunge forward, as Dewey develops terminology as he goes along, and accept intuitively that his statements will be gradually transformed into a unified whole. One might almost say that one cannot just read and reflect on Dewey, but that one must also "experience" him. Clearly, for Dewey the entire process leading to warranted assertibility is both operational and experiential.

Yet considering how to "experience" Dewey brings us back to the question of how warranted assertibility is an statement of how things are. If by experience we mean immediate sensory stimulation, the account would be inadequate. However, if knowledge can only result from cognitive rational activity, even accompanied by James' "cephalic movement," we are no closer to a complete account. Added to which the entire corpus of Dewey's work revolves in no small part around his use of the term "experience."

It is not unusual to find a philosophical concept broken down into its components with only one of these parts dealt with, while the rest get dumped in a box labelled "later" or "don't fit." It is particularly tempting to deal only with John Dewey's clearer statements because his dense language sometimes renders a familiar philosophical component quite unrecognizable, or he jumbles together a boxful of bits with a label that is not part of our philosophical vocabulary. An example of this is Dewey's use of the term "environment," by which he means not only "a field in which observation of this or that object or event occurs," but also "the universe of experience."[23] This definition of "environment" obviously is not a direct answer to the question, "What is experience?" It is, however Dewey's all-encompassing answer to "how things are;" that is, environment includes, and at the same time, IS, <u>all</u> the constituents of an experienced situation.

Now, consistent with his abhorrence of any sort of dualism, Dewey dismisses the either/or of realism and idealism with an appeal to a "unity of relationship" between cognitive and empirical experience. This includes logical relations of both abstract terms and propositions, which must "be satisfied in the course of inquiry [in order to formulate] the ultimate <u>goal</u> of inquiry in complete satisfaction of logical conditions."[24] That is, some logical

---

[23] Ibid., p. 530.

[24] Ibid., p. 346.

principles are essential to the unity of relationship that establishes the environment for both the operation of inquiry and the goal or end-in-view of the operation. Inquiry, then is the working relationship between facts and ideas. This functional attribute is an operational process, however, not a fixed static point. It is the state of growth from antecedent reality to consequent reality, which are really only abstractions marking off a segment of the dynamic process of transformation.[25]

The process -- and the goal -- of Dewey's operation of inquiry is "the state" of how things are. Since it is the operation of inquiry, that is, the process of establishing a unity of relationship, that is the warranted assertion that such is indeed the case, warranted assertibility is another way of stating "how things are."

Achinstein's concepts of evidence and probability

While the process of inquiry assures the procedural means to examine the works of Dewey and of Aristotle, it is necessary at this point to discuss the way in which the presentation of data and warrants for such data constitute evidence and as such are confirmation of the claim presented in each chapter; that is, assure that the material means are

---

[25] Gertrude Ezorsky, "Dewey: truth as warranted assertibility" from article on Pragmatic Theory of Truth, Encyclopedia of Philosophy, v. 6 (New York: Macmillan, 1967), pp. 428-430.

adequate. While the nature of this work is not such that evidence can be defined solely in the propositional form of deductive logic, for example, even if such a process were acceptable to Dewey's pattern of inquiry, the "aim is to provide conditions that determine when a body of information is evidence that some hypothesis or theory is true."[26] These conditions are met in part by the use of Dewey's method that assures warranted assertibility. This would show that there is a unity of relationship in the comparison of Dewey and Aristotle that leads to a warranted assertion that it is indeed the case that Dewey's 1932 Ethics are Aristotelian. Even if such a conclusion cannot be asserted, the method should ensure at least that the claims are "theoretically and practically informative."[27]

Determining the probability of the correspondence of concepts is already difficult in terms of comparison of the language of Dewey and of Aristotle. Further, Peter Achinstein maintains that to say that data or a warrant is evidence that an hypothesis is true does not mean that there is an increase in probability of the truth of that hypothesis. Although he does not "claim that probability is irrelevant for evidence,"[28] Achinstein holds that standard

---

[26] Peter Achinstein, Concepts of Evidence (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 2.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Achinstein, Concepts, p. 157.

definitions of probability are inadequate and proposes what he calls an "explanation definition."

According to this explanation definition, data or warrants serve as potential evidence that an hypothesis is true if and only if that evidence is true and the hypothesis could correctly explain the evidence if the hypothesis were true. Although Achinstein says that he does not really find this an adequate definition, he provides nothing further himself. However, Achinstein's explanation definition actually does satisfy Dewey's condition for warranted assertibility. That is, an environment is set up in which the "problem" is in effect intrinsic to the solution, and both are encompassed by those ideas and facts of "how things are" in the pattern of inquiry.

Conclusion

By clarifying Dewey's pattern of inquiry with a method by which to make claims about the hypothesis of this dissertation, the task has been broken down into what Dewey called "constituent distinctions and relations."[29] The primary and secondary material will be built up into warrants to support the claims of each chapter. While it may not be possible to subject these judgments to the rigors of probability analysis, any conclusions will at least meet the conditions of Dewey's warranted assertibility.

---

[29] Dewey, Logic, p. 108.

Dewey emphasizes that "in both science and common sense, the operations of transformation, reconstruction, control, and union of theory and practice in experimental activity...are analogous to those involved in moral activity."[30] Now the dynamic process of growth is related to persons, who, after all, are the agents of moral activity. While it may not be possible to establish more than a minimal correspondence between Aristotle and some of Dewey's points and processes contained in the 1932 Ethics, it is in the arena of moral activity that this inquiry will take place. Any conclusions reached will be rather more of the nature of similar structures of the ethics of Dewey and Aristotle than of final absolute principles.

> "Absolute principles" appear so attractive today partly because of the continuing power of that "quest for certainty" about which John Dewey wrote. Not that it needed Dewey to teach us the weakness of absolutism: Aristotle himself saw that ethics contained no essences and that there is accordingly no basis for geometrically rigorous theories in ethics.[31]

Here is actually an instance of a case that could be made for Dewey's Aristotelianism with regard to the topics of absolutism and essences. Although a discussion of the Aristotelian content of another of John Dewey's great

---

[30] Dewey, "Experience, Knowledge and Value: A Rejoinder," in Paul Arthur Schilpp, The Philosophy of John Dewey The Library of Living Philosophers Vol. I (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press), pp. 579-80.

[31] Albert R. Jonsen and Stephen Toulmin, The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988), p. 341.

works[32] is beyond the scope of the present task, the above quote from Albert Jonsen and Stephen Toulmin is also an example of material means found in secondary literature from which one can infer the similar positions of Dewey and Aristotle. Their positions on systems of ethical theory have already been discussed briefly in a way that leads to the implication that, in this matter at least, Dewey may be Aristotelian.

In the following chapter, I will undertake the procedural means of examining secondary literature to determine, first, what it is to be Aristotelian; second, what others say about Dewey in this regard; and, finally, what Dewey says himself about his philosophical heritage. The subsequent chapters will set out in what specific ways some concepts Dewey presents in the 1932 Ethics are Aristotelian. The structure and process of the method presented in this chapter will be used to compare what Dewey says and what Aristotle says -- and what each appear to mean by what they say -- to determine the extent, if any, to which it can be claimed that Dewey's 1932 Ethics is Aristotelian.

By presenting primary source evidence of the words of both Aristotle and Dewey and drawing on support from secondary sources, the points of each ethical structure will be indicated, as will the processes that connect these

---

[32] Dewey, The Quest for Certainty, (New York: Minton, Balch, 1929) [LW: 4].

points. If it appears that the method of inquiry and what is being accomplished by this method are one and the same thing, that is indeed the case.

The particular elements of the ethics of John Dewey that have been chosen for this dissertation as points in a structure of Dewey's ethics are conduct and character, virtue and reflective morality, and the teleology of human acts. The functional or operative process of these in terms of both the individual and society will connect the points of the structure. What I perceive as comparable points and functions in Aristotle also constitute a structure, which itself can be compared to the structure of similar points and functions in Dewey's ethics.

CHAPTER III

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE "ARISTOTELIAN"?

There are several strands to Aristotle's work that can be said to characterize his philosophy. Randall summarizes these as a "formalistic naturalism" or a "structuralistic functionalism."[1]

Aristotle's naturalism

One view of naturalism takes direct experience of the world as its primary subject matter.[2] Although there were "naturalist" philosophers before Aristotle, they tended to devise speculative hypotheses and theories that had little acquaintance with empirical facts.[3] Aristotle sought to reconcile observation of nature with the practice of dialectic, the systematic discussion of beliefs and facts that Plato regards as the primary method of philosophical inquiry.[4] Although dialectic takes the form of question-and-answer between different persons in Plato, in Aristotle's

---

[1] Randall, Aristotle, p. 295.

[2] Ibid., p. 297.

[3] Terence Irwin, Classical Thought (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 119.

[4] Irwin, Aristotle's First Principles, p. 7.

works dialectical conversation becomes one person taking both parts in the development of philosophical exploration.[5]

Aristotle's formalism

There is a certain formalism to the method of dialectic. John Dewey and others have attributed a too rigid formalism to some of Aristotle's thought, particularly to the application of that logic which has come down through the scholastic tradition. However, one cannot escape the fact that there is a formal procedure to be followed in factorial analysis, that is, the search for factors and structure within subject matter in order to understand these in terms of their functioning within the context of the subject matter.[6] For example, biological taxonomy, the method of classification, requires a formal series of steps to final identification. Logical realism views knowledge as a discovery of what is experienced to be there and not merely a human invention.

Further, "what is there" exhibits the characteristics of Aristotle's functional realism, the view that "structures found are always those of determinate processes, functioning in determinate contexts."[7] This is the functionalism that includes observable structures that have a describable and

---

[5] Irwin, Aristotle's First Principles, p. 488.

[6] Randall, Aristotle, p. 297.

[7] Ibid., pp. 299-300.

often predictable "formal" way of behaving according to their nature.

It must be remembered that Aristotle's logical and functional realisms are two aspects of his theory that universals exist only in the experienced world. This theory is opposed to the Platonic idealistic theory of an unchanging and eternal world of ideal and perfect forms. On Plato's account, reason recognizes contrasts and similarities between the experienced world and the Realm of Ideas, and thus identifies things. A person thereby recovers knowledge that was forgotten when psyche became enmeshed in matter.

Aristotle's universals can be grasped by human reason and are not dependent on Plato's Realm of Ideas. That is, they exist independently of the mind but not independently of the things in which they are recognized. First order universals are apprehended a priori[8] and include mathematical concepts and logical constructs that, while not "experienced," nonetheless can be grasped by reason and used to discover knowledge of the things perceived or experienced. Aristotelian second order universals also exist independently of the mind but can be recognized in particulars, such as two plus two equals four. In this case one can say that universals "are to be induced by experience."[9] The use

---

[8] Takatura Ando, Aristotle's Theory of Practical Cognition (The Hague: Marcus Nijhoff, 1971), p. 189.

[9] Ibid.

of these tools of reason in the experienced world guarantee a formal or structured approach to knowledge by means that are consistent with the processes or "functional" aspect of Aristotle's natural world.

Aristotle's structuralistic functionalism

Direct experience of the world is the primary subject matter for Aristotle. Thus, naturalism relies on experience and rational methods of inquiry to discover the structure of an organic relationship or way in which human beings function in themselves and with their environment. A way of looking at this has been summarized by Chambliss as:

> ...the ways in which human beings take action as part of their nature. [This view of naturalism] is a declaration of the idea that we cannot avoid making our own social and political nature. Since to be social is to be human, we make our own human nature. Aristotle's naturalism stands out in the idea that things of nature have ends...[10]

Thus nature is a teleological system in which natural objects, including human beings, function and interrelate as part of an overall pattern or order that is natural both to the individual objects and to the universe itself. For Aristotle, the structure of nature can be grasped through formal methods of reasoning, as well as through experience. To do so is not to put reason in opposition to experience, but rather each is contained within the other as the

---

[10] J.J. Chambliss, Educational Theory as the Theory of Conduct: From Aristotle to Dewey (Albany: State University of New York Press), 1987. p. 23.

experience of reasoning about nature gives meaning or reason to the experience of nature.

The structure or system of the natural order for human beings includes psychological and social as well as biological factors, all of which function or operate in relationship to one another so as to enable specific tasks or activities to be accomplished. It is in this sense that Aristotelianism can be said to be a "structuralistic functionalism." The Aristotelian naturalist directly experiences the world within the context of a biological, psychological, and social structure, which can be known both perceptually and through the use of reason. It is in this sense that an Aristotelian can be said to be a formalistic naturalist.

John Dewey and Greek philosophy

In order to answer the question of whether Dewey was an Aristotelian, we cannot depend on what he said of himself. Probably no philosopher has ever attributed to her own position the wholehearted adoption and assimilation of all of the characteristics of the philosophy developed by another. As case in point, we have Aristotle who, while accepting Plato's view that there are universals, nonetheless argued in favor of the universal inhering in a natural order, against Plato's view of the universal as eternal forms residing in the Realm of Ideas. So, while Platonic

concepts can be traced in Aristotle's thought, we could not say that Aristotle was a proponent of this aspect of Plato's philosophical thought.

Dewey, in fact, often says how drawn he is to Plato's writing, but approval of Plato's dialogues on the teaching of morality, for instance,[11] by no means makes Dewey's total view of moral theory Platonic, except perhaps in the same sense as it can be said that Aristotle was Platonic because he agreed with Plato's belief in universals but disagreed with the Theory of Forms.[12]

However, Dewey was greatly influenced by the ideas of the Greek philosophers, and to determine the extent of this influence we need to draw not only on what Dewey said of himself, but also on what other persons said about him. By way of a preliminary example, which also suggests Dewey's position with regard to Plato's Realm of Ideas, Lewis Hahn says that Dewey's is a pragmatic naturalism in which "not eternal static realities or permanent substances but qualitied events, things in time, temporal processes, histories, or historical events, happenings are central."[13] Now, this example does not bring us very much closer to determining if Dewey is Aristotelian, but one can suggest

---

[11] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 163.

[12] Irwin, Classical Thought, pp. 123-124.

[13] Lewis E. Hahn, "Dewey's Philosophy and Philosophic Method," in Guide to the Works of John Dewey, p. 40.

that it may be enough to indicate that, like Aristotle, Dewey did not agree with Plato's view of the universal.

What do others say of Dewey's relationship with Greek philosophy? There is an enormous amount of evidence to examine, and everyone seems to quote everyone else. I would like to begin with what was said of Dewey after his death. In 1958, an informal meeting of ten men who had known and worked with John Dewey, in some cases for forty years, was tape-recorded. Their conversation was transcribed, edited, and published in 1959 to mark the centennial of Dewey's birth. At the end of the evening, one of the men at the meeting read a letter that he had presented to Dewey on his 90th birthday in 1950. Alvin Johnson was a classical Greek scholar and political scientist, who, with John Dewey and other educators, founded the New School for Social Research in 1919 and retired as president emeritus in 1945. He wrote:

> To John Dewey, latest of all the great Greek philosophers. But have you not been fighting the Greek philosophers? So you have: Greek philosopher has fought Greek philosopher since before Thales and Heracleitus the obscure. But in one thing you, John Dewey, and the Greeks are one. You have all fought Fear....the blacker night of the mind, where habits, traditions, abstractions, assumptions, prejudices, hatreds at large, dance...[14]

Most sources seem to agree that Dewey drew on his earlier experience of Greek philosophy less after he became acquainted with F.J.E. Woodbridge, Johnson, and others who

---

[14] Lamont, ed., Dialogue on John Dewey, p. 139.

wore their classical scholarship lightly as they went about more immediate matters in the world around them. While Dewey did maintain in the 1908 Ethics some knee-jerk biases against the classical tradition, these were minor compared to the polemic enjoined against the later classical modern tradition in the persons of Kant and Bentham.[15] In the 1932 Ethics, Dewey makes frequent reference to Aristotle, although he does not directly quote from the Nicomachean Ethics or other works. The number of references to Aristotle's Ethics has also increased in the Literature at the end of chapters in the 1932 edition.[16]

John Anton, in particular, points out that Dewey had a genuine affinity to Aristotle, which his "students saw more clearly than Dewey ever realized, or perhaps was willing to admit."[17] John Herman Randall, who was one of Dewey's students and later his colleague at Columbia University, has probably proposed the most relevant connections between Aristotle and Dewey. From this connection that others saw, although is was never acknowledged directly by Dewey, it could reasonably be inferred that

---

[15] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, see Ch. 13 and 14, pp. 235-284.

[16] From only three books mentioned in the 1908 Ethics, Dewey has increased the Literature references in the 1932 Ethics to include Aristotle's entire Nicomachean Ethics.

[17] John P. Anton, "John Dewey and Ancient Philosophies," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research 25 (1965), p. 485.

Dewey continued to study Aristotle over the long years of ongoing intellectual growth and development.

Dewey and Hegel

Occasionally, it is suggested that Dewey is in some way a "Hegelian," in part through the influence of one of his early mentors at Johns Hopkins, George Sylvester Morris, who maintained that Hegel and Aristotle were in essential agreement.[18] Harris had studied in Germany under Friedrich A. Trendelenburg who had concluded that "the organic operation of the natural world argues to the existence of a guiding intelligence."[19] Morris then came under the influence of the British neo-Hegelian, Thomas H. Green, who, Dewey says, argues "that the only conceivable world....is a single, permanent, and all-inclusive system of relations,"[20] that is bonded by "a permanent, single consciousness."[21] It must be noted that Morris had rejected Trendelenburg's Aristotelian naturalism, yet it seems that that was the very thing Dewey was later to develop in his own philosophy. In the same way, Dewey picked up on Green's "system of relations," but gives no more hint of any religious or other

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] Neil Coughlan, Young John Dewey (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1973), p. 22.

[20] Dewey, [EW: 3], p. 20.

[21] Ibid., p. 22.

conviction of supernatural guidance or control of the natural world than Aristotle does.

Hahn, however, makes the point that although Dewey acknowledged his debt to Hegel, Dewey also believed that his critics had exaggerated his indebtedness, as Hahn says:

> ...because they had not paid due regard to the context or situation in which he used certain terms, and that, in any event, objective idealism does not have a monopoly on the interpretation of such words as `whole, complete, coherence, integration,' and presumably `interrelated unity' or `interdependence'.[22]

Dewey himself says:

> There was a period extending into my earlier years at Chicago when, in connection with a seminar on Hegel's Logic I tried reinterpreting his categories in terms of "readjustment" and "reconstruction." Gradually I came to realize that what the principles actually stood for could be better understood and stated when completely emancipated from Hegelian garb.[23]

During the early years of World War I, Dewey's attitude toward Hegel in particular changed even more as he attributed to German philosophy the rise of Prussian militarism.[24] "It is customary to call [Hegel] an Idealist. In one sense...he is the greatest realist known to philosophy. He might be called a Brutalist."[25] At this time, too,

---

[22] Hahn, "Dewey's Philosophy and Philosophic Method," in Guide to the Works, pp. 24-25.

[23] Jane M. Dewey, ed., "Biography of John Dewey," Schilpp, ed., The Philosophy of John Dewey, pp. 17-18.

[24] Max H. Fisch, "Dewey's Critical and Historical Studies," in Guide to the Works of John Dewey, p. 320.

[25] Dewey, German Philosophy and Politics (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1915), p. 107; [MW: 8] p. 191.

Dewey changed his attitude on American non-involvement and began to support American entry in the European war.

In the 1908 Ethics, Dewey makes three references to Hegel by way of example of a type of moral theory in which "both the good and the law of the individual are placed on a strictly institutional basis."[26] However, his discussion of the nature of moral theory in the 1932 Ethics does not contain these quotations, neither is there further any reference to Hegel in the body of this text.[27] One must conclude that, by 1932, Dewey really had no further need of or use for Hegel.

Dewey's naturalism

Dewey's naturalism, like Aristotle's, involves direct experience of the world. However, our human nature is also experienced as we are engaged in interrelationships that involve much more than just our human experience of the world. In effect this view of the nature of human relationships suggests that our sum of human experiences contributes as a part of the sum of all experiences of humanity, that in

---

[26] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, p. 208.

[27] There are two end of chapter Literature references at p. 157, Ritchie, Darwin and Hegel, 1893, and p. 81, Hegel, Philosophy of History, 1881, the latter also appears in Checklist of References, p. 502, along with Hegel, Philosophy of Right, 1896, but I can't find reference to this last anywhere in the text.

turn can be recognized as part of our individual experience. But we must be aware that:

> ...experience is of as well as in nature. It is not experience which is experienced, but nature...Things interacting in certain ways are experience; they are what is experienced.[28]

This is a naturalism that involves the individual in interaction with the natural and the social world, for on Dewey's account these cannot be separated. Nor is the involvement of the individual with the world separate from that which it is the nature of the human person to be.

Dewey's 1932 view of the individual as being by nature involved in the total environment represents a change in his thinking. His earlier position that the individual merely affected and was affected by the environment drew on limited psychological ethics in "terms of inner-individual processes...Now, however...there is a direct focus on the full complexity of natural and social relations..."[29]

Dewey's formalism

Direct experience of the world includes a temporal development that leads to knowledge. By undertaking any inquiry a person is engaged in that sorting and ordering of

---

[28] Dewey, Experience and Nature rev.ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1929), p. 4a; [LW: 1] p. 12.

[29] Abraham Edel and Elizabeth Flower, Introduction, 1932 Ethics, p. xxvi.

the material means of experience that utilize the formal procedural means of the process of inquiry.

> ...knowledge implies judgement (and hence thinking) ...[and] such terms as `thinking,' `reflection,' and `judgement' denote inquiries or the results of inquiry, and [further] inquiry occupies an intermediate and mediating place in the development of an experience.[30]

We saw that Dewey's pattern of inquiry does have a formal, procedural process of treating the material means, the subject matter of experience. Through scientific inquiry, we discover and come to understand "the distinctive features of nature and how experience is one type of natural transaction."[31]

Dewey's structuralistic functionalism

Once again, it is another of Dewey's innumerable definitions of "experience" as "the interaction of organism and environment, resulting in some adaptation which secures utilization of the latter,"[32] that describes the functional aspect of his thought. His naturalism thus involves dynamic

---

[30] Dewey, Essays in Experimental Logic (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916), p. 1; [MW: 10] p. 320.

[31] Richard J. Bernstein, John Dewey (New York: Washington Square Press, 1966), p. 79.

[32] Dewey, Reconstruction in Philosophy (New York: Henry Holt, 1920), p. 87; [MW: 12] p. 129.

functions of "interactions or trans actions of varying durations and extents"[33]

There is a diverse structure to these functions on three levels. Hahn commenting on Dewey describes these as:

> 1) the physico-chemical level of mass-energy interactions, the level on which the physical sciences seek to discover the properties and relations of things in terms of which they may serve as means or instrumentalities, 2) the psychophysical or organic pattern of need-demand-satisfaction activities, and 3) the level of mind or human experience in which social transactions and meaning come in. Matter, life, and mind accordingly are not separate and distinct kinds of Being but rather different modes of interconnection and operation...[34]

Development of Dewey's thought

Dewey has not been helpful to us who try to deal with his philosophy. Not only is his writing dense, but it is also particularly difficult to read, as Dewey attempts to construct a vocabulary to express his thought. This vocabulary was in lifelong process of change and refinement, but Dewey rarely drew attention to the instances where he was using earlier concepts as part of newer concepts expressed with different terms. Thus the "reflex arc" as a concept of the response of reason to the data of experience lost its simple connotation of behavioralist cause and effect and became subsumed into "rational morality" in the 1932 Ethics, and, without much clarification, into the "matrix of

---

[33] Hahn, "Dewey's Philosophy and Philosophic Method," Guide to the Works, p. 42.

[34] Ibid., pp. 42-43.

inquiry" in the Logic, which now included not only psychological thought responses to stimulii, but also biological and social elements, all operating in relation to one another. But Dewey never alludes to this development of his thought, much less spells out the incorporation of his earlier concept into a larger whole.

Dewey was well aware, however, that his need to express his philosophy in what he hoped was common, understandable language was problematic. He even considered changing the title of Experience and Nature to Culture and Nature in a revised edition because of his:

> ...growing realization that the historical obstacles which prevented understanding of my use of "experience" are, for all practical purposes, insurmountable...[35]

Even when he seemed to be making a clear statement, Dewey's words are open to misinterpretation. For instance, one of the few reviews of the 1932 Ethics places Dewey in the ranks of universalistic or consequentialist utilitarianism.[36] While it is true that Dewey has a great deal to say about utilitarianism, the reviewer failed to notice that such attention was for the purpose of setting up Dewey's rejection of either a utilitarian or deontological basis for

---

[35] Dewey, quoted in Textual Commentary, Experience and Nature, [LW: 1] p. 361.

[36] Frank Chapman Sharp, book review in International Journal of Ethics 44 (1933-34), p. 159.

a complete moral theory in favor of one that provides "principles which are truly relevant in our own day."[37]

Conclusion

Dewey's article, "Experience, Knowledge and Value: A Rejoinder," concludes with a general remark to his critics, with a reference to Dr. Randall, that he considers some criticisms to be "negotiable differences, matters of degree rather than of central principles."[38] While it is not clear to which of Randall's specific criticisms Dewey is referring, much of this article is an attempt to clarify some misconceptions arising from his "admitted lack of clearness in [his] previous writing."[39] The general tenor of Randall's remarks had been to accuse Dewey of being some sort of crypto-neothomist, while at the same time entreating him to unveil himself as "he who of all thinkers can today best claim to be the representative of Aristotelian thought..."[40]

We have seen and will see again that Randall has an extravagant view of John Dewey as heir to, if not reincarnation of, Aristotle. Be that as it may, Randall provides us

---

[37] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 283.

[38] Dewey, in Schlipp, ed. The Philosophy of John Dewey, p. 606.

[39] Ibid.

[40] John Herman Randall, "Dewey's Interpretation of the History of Philosophy," in Schlipp, ed., The Philosophy of John Dewey, p. 102.

with an argument for the commonality of ideas between Dewey and Aristotle can begin; for he says that:

> ...Dewey himself seems to be working primarily with the conceptions of Aristotle. In his naturalism, his plur-alism, his logical and social empiricism, his realism, his natural teleology...above all, in his thoroughgoing functionalism, his Aristotelian translation of all the problems of matter and form into a functional context--to say nothing of his basic social and ethical concepts--in countless vital matters he is nearer to the Stagirite than to any other philosopher.[41]

Part of our task is to see the extent to which Randall may be correct in his evaluation. The factor of naturalism as a functional structuralism that can be examined by formal means has been established as characteristic of Aristotelianism, and also is characteristic of John Dewey's philosophy in a way that Platonism and Hegelianism are not. It remains to examine more specific aspects of both Dewey's and Aristotle's ethics.

An additional point is the teleology or end of the ethics of either Dewey or Aristotle. The aspects covered in the next three chapters -- conduct and character, virtue, and the social role of the human person, are in fact, ends-in-view in Dewey's terms. They also are parts of the structures of each philosopher's ethics revealed in these chapters. It is these structures that may give us an indication of some ultimate end or telos that will be discussed in the final chapter.

---

[41] Ibid., p. 101.

CHAPTER IV

ETHICS AS CONDUCT OR CHARACTER

While the way in which persons behave is of concern to society, the sort of person that behaves in a particular way seems to be of less concern. That is, as long as we conduct ourselves in a way consistent with what society expects of us, the sort of character we have seems to be of lesser importance. However, for both Dewey and Aristotle it is the character of the person that informs his conduct.

Further, it is through learning appropriate conduct that a person's character is formed. Habit plays a role in this development of character. So does a reasoned understanding of why one sort of conduct is more appropriate than another. As Aristotle says, "actions should express correct reason."[1] Therefore, character is as important as conduct.

Neither Dewey nor Aristotle provides us with a system of how one ought to behave, much less a set of rules to guide such behavior. Yet both of them base their ethics on what can be observed to be experienced and what experiences guide and motivate conduct. For both philosophers, the roles of habit and of practice are fundamental to conduct, while,

---

[1] Aristotle, NE, 1103b33.

as we shall see, the type of conduct in which an individual engages seems to be a factor of the character of that individual. Further, it is clear that the development of certain conduct begins in the very young and is part of the experience of education, both in the family and in the schools. This chapter examines the relationship of character and conduct as points in the structure of ethics and begins with an example of the process by which these elements are developed in one elementary school.[2] The reason for using this anecdotal material is because it shows the process through which character development takes place, first by following rules imposed with an intention to habituate and then by adopting rules that arise from consideration of the best possible conduct.

The new principal made it very clear that she intended to be as much involved with the children and with the teachers as with the running of the school. One small interdiction was on teachers' taking coffee to their classrooms. "It is not safe to carry hot beverages in the corridors where children are present," she said. On the first rainy schoolday, while attempting to drive their offspring to the school door across the playground where busses were offloading and many children were on foot,

---

[2] Shirley Buchanan of Sauk Elementary School, where the principal is Lynn Badgley, Ph.D., Richton Park, Matteson, Illinois, provided the anecdotal material in this chapter during several delightful telephone conversations.

parents were surprised to meet the new principal setting up a barrier, "It is not safe to have cars in the playground when the children are arriving," she said. As each class arrived at the lunchroom on the first day, the principal addressed them. "There are nine rules in the lunchroom. You will learn three each day." She proceeded to tell the children the first three, had the class repeat them, and asked, "How many lunchroom rules are there altogether?" "Nine!" came the chorus of little voices. On the second day, she lined the children up and taught them the next three rules. On the third day, the principal had each class file to their places in the lunchroom and sit down before she had them repeat the first six rules. Then she gave them the last three, "Don't trade food, don't go to another table to chat, chew with your mouth closed."

In the first two instances, the principal was setting up some standards of behavior for teachers and parents based on an appeal to the general principle of concern for the safety of children at school. In the third instance, she was setting up standards of acceptable behavior for the children in the lunchroom, but did not appeal to any general principle. The children were being taught rules of conduct. The adults, too, were in effect being given "rules," but their conduct would be based upon their reasoned acceptance of the rule as an appropriate way to ensure the safety of the children.

Dewey says that the initial motivation of any conduct is interest.[3] The involvement of the principal in the day-to-day activity aroused the interest of all parties. She also knew what Dewey said was "...the difficulty of maintaining an idea, in keeping attention alert and continuous."[4] With the children, repetition leading to "habituation" of the children in rule-following was appropriate, for the principal knew that children "...live by appetite, and the desire for what is pleasant is found more in them than in anyone else. If, then, [the child...] is not obedient and subordinate to its rulers, it will go far astray."[5] It is necessary to instruct the young in correct conduct.

An appeal to general principles can be made only to those to "whom habituation to existing moral traditions is actually taught."[6] This seems to suggest that all conduct has a moral element, but what that ethical dimension might be has to be learned. As interest leads to impulse and desire, conduct then stands in "relation to thought, or as

---

[3] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 290. Although Dewey has earlier [pp. 256-57] defined "interest" by the three characteristics "wholehearted," "persistent," and "impartial," he seems to be using the word in a more conventional sense here.

[4] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 190.

[5] Aristotle, NE, 1119b6-8.

[6] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 163.

an idea of an object to be attained,"[7] the safety of the children in the school.

Morality of the human act

In response to the question of the extent to which conduct can be said to be "moral," Aquinas claims that some actions, such as walking in a field or picking up a straw, are "indifferent."[8] One could object that even if there are such actions devoid of any moral element, they can take place only in utter social isolation. In any other circumstance there must surely be a moral element to human conduct, even if it is still not clear just how any conduct may be said to be "moral."

Clearly, moral action in some way has to be "social" even if it is not "public." That is, human activity, even some actions that might never be performed in public, has a "human" element, that is, such activity is common to the nature of all human persons. Without yet considering what "moral" actually means, it appears that "moral" activity is synonymous with "human" activity.

In society it is easier to determine what is moral by ascertaining what is appropriate to the group than to rely on individual judgment. Edward Westermarck maintains that conduct includes both individual and group action as

---

[7] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 191.

[8] Aquinas, ST I-II 18.9.

activities adhering to custom or law. He defines customs as public habits that in the strictest sense involve rules based on society's ideas of conduct and that must demonstrate two characteristics, habitualness and obligatoriness. Therefore, not every public habit is a custom.[9] If an action is not obligatory or binding in some way, it is merely a habit that upon reflection will disclose no underlying moral considerations. Thus, some conduct may indeed be morally indifferent at least with regard to the expectations of society, even if it has some underlying consideration on the part of the individual.

Customary morality

Is it possible that, even if morality does not inhere in all individual acts, society in some way provides an ethos in which all action has a moral dimension? In a primitive society, custom may be the sole rule for conduct, but not every member of a group need share the moral ideas upon which a custom is based even if all may "aver to the custom."[10] A more sophisticated society codifies customs as rules of conduct and enforces these laws as a means of social control, as Westermarck says, both from considerations of social utility and from a sense of justice. Laws

---

[9] Edward Westermarck, The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas (New York: Macmillan, 1912), p. 159.

[10] Westermarck, p. 161.

may express the moral ideas of acceptable conduct held by most or all members of a society or may, unlike a custom, "express the ideas, or simply the will, of a few, or even of a single individual"[11] sovereign and impose control on the members of a society. Thus, there is also a possibility of bad law that might not even be overcome by a Hobbesian concept that the will of the commonweal was sufficient to enact good laws for the commonweal.

That law can be considered "bad" or "good" demonstrates the fact of a moral dimension to all social action as conduct based on custom. Thus every social act may be said to be in accordance (or conflict) with rules based on ideas of morality that deal with public and overt acts.

What does this moral dimension to the social act mean for the individual person? If conduct is a social expression of moral ideas, what would bring an individual to act in accordance with or against the custom or law of a society? Dewey makes the distinction between "customary" and "reflective" morality.

> The former places the standards and rules of conduct in ancestral habit; the latter appeals to conscience, reason, or to some principle which includes thought.[12]

While, in our opening example, the subsequent conduct of parents and teachers might well be habitual response to

---

[11] Ibid., p. 167.

[12] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 162.

CHAPTER V

IS DEWEY'S CONCEPT OF VIRTUE ARISTOTELIAN?

Dewey makes a distinction between natural goods that appeal to immediate interest and desire and "moral good, that which is approved after reflection."[1] This distinction is one that demonstrates the role of reflective morality in ethics. That is, conduct which has its basis in reflective morality is characteristic of the person who can make the determination of actions that may be said to be "good," for both that individual and society. This aspect of character is called "virtue" and is found in the structures of the ethics of both Aristotle and Dewey. By examining the concept of virtue in each philosopher's work it is possible to claim that Dewey's view is Aristotelian.

A concept of virtue as goodness dates from pre-Homeric times in Greece. Aristotle developed the view that virtue was not so much the heroic state of being "good at," but rather being good for its own sake. In the Christian era ways of "being good" were enumerated until the whole catalogue of virtues fell into disuse. Virtue as an essential point attained by a specific process in the ethical

---

[1] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 207.

structure was lost -- or discarded as religious apparatus not appropriate to philosophical discourse.

Dewey, however, considers the virtues important traits of good character in much the same way that Aristotle did. On Dewey's view "a list of virtues...cannot be given a fixed meaning, because each expresses an interest in objects and institutions which are changing."[2] Similarly, Aristotle presents the virtues not as a fixed list of behaviors but rather as the different "states of character [that] should be formed and coordinated for the virtuous person's benefit."[3] That is, the "virtue" of any individual may differ from that of any other person as much as persons may differ in physical characteristics or in social environments. Although each philosopher considers the "cardinal" virtues of justice, temperance, courage, and wisdom, such specific characteristic do not make a person virtuous, but rather the person's character is the expression of the virtue of the person. The virtuous person is one who has a balance of all the virtues to whatever degree necessary to live and participate in society.

After presenting an enormous amount of historical, ethical, and philosophical thought in Ethics and the Limits

---

[2] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 255.

[3] Irwin, Classical Thought, p. 136.

of Philosophy,[4] the contemporary British philosopher Bernard Williams concludes that Socrates' question, "How should one live?" is nowhere closer to being answered than when it was first asked. As Williams looks at the enterprise of philosophy and how its various parts are related to that part called ethics, he suggests, first, that in this century all historical perspective has been lost and, second, analytic philosophy in particular has given us patterns of process that makes much of what is called "ethical theory" a cold -- rather than hedonistic -- calculus. I will try to show that this is not true of John Dewey, who has not only followed the lead of Aristotle -- a most historical figure -- but has also warmly enhanced Aristotle's classical ethical concept of virtue.

Both Aristotle and Dewey had quite clear visions of "how one should live," and for each of them, their life as individuals was one in which they each considered the entire philosophical enterprise as both the reason for life and the goal. What they have shared with us is obviously not a blueprint for behavior. Rather, each philosopher's ethical writing is a powerful exposition of the underlying universal principles of how humankind behaves.

John Dewey also does consider modern ethical traditions, but clearly maintains that neither utilitarianism nor

---

[4] Bernard Williams, Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1985).

deontologism alone is an adequate guide to how one should live.[5] Theory is not useful on a day-to-day basis except when one has the time to consider it.

> For what is called moral theory is but a more conscious and systematic raising of the question which occupies the mind of anyone...in the face of moral conflict [6]

What is needed is not a guide to how a person should live but rather a guide to what sort of person one is, should be, and can become. For Dewey this is a process consistent with his concept of conduct being informed by character which in turn informs conduct. That element of character as process as well as manifest in action is virtue.

Virtue in moral theory

The theory, if it can be called such, that persons' good conduct is based on their character, is called in contemporary moral philosophy, "virtue ethics." While deontologists and utilitarians proliferate in abundant and fractional variety, most proponents of virtue theory seem to agree that the virtuous person would readily use the tools provided by other moral philosophies yet adhere rigidly to none of them. This appears to be what Dewey proposes. While Dewey has not actually proposed some sort of "virtue ethics," his "reflective morality" specifically requires

---

[5] See also "Three Independent Factors in Morals," [LW: 5] pp. 278-288.

[6] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 164.

human conduct modified and enhanced by the response of others, to take a direction Dewey calls "virtuous."

The basis of virtue ethics is found in the classical Greek tradition of Plato and Aristotle. Although Dewey has in his writings expressed his pleasure at reading Plato, he makes no such reference to Aristotle. This is not surprising as, unlike Plato's Republic, the Nicomachean Ethics was not composed as a text but reads like what it is, a set of lecture notes and outlines probably compiled by Aristotle's students -- not particularly pleasurable reading. Dewey also may have been highly antipathetic to some late nineteenth century interpretations of Aristotle[7] and chose not to deal with any such concerns while collaborating on an ethics textbook. However, it is clearly upon Aristotle's account of virtue that Dewey draws for his share of the 1908 Ethics.[8]

Dewey is still consistent with Aristotle in his account of virtue in the 1932 Ethics. Abraham Edel and Elizabeth Flower say, in their introduction to the 1932 Ethics, that Dewey's ethical theory has undergone con-

---

[7] Werner Jaeger, Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of His Development, Richard Robinson, trans. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948). The issue appears to be the primacy of contemplation of God over against eudaemonia in Aristotle. One could also speculate Dewey was not yet far enough removed from his neo-Hegelian background (see Chapter III) to consider Aristotle on his own merits.

[8] The references to Plato are mainly contained in the chapters written by James Tufts in both the 1908 and the 1932 editions. The concept of "wisdom" referred to later in this chapter is clearly not a Platonic view.

siderable revision, which is, in fact, reflected in the later account of the role of virtue in morality. There is a continuity to Dewey's account of virtue in this edition that can be shown to be similar to Aristotle's account of virtue. This continuity is reflected in the expanded references Dewey gives to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics.[9]

If Dewey's account of virtue is derived from Aristotle's, in some respects it may be said to be both more psychological and social than Aristotle's account.[10] For instance, Aristotle distinguishes between virtues of character that promote the person's happiness and moral virtues that promote the good of others. Dewey makes no such distinction. Virtue for him is integrity of character -- whole, persistent, impartial interest, and thus always in relation to the person's total environment.[11] Yet Aristotle does bring his two notions of virtue together when he says that virtue of character as a whole is the same state of character as general justice, "complete virtue to the highest degree because it is the complete exercise of complete virtue."[12] And so too for Dewey, virtue as "com-

---

[9] The 1908 Ethics gives only Books II, III, and IV of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics as references, whereas references to every book appear in the 1932 Ethics.

[10] While I do not address this here, Dewey's section on generosity in the 1908 Ethics shows a Yankee spareness when compared to the spectrum of Aristotle's first four chapters of Book IV (1119b22-1125b27).

[11] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 257.

[12] Aristotle, NE, 1030a30.

plete interest is the only way in which justice can be assured."[13] In this, Dewey's view is certainly Aristotelian.

In the next chapter we will see Aristotle's description of "virtue in action." It remains to be seen if Dewey provides for us in the late twentieth century a fuller explanation of the social nature of virtue than Aristotle.

While what he says may be Aristotelian, the way in which Dewey says it is not. Dewey does not use much of the common vocabulary agreed upon by scholars of Aristotle, and when he uses particular words of his own choosing, the meaning frequently slips and slides in context. I have tried to draw parallels with only the most clear concepts but sometimes have found that, the fuller the account, the muzzier the details became. This phenomenon will be seen in Chapter VI, which focusses on the social part of Dewey's account, Part III of the 1932 Ethics, in which there are no references to Aristotle. The rest of this chapter will deal with virtue in Dewey's account of habituation in moral conduct as well as with Aristotle's phronesis as the operating principle of moral conduct. That is Dewey's reflective morality is a process that has been fully described by Aristotle, although Dewey does not call our attention to the resemblence.

---

[13] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 259.

Acquiring virtue

In the 1908 Ethics, Dewey had defined virtue as "habits of character whose effect is to sustain and spread the rational or common good."[14] As we saw in Chapter III, these habits of conduct arise from natural capacities or interest deliberately encouraged, whether through specific instruction or through the practical assigning of value as rules. Both Aristotle and Dewey deny that virtue is in any way innate, although the disposition to virtue is part of the "good" of human nature. Natural capacities or dispositions, Aristotle says, "arise in us by nature...we did not acquire them, but already had them... [V]irtues, by contrast, we acquire..."[15] as habits of character. How, then, does habituation of an individual sustain and spread the rational and common good?

For Aristotle, the highest goal for the person as a citizen is, after all, the practice of politics. He says that the role of a legislator is to make citizens good by habituating them, and thus "[the right] habituation is what makes the difference between a good political system and a bad one."[16] Or as Dewey says, "...society esteems and respects those attributes of an agent which tend to its own peace and welfare."[17]

---

[14] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, p. 358.

[15] Aristotle, NE, 1103a27-33.

[16] Aristotle, NE, 1003b4-6.

[17] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, p. 360.

Further, society's esteem and approval are essential to the process of habituation. That is to say, if the practice of virtue can be said to be the art of making choices well, we need to learn how to make good choices, to become habituated in choosing well. Choice is a basic element of human action. At the simplest level we choose or don't choose. Luckily, most babies come with the fundamental preference or choice for eating. A built-in mechanism, crying, may at first only signal undifferentiated discomfort, but the organism quickly develops a range of choices to convey to caregivers. Humans need other humans to provide availability of choice and to give meaning to some of the choices made. And it is through choices made that persons actually reveal and become the sort of self or moral agent they are.[18]

The choices we make result from many factors: temperament, a disposition to act, environment or psychological conditioning, or even part of the genetic package. Common sense tells us this is so, that persons have these attributes as part of what makes a person who they are, recognizable as this individual and not any other. The conglomerate of these attributes is what we call a person's character and what some of us call our <u>self</u>. But Dewey reminds us:

---

[18] Dewey, 1932 <u>Ethics</u>, p. 287.

> Selfhood or character is ...not a mere means, an external instrument, of attaining certain ends. It is an agency of accomplishing consequences.[19]

That is, there is some end-in-view to conduct, but a further end to which character contributes.

Further, we are engaged in a lifelong process. A child's choices are developed through experience and instruction. Parents indicate by approval or disapproval whether a child has made an appropriate choice. Dewey says, society "instructs the individual as to the consequences of his act."[20] He also reminds us that we "must look behind the current valuation to the real value. Mere conformity to custom [should not be] conceived to be virtue."[21]

Virtue as practices

This concept of the value or good of conduct, as being more than that which is approved by society, is consistent with what MacIntyre calls "practices." A practice on his account is any coherent human activity through which goods internal to that particular activity are realized with the result that human powers to achieve excellence and human conceptions of the ends and goals involved are systematically extended. In this Aristotelian sense, not all human activities are considered practices. For example, an

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 361.

activity may be aimless, that is without a specific end or goal. Some activities merely result in an external good, such as money or status, and as such may be interchangeable with any other similar activity with similar reward. In fact, most human activities do have goods "externally and contingently attached...by the accidents of...circumstances," but MacIntyre's point is that,

> "[T]here are always alternative ways for achieving such goods, and their achievement is never to be had only by engaging in some particular kind of practice."[22]

It is the undertaking of the particular practice, then, that yields internal goods. Thus, in Dewey's terms, current valuation, including conformity to custom, is analogous to external goods: real value is only to be found in internal goods. Practices as social phenomena will be discussed in the next chapter.

In Aristotle's discussion of virtue, he also defines goods as external and internal. Then of internal goods he distinguishes between intrinsic goods and useful goods. Useful goods are those that may be directed to a specific end. We may use many of these goods to achieve a rational plan that in itself may be a useful good...or to reach an intrinsic good, that is, something to be pursued for its own worth and value. As Dewey says, the end-in-view may become the means to yet some further end. While for Aristotle the

---

[22] Alisdair MacIntyre, After Virtue (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Press, 1984), pp. 251-252.

only thing ultimately worth pursuing appears the intrinsic primary good eudaemonia, good-spiritedness, or "happiness:" Dewey uses "identification of an agent's capacity with some aspect of the reasonable or common happiness," in yet another definition of virtue.[23] Thus, there again is agreement that happiness in the broadest sense is some sort of principal good. It still must be made clear what role virtue plays in the enterprise.

Virtue defined

Happiness is not virtue; nor is it a virtue. On Aristotle's account, it is the ultimate end of all human actions, and, since all actions are attempts to achieve this end, it follows that all of our choices and actions can be said to be means to that end. Virtues are qualities, character traits, choice making processes, and principles that enable us to perform acts that are more likely to help us to achieve the primary good, happiness. Thus a good choice is a virtuous choice, or as Thomas Aquinas says:

> ... of those who are good and best in virtuous living, only those are illustrious and happy who actually perform good deeds. Hence it is better to say that happiness is a virtuous operation than virtue itself.[24]

---

[23] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, p. 362.

[24] Aquinas, Commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics, Vol. I, L.XII: C 153, p. 65.

Just as we found more than one sense of the word "choice" in action or conduct, so "virtue" may be used in different ways. Sometimes the terms choice and virtue are interchangeable. For instance, the "choice" to be courageous can also be described as an exercise of the "virtue" of courage. Thus, "a virtue" may be the name for a quality of human character. It may also be the quality of some end-in-view or immediate goal, or it may be the quality of the execution of a plan itself; while at the same time the goal and the execution are often inseparable in the human act. That is, though useful goods may be used to achieve a plan, it is the intrinsic good of the plan itself from its conception through the excellence of execution that is to be rationally aimed at and achieved. Once again, here are two different senses of "virtue," as intrinsic good and as useful good. Which is to be preferred? For Aristotle,

> "...it matters quite a bit whether we suppose that the best good consists in possessing or in using, i.e. in a state or in an activity that actualizes that state."[25]

Dewey again defines virtue, this time as an attitude of interest. This for me triggers an image of a dog poised, paw up, head and back and tail forming a straight pointer to the quarry. But Dewey's "aspects of virtue" as interest summarized in both editions of the Ethics [26] appear to

---

[25] Aristotle, NE, 1098b25.

[26] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, pp. 363-64; 1932 Ethics, pp. 256-57.

constitute a state rather than an activity. That is, wholehearted, persistent, and impartial interest are all needed to achieve an end, even if it should turn out to be the means to yet another end.

For example, self-esteem or a sense of self worth is not just a quality that enhances activity. Nor is it merely a "process and becoming," as Aristotle would put it. It is a state from which one carries out one's intentions, one's plans. John Rawls describes self-esteem as that which gives us the assurance to undertake a plan with the "secure conviction" that it is worth carrying out, "...[and] a confidence in one's ability, so far as it is within one's power, to fulfill one's intentions."[27]

It seems then that such "ability" may be not just either useful or intrinsic, but rather both/and. So generosity or temperance may not be virtues only as names for qualities of human character, but also are essential to an operation leading to happiness. But are virtues turned off and on for appropriate occasions? Could "happiness" be the only "virtue" after all? What happened to justice, which was discussed earlier in this chapter? Apparently virtue must be "grown into." For instance, Aristotle distinguishes between "natural" and "full" virtue.

> For each of us seems to possess his type of character to some extent by nature, since we are just, brave,

---

[27] John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 440.

> prone to temperance, or have some other feature immediately from birth. However we still search for some other conditions as full goodness...for these natural states belong to children and to beasts as well [as to adults], but with out understanding...[28]

It appears that virtue is a state, but all the activities in which persons engage may be simply what Aristotle would say are the natural virtues exercised. These seem then to be consistent only with what Dewey calls "customary morality."[29] However, some other condition is needed for full virtue, even when particular virtues are not "in operation," as it were. Aquinas calls it prudence and names it as the general principle of operation for moral or full virtue, that is, understanding or rationality.[30]

Dewey has a name for it, too. He says, in the 1908 Ethics, "Wisdom, or (in modern phrase) conscientiousness, is the nurse of all the virtues."[31] For the Greeks, wisdom is the highest of the virtues and Aristotle distinguishes between sophia, wisdom concerned purely with study and the processes of thought, and phronesis, most usually translated as intelligence or prudence, both of which are misleading, alas, for the current meaning of the former is often limited to mental capacity and agility and the latter to over-

---

[28] Aristotle, NE, 1144b.

[29] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 255.

[30] Aquinas, CNE, Vol. I, L.XI: C1280, p. 602.

[31] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, p. 364.

cautious narrow-mindedness, or. as Dewey says, "a kind of sublimated egoism."[32]

So Dewey offers the word "conscientiousness" and while ignoring its possible misinterpretation as punctilious attention to the dictates of conscience, defines it as the intelligent or deliberate character at the heart of a voluntary act. In his early work, Dewey began to describe what was to become his concept of conscientiousness in the character of the individual as that "habit of judging moral situations...[as] the key to the direction and to the remaking of all other habits."[33]

Process of reflective morality

In Chapter IV we saw how reflective morality leads to making moral choices and seeking moral ends-in-view. Aristotle emphasizes the role of reason in character of the act as well as of the individual in another description of virtue as:

> ... not merely the state expressing correct reason, but ...the state involving correct reason...and it is intelligence that is correct reason in this area...We cannot be fully good without intelligence or intelligent without virtue of character.[34]

What then is this intelligence or "prudence " without which we cannot be fully good...or be said to have full virtue? It

---

[32] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 258.

[33] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, p. 375.

[34] Aristotle, NE, 1145a5.

is a process with three stages and levels and steps within the second stage. Phronesis begins with what Aristotle calls "good" deliberation over one's own eudamonia or state. Such deliberation leads to the second stage, forming a supposition, and the first of two levels of decision-making, prohairesis. The steps within this level include identifying the rational desire, calculating about how best to achieve it, and actually making the decision to go ahead. The second level, praxis, involves acting on the decision made about the supposition, with the steps of forming an intentional, voluntary desire to act, undertaking the act, and completing the entire activity. This brings us to the third stage of phronesis, which is to once again engage in deliberation.

Thus, phronesis or prudence is an ongoing reflective process that at the second stage may lead to decision that may in turn lead to action. I would suggest that it is this second stage where Dewey's "problem-solving" takes place as a stage in reflective morality. If a supposition is formed, it may or may not be identified as a problem, need calculations of how to act or not to act upon it, and require a decision to go ahead or not. These steps are a process complete in itself within the larger process and may lead either on to praxis or back to the third stage. This is not an endless repetition however, but more of a reconstruction, with an end-in-view at each level, as in Dewey's reflective morality.

In the same way as in phronesis, the process operating in reflective morality is not exclusively rational, for it depends on the material of experience for the evaluation of courses of action, skill of execution or techne of the action, and the ongoing evaluation of both the process and the arrival at the end-in-view, which is a point at which the process can begin again.

Conclusion

In the 1932 edition, Dewey wrote an entire chapter in which "moral judgment is the general principle of operation for reflective morality."[35] The operation, like Aristotle's, is one of moral deliberation and valuation, initially based, as we have seen, on choice and the moral development of the self. While perhaps not as refined, this is in several ways consistent with Aristotle's phronesis. And although Dewey's effort to render reflective morality into social action is less than satisfactory, it may be appropriate to consider that Aristotle never attempted such a thing. However, Dewey's exposition of the person in the process of reflective morality may be rooted in the social context to a greater extent than Aristotle. His deeper insight that our conduct is informed by our awareness of others makes virtue in the individual more dependent on society. Nonetheless,

---

[35] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, Chapter 14, "Moral Judgment and Knowledge," pp. 263-284.

both Aristotle and Dewey have attempted the resolution of the contrast between "man-as-he-happens-to-be and man-as-he-could-be-if-he-realized-his-essential-nature."[36]

---

[36] MacIntyre, p. 52.

CHAPTER VI

ETHICS IN SOCIETY

There is some way in which persons continually relate to one another that initiates, sustains, and furthers such relationship. As we will see in this chapter, Aristotle calls this bond of relationship philia, often translated as friendship. Dewey does not have an account of friendship as such in his part of the 1932 Ethics, but his discussion of what it is that binds persons together in society, particularly in brief references to that which Dewey calls love, can be shown to be remarkably similar to Aristotle's philia. The claim of this chapter is that Dewey and Aristotle are saying the same thing.

Society and the individual

Up to this point the discussion has focussed on the individual rather than on the group. Although ethics and ethical behavior are manifest in society, it has been more important to determine whether Dewey's account of ethics in the individual person is Aristotelian. We have seen that the human act of reflective morality includes the element of virtue in both the character of an agent and of the conduct and consequences of action. We also have seen that such

moral reasoning both on Dewey's and on Aristotle's account has a social function rather than merely the formal, rational systematization of rules for the individual. Or as Dewey says:

> The genuinely moral person is one, then, in whom the habit of regarding all capacities and habits of self from the social standpoint is formed and active.[1]

This gives some indication of the role of the individual in society. What is the role of society for the person? One role of society is that it establishes norms of conduct, but these, by and large, are on the level of customary morality. Society also functions in the role of educating its members, as well as the milieu in which human experience take place.

Society as educator

The community undertakes the role of educating its members. Whether this education takes place in the family or a tutorial or an institutional setting, the goal is to convey those skills considered necessary in a particular society. N.A. Lawrence says that on the level of elementary education:

> There seems no real quarrel between Aristotle's notion of education as disciplined cultivation of the intellect and Dewey's notion of education as development of skills through motivated experience...[2]

---

[1] Dewey, 1908 Ethics, p. 271.

[2] Nathaniel A. Lawrence, "Aristotle: Education as Self-Realization," in Robert S.Brumbaugh and Nathaniel A. Lawrence, Philosophers on Education: Six Essays on Founda-

Both Aristotle and Dewey, however, consider all of the institutions of society to be educative, not just the schools. About this Dewey says:

> In the sense in which culture signifies nurture of powers of growth and increased fullness of the life of the mind, the ulterior function of all definite modes of organization, political and otherwise, is cultural.[3]

Insofar as inculturation is synonymous with education, the goal is for the individual to take part in society as a reasoning and understanding member. To do so, persons must first develop the capacity to conduct their own lives and then become involved in the life of the group.

This group that we call society Aristotle called the polis. Ethics involves the capacity to conduct one's own life well. Engaging in the good conduct of society Aristotle calls politics.

> ...the one that, more than any other, is the ruling science...it is the one that prescribes which of the [other] sciences ought to be studied in cities...even the most honoured capacities, e.g. generalship, household management and rhetoric, are subordinate to it. Further [politics] uses the other sciences concerned with action, and moreover legislates what must be done and what avoided.[4]

R.S. Brumbaugh points out that for the Greeks "effective community membership is a necessary condition for self-

---

tions of Western Thought (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1968, reprinted 1986), p. 73.

[3] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 364.

[4] Aristotle, NE, 1094a25-1094b7.

realization...and in much the same way Dewey sees self-realization as an essentially social process."[5]

> Individuals are interdependent...[While] independence of character and judgment is to be prized...[it] does not signify separateness; it is something to be displayed in relation to others...the human being is an individual because of and in relations with others.[6]

Society as a milieu

One vital function of society is that it provides a milieu in which we can engage in activities or practices that on MacIntyre's account have goods internal to them. Practices must meet two criteria. First, the practice must be specific in kind, and second, the practice can only be known by the actual experiencing of it. Thus membership in an institution such as the American Medical Association specifies only the practice of being a member, which although such membership can be experienced by attending meetings and reading the journal, is neither the specific practice of the healing arts, nor can it ever be experienced as such. In the same way, our citizenship is nominal or an external good unless and until we actually exercise our constitutional franchise, specifically through the experience of voting.

---

[5] Robert S. Brumbaugh, "Rousseau: Emile, A Romance of Education," in Philosophers on Education: Six Essays, p. 92.

[6] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 227.

The second criterion of a practice is that it must specifically aim to ensure standards of excellence. Clearly the AMA does propose such standards but in fact does not have the means of enforcing them because the actual practice is the healing arts and it is by membership in the medical profession, not the AMA, that the internal good of excellence can be realized.

Not every human activity experienced as a "practice with internal goods and standards of excellence"[7] involves joining some organization. There are other human activities that involve qualities such as compassion and loyalty and courage that are essential to human practices. These are the virtues that MacIntyre defines as:

> ...an acquired human quality the possession and exercise of which tends to enable us to achieve those goods which are internal to practices and the lack of which effectively prevents us from achieving any such goods.[8]

So it is through the exercise of virtue that the moral development of the individual that is essential to the moral development of society takes place. It is this "social virtue" that attaches to the institution, not merely to the elements that enable the practices of the person.

Further, although practices are essential to human institutions, there is a mutual interdependence between the institution and its members. For instance, institutions may

---

[7] MacIntyre, After Virtue, p. 253.

[8] Ibid.

need to be concerned with external goods that are required to sustain the practices of which the institution is the bearer. As MacIntyre says:

> [I]ndeed so intimate is the relationship of practices to institutions...that [they] characteristically form a single causal order in which the ideals and creativity of the practice is always vulnerable...and the essential function of the virtues...justice, courage, and truthfulness... [enables practices to] resist the corrupting power of institutions.[9]

Dewey was well aware that there are some aspects of modern technological society that have made it almost impossible to achieve human excellence. As early as 1916 he said that:

> Aristotle was certainly right when he said that "any occupation or art or study deserves to be called mechanical if it renders the body or soul or intellect of free persons unfit for the exercise and practice of excellence."[10]

Dewey also understood the Greek view of what constituted a free person. "Because Greek industry was so largely... [based] on servile labor, all industrial activity was regarded by Greek thought as a mere means..." Thus, the persons engaged in such labor could not enjoy a truly human and rational life. However, Dewey accepts that Aristotle has drawn "a just conclusion from the assumed premises, [that] there are classes of men who are necessary materials of society but who are not integral parts of it."[11]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 256.

[10] Dewey, Democracy and Education, [MW: 9] p. 264.

[11] Dewey, Experience and Nature, p. 369 [LW: 1] p. 277.

What then enables persons successfully to engage in practices? How do individuals function together in society? What binds them?

Some virtues or qualities of character such as courage or truthfulness have been named as necessary to achieving excellence in practices, which necessarily are social activities. Justice results from the successful achievement of excellence in virtue of character and of conduct. Justice is, as it were, a "social" virtue, recognized by others who experience what Tufts calls "an impulse toward a life in common."[12] Here Tufts uses the Greek word philia as that "which expresses itself in friendship," But then immediately refers to "a unity of disposition and purpose (homonoia) ...which may be called 'political friendship'"[13]

Although Tufts also quotes Aristotle on friendship in his chapter on marriage and the family in Part III,[14] Dewey's only reference to friendship[15] is a discussion of Epicureanism as a philosophy that holds that "[p]rivate

---

[12] Tufts, 1932 Ethics, p. 113.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., p. 450.

[15] Dewey does include friendship with "books...[and] the fostering of esthetic delights" among those pleasures "more likely to give rise to future occasions of enjoyment" in this same discussion of Epicureanism as a "doctrine which will always flourish...when social conditions are troubled and harsh," but this comment adds nothing to the matter at hand. 1932 Ethics, pp. 200-202.

friendship is better than public life."[16] Before we can discover if Dewey offers a view of the relationships that can bind individuals in society, it is necessary to examine Aristotle's notion of friendship.

Aristotle on friendship

While virtuous practice in one's own affairs is good, it is only in relation to others and in association that the virtue of justice is practiced. Aristotle defines justice as "complete virtue," or:

> ...virtue to the highest degree...because the person who has justice is able to exercise virtue in relation to another, not only in what concerns himself...but in what relates to another.[17]

One might argue that the act of exercising the virtue of justice in relation to another could be called friendship. While such an act could be said to be done by a person exercising the virtue of friendliness, Aristotle's concept of friendship is so large that to call it simply a virtue of character is not sufficient. In the first place it can not be extended toward inanimate objects as can, for example, the virtue of courage. Rather, it is the virtue that is involved in all interpersonal relations of which Aristotle distinguishes three types: good, pleasant, and useful.[18]

---

[16] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 114.

[17] Aristotle, NE, 1129b30.

[18] Aristotle, NE, 1156a3.

It is not possible here to consider all of Aristotle's different perspectives on friendship. Rather the focus must be on the social, the community as the highest form of friendship in the domain of the political. Here association may be pleasant, if the persons involved are acquainted with one another, but for Aristotle, personal relations of intimacy whether of family or friends are not essential to community. It is possible to have useful relations such as business association in which the parties concerned may not even know one another, but this is not the highest form of friendship in the polis.

Political friendship must extend beyond a circle of immediate friends, but it must also involve more than an attitude of goodwill toward other members of the community.

> For the primary concern of justice is the good of the political community (1129b17-19); and if rational agents have good reason to be concerned about the good of the political community, they have good reason to extend their altruistic concern in the particular direction that leads to justice and to the choice of just action for its own sake.[19]

So concern for the good by good persons with good reason for good action is served by friendship in the community. Another way to put this is to say that the ethos of the community is one of friendship in that all of the members are engaged in ethical conduct for its own sake. Recalling that Dewey does not directly address the topic of friendship in his Ethics but that the word for friendship in Greek is

---

[19] Irwin, Aristotle's First Principles, 215.

philia, which can also be translated as love, we can turn to see what Dewey has to say on this matter.

Dewey's view of ethics in society

In his discussion of virtue, Dewey argues that individual virtues cannot be taken in isolation, not should they be treated as other than phases of "an interpenetrated whole...the positive harmony characteristic of integrated interest."[20] He uses the term "love" to define such an attitude of interest. He names the virtues of courage and wisdom as essential to the realization of:

> ...such a complete interest [that is] the only way in which justice can be assured. For it includes as part of itself an impartial concern for all conditions which affect the common welfare, be they specific acts, laws, economic arrangements, political institutions, or whatever.[21]

Dewey is using interest or love in the same way as Aristotle in using friendship with regard to the community. Such love is not just what is good for the person or merely pleasant. Nor is Dewey treating simply personal relations or relations of utility.

At the end of his final chapter in the 1932 Ethics, Dewey writes of "social unity," and defines it as "interest in the affairs of the community as if they were one's own concern," and he further says "love of country is intrinsically extension of love for one's friends and neigh-

---

[20] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 258.

[21] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 259.

bors."[22] Dewey's view of a global community of nations is clearly much more than Aristotle ever envisaged. However, I would maintain that in his very restraint in the use of what he would consider overly emotional language, in his use of the word love only with regard to morality in society, that Dewey is very near to Aristotle's view of that which binds persons in community.

---

[22] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 368.

CHAPTER VII

DEWEY'S AND ARISTOTLE'S TELEOLOGY

This chapter will look at the end or telos of Dewey's and Aristotle's ethics. We have seen that ethical conduct and character can be described in terms of virtue in the individual. The relationship of persons in society can be described in terms of philia or friendship or love. Dewey's reflective morality functions in the same way as Aristotle's practical wisdom, or phronesis, enabling a person to make good choices and choosing the good. Society, or the polis, provides the necessary social environment where all this takes place. What is the end of all this? Is there some final or ultimate good toward which ethics leads us?

Dewey says that the question of what ends a man should live for is only meaningful in a reflective morality, "[t]he question of what ends a man should live for does not arise as a general problem in customary morality."[1] What this means in effect is that the end of customary morality is that it should be observed. Reflective morality requires something more, however, that is, goals and behavior consistent with:

---

[1] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 184.

> The development of inclusive and enduring aims is the necessary condition of the application of reflection in conduct; indeed they are two names for the same fact.[2]

Thus the ends of reflective morality and the process itself are one on Dewey's account.

Reflective morality in Aristotle's terms is virtuous conduct expressed in an individual through a character that has been formed through habit and education. The aim of practical wisdom or reflection in conduct is arete or excellence in the practice of ethics and politics. The word eudaimonos can be used as an adjective to describe such good practices; that is, excellence of character and conduct has both for the person and for society the inclusive and enduring aim or goal of well-being or eudaimonia. Before we can discuss whether eudaimonia can be seen in some way as an ultimate end, however, it is necessary to look at how a person moves toward the recognition or the understanding of human action and experience in order to develop any such end or goal.

Aristotle's archai and logoi

It is through dialectical reflection on experience that we become aware of the archai, the reasons "why" things are as they are. Those reasons derive from the logoi or meanings that are generated by sensory perceptions and go to

---

[2] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 185.

make up what we recognize as an experience. It is upon these experiences that we engage in the process of dialectic to discover universals by induction, that is, to account for the underlying concepts or principles implicit in the particular instances. "When the observation of particular instances is often repeated, the universal that is in them becomes plain."[3] The archai, then, are the underlying concepts or the basis of recognizing, understanding, and learning the logos or meaning of future experiences.

It can be shown that for Dewey a similar structure and function are contained in the concept of reconstruction of experience. It remains to be seen if this is a useful basis for Dewey's teleology. That is, does Dewey also have some ultimate end, such as eudaimonia, reached by a process that is similar to Aristotle's?

Dewey's reconstruction of experience

One could say that the meaning of reconstruction of experience is contained in the juxtaposition of the words rather than in the individual words themselves, that is, the dynamic or functional relationship of the words reflects the dynamic meaning of the expression. It is, however, possible to analyze some meanings of the word "reconstruction" and its relationship to the word "experience" in order to show

---

[3] Aristotle, Posterior Analytics, BkII, 19: 100a5, 100b4, 5.

that, while not interchangeable, the meaning of each word and its underlying concept depends on the other for complete understanding.

As an underlying concept, or arche, reconstruction as remodelling (or building again) generally is done with intention of some improvement in the original structure, to make it better or more efficient. If we are discussing human persons or groups, one such intention or aim of reconstruction, then, could be "social efficiency," which Dewey defines as "...the cultivation of power to join freely and fully in shared or common activities."[4]

The problem with this definition of reconstruction is that it seems to require the participation of more than one individual for the actual manifestation. Can reconstruction be only a group activity? Surely the individual can engage in the enterprise on his or her own? The definition of reconstruction as social efficiency gives us a clue, in that it tacitly indicates that it may not be the group that is "reconstructing" but the individual who cultivates some means of participating in the group. The person, then, is engaged in the experience of reconstruction.

Why then are common or group activities needed at all? From Dewey's perspective it may be that the group provides some necessary element for the enterprise. That is,

---

[4] John Dewey, Democracy and Education, [MW: 9] p. 123.

that only in shared or common activity can experience take place that is the material of reconstruction.

One might object that a person can have "experience" completely alone. This would be true, however, only if such experience excluded any reference to prior experience or knowledge or memory that at whatever remove would necessarily involve contact with an other. That is, all that we are aware of involves experience of other persons. Further, it is only by experiencing "the other" that we develop an awareness of our "self."

In a extended discussion of the self, George Herbert Mead suggests that the commonality of experience of events exists only in the spatial-temporal world each individual experiences through the consciousness that is unique to human beings. That is, neither the location nor the duration of an experience will ever be the same for any two individuals. We can nonetheless deal with our subjective worlds, anticipating and planning eventualities, and engage in all forms of social conduct through the functioning of both "self and the mind."[5]

However, a person's awareness of self depends on awareness of others. It is clear that for Mead a person is a social animal who must experience a group and the attitude

---

[5] George Herbert Mead, The Philosophy of the Present (Chicago, London: Open Court Publishing Company, 1932), ed. Arthur E. Murphy; Lectures upon the Paul Carus Foundation, Third Series, plus supplementary essays. p. 178.

of others before she can experience herself. This does not necessarily mean that exposure to great numbers of other people is necessary before a sense of self can develop. In his discussion of developmental play, Mead is particularly clear that the imitative acts of role-playing are the self-stimulation of the responses of a limited other, that is, the person's own experience limits how the "other" can respond. As play becomes a game with rules and structure, roles are formalized and the person must become aware of all of these in order to participate fully, even when the activity is solitary or, as we say, takes place in the person's imagination. The person develops a sense of the "generalized other" that enables him to play a role himself and also to anticipate the actions of other players, even if they are not present.[6] Mead has given us a view of an early stage of what Dewey calls reconstruction of experience. Now we need to look at where all this takes place -- where the real "others" are -- in society.

Reconstruction of experience and social reality

The experience of reconstruction increases the ability of the self to undertake subsequent experience through practice and experiment. It is through experience of both self and others that an individual develops what Alfred

---

[6] Ibid., p. 186.

Schutz calls organized knowledge of "social reality."[7] It is possible to acquire this knowledge because, as we have seen, to be social is to be intersubjective; that is we can share experiences and those experiences are meaningful to us and to others in that we are able to recognize and grasp others' actions, motives, and goals. Thus, "our common sense knowledge of everyday life"[8] enables us to describe and name some experienced attributes of social reality.

First, Schutz says, our lives are "structurally socialized" in that if we change places with any other person we will experience substantially the same perspective as the other. This reciprocity of perspectives makes it possible to place ourselves "in another's position" to examine the particular instance. The examination of the immediate experience enables us to enhance both our experience of self and of others as the reconstruction of the "material of experience" proceeds.

Second, the greater part of our knowledge, its content and forms, is genetically socialized, derived from past experience and approved in institutionalized forms, such as Dewey's customary morality. The individual can choose to accept, examine, change or reject the content,

---

[7] Alfred Schutz, Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality, ed. and intro. by Maurice Natanson with preface by H.L. Van Breda (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962), p. 53.

[8] Ibid., p. 55.

thus enabling the reconstruction process. By identifying some of the basic meaning of experience, at least one discovers those things that are biologically and physically determined.

Finally, although knowledge actually may vary between individuals, this variety is accepted as being an appropriate distribution that somehow levels off and no one is concerned that everyone does not know everything that everyone else knows. This social distribution between individuals makes it possible to universalize "common knowledge." Reconstruction of individuals' experiences in a group situation must draw on the acceptance of this commonality to reach consensus, for example.

As we keep in mind these attributes of social reality Schutz offers as the logoi that make up the "material of experience," it is possible to recognize the archai of many of our experiences and thus advance the enterprise of reconstruction. But what is the end of all this? Is reconstruction of social reality in some sense the goal?

If so, the group or shared activity, actual or in memory or imagination, is essential for the experience of reconstruction, but this is not the word order of our original expression. Although we have shown there is some relationship that may even be called a dynamic interdependence between the terms, what then is "reconstruction of experience"?

We may return to the definition of social efficiency for the answer. The expression "reconstruction of experience" refers to a "power," a mode of human action whether by disposition, habituation, or virtuous intention, that can be cultivated and that enables the individual to join "freely and fully" in...what? There is always a threat of circularity in Dewey, and at this point it seems that reconstruction of experience leads to more of the same ad infinitum. But we have already seen in Chapter II that Dewey's many definitions of the word "experience" often have this apparent circularity. Perhaps we need to ask, Is there a further purpose or end to "reconstruction of experience" that is contained in, but not limited to, definition?

Dewey clearly intends there to be an end that could be described as something like the realization of the self both leading to and resulting from participation in society. "Reconstruction of experience" is the shorthand expression of how this may be achieved. It is not an end in itself, but is descriptive of a dynamic process or activity that leads toward an end. Nor is reconstruction of experience intended just to be the means to an end. Once again, there is an element of both/and, in the same way as Dewey says that:

> The self is not a <u>mere</u> means to producing consequences because the consequences, when of a moral kind, enter into the formation of the self and the self enters into them.[9]

---

[9] Dewey, 1932 <u>Ethics</u>, p. 286.

Somehow the reconstruction of experience functions as an ongoing process with a structure that can change and grow as the process proceeds. As the meanings of experience are recognized, these become the basis for the continuation of the process, the archai underlying the further recognition of logos, in Aristotle's terms.

Is reconstruction of experience teleological?

Before one can say whether reconstruction of experience is teleological, on must define both the predicate and the subject of the statement. That which is teleological has some end or goal or purpose. A teleological ethics, for example, looks to the end result of an act, whereas a deontological ethics looks to the extent to which a moral principle of obligation, such as duty or promise-keeping, requires that the act be performed. Teleological explanation is in terms of some end that may or may not lead to a further end. These are not ends in a causal sense, that is, landing in the parking lot does not "cause" the cat to be dropped out the window. Nor are ends just functional, as excretion is a function of the kidney, because that function is part of the function of the entire organism.

Ends also must be goal-directed or purposive, whether in the short term as means to yet another end or as an end that is, in ethical terms, some "good" in itself, such as

knowledge or self-fulfillment, or some balance of "better" good over "lesser" good.

Dewey's best simple definition of reconstruction of experience is the "...reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience."[10] This reorganization is purposive, an intelligent direction and redirection of action to an end. It also involves innumerable short term "ends-in-view" leading to a unity of purpose or rational integration of the person in his environment as yet another and further end of reconstruction of experience.

So ends-in-view lead to some further end of reconstruction of experience. Dewey writes about the structure of experience as "three deepening levels or three expanding spheres of context." The first level is the direct personal experience of the thinker. The second is social or anthropological world we call "culture." The third level is the philosophical context of "the boundless multiplicity of the concrete experiences of humanity when they are dealt with gently and humanely, [that] will naturally terminate in some sense of the structure of any and all experience."[11] If such a statement sounds like some part of a definition of experience as an elaborate teleological structure, that is

---

[10] Dewey, Democracy and Education, [MW: 9] p. 82.

[11] [LW: 6] pp. 3-28.

indeed the case. In his introduction to one of the collected works editions Sidney Hook describes Dewey's use of the term to refer to "a pattern of events in which the organism is deliberately or with some awareness attending or acting upon something and undergoing or suffering the consequences of the action."[12]

Thus, reconstruction of experience is teleological in that unity of purpose as an end requires some sense or awareness of the structure of experience leading to the rational integration of the person in the pattern of events of her environment as an end. These are not two ends, but rather aspects of the end that is the dynamic ongoing process of reconstruction by, for, and in the person. If some ultimate end is sought, it may be for the person to be the most that that person can be.

Ultimate ends

We have now reached the point where there must be some ultimate end to which the practice of ethics aims. For both Dewey and Aristotle, it seems, the end of good conduct is human welfare. But is there some ultimate end beyond "the functioning of man's various powers under the guidance of intelligence," as Randall puts it?[13] Dewey maintains that

---

[12] Democracy and Education, [MW: 9] p. 10.

[13] Randall, Aristotle, p. 253.

although "we set up this and that end to be reached...the end is growth."[14]

Growth as the ultimate end for Dewey

The Introduction of the 1932 Ethics discusses the moral life in terms of growth, "...a process in which man becomes more rational, more social, and finally more moral."[15] It is through reconstruction of experience that this growth process takes place. That is, just as Dewey sees education as reconstruction of experience, he also emphasizes "that the educative process can be identified with growth when that is understood in terms of the active participle, growing."[16] Thus, both the process and the end of reconstruction of experience are, in fact, growth. Since the practice of ethics involves reconstruction of experience, the end of ethics is growth.

What is the ultimate end for Aristotle?

Just as character is inseparable from conduct, so too is ethics inseparable from politics. Although ethics is concerned with the happiness and virtue of individuals and politics with the best sort of society, both are concerned

---

[14] 1932 Ethics, p. 306.

[15] 1932 Ethics, p. 13.

[16] Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1938; Collier Books, 1963), p. 36 [LW: 13] p. 19.

with human conduct that will bring about human good.[17] Ethical and political knowledge must be intellectual as well as practical, and its aim is to strive for the good of human conduct.

> ...good deliberation is correctness that reflects what is beneficial, about the right thing, in the right way and at the right time...unconditionally good deliberation is the sort that correctly promotes the unconditional good [ie. the highest good][18]

What Dewey would call reflective morality must be just that, good action based on good reflection about good things. What then is the highest good? Good conduct is "good because it gives satisfaction to human feelings...a means to [individual] happiness or self-contentment...whereas virtuous conduct affords us happiness apart from the result."[19] Clearly, the highest good is not just that which is good for something or a means, but is that which is in some way good in itself.

Good deliberation is good for something, obviously, but there is still another level of deliberation. First, unconditionally good deliberation must extend into one's whole life, past and future, and take into consideration one's total environment.[20] Second, one must be aware of the

---

[17] Aristotle, NE 1094b9

[18] Aristotle, NE 1142b27-30.

[19] Takatura Ando, Aristotle's Theory of Practical Cognition (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971), p. 265.

[20] Irwin, Aristotle's First Principles, p. 338.

good of the deliberation for its own sake.[21] Finally, the choice made as a result of the good deliberation must be made for its own sake. That is, the person of virtuous character chooses virtuous conduct because such conduct is virtuous. It is in making this choice for the good that the highest good is achieved.

Eudaimonia as the ultimate end for Aristotle

This highest good, or eudaimonia, has been variously called happiness or well being or living well, but none of these can give the full meaning of the function of eudaimonia in the person. That is, eudaimonia is not some static point that is reached once and for all, an accomplishment. Rather it is the continual act, the ongoing accomplishing that is human nature, something for which it is our nature to strive, and in the striving we realize our nature more fully.

Self-realization is not the nature of the greatest good discussed by Aristotle, however. As Edel points out:

> ...ethics in the Aristotelian tradition is not a separate province in which a freely willing moral agent struggles within himself in a fretful effort to do his duty or conform to a universally binding moral law or even calculate profit and loss.[22]

---

[21] Ibid., p. 341.

[22] Abraham Edel, Aristotle and His Philosophy (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), p. 251.

This rejection of individualism is, of course, consistent with Dewey's view that no single contemporary moral theory is sufficient "...as the injunction to each self on every possible occasion to identify the self with a new growth that is possible..."[23]

Can some ultimate end of growth in the moral life be attained, however? Aristotle does deal with this question at the end of the Nicomachean Ethics.

Although it is through the realization of our natures as social "animals" that the human good is accomplished, we also are, on Aristotle's view, the only animals that think. Thinking or reasoning is necessary for practical wisdom, but there also is a speculative reasoning that can be engaged in for its own sake. This is sophia, wisdom that is "...found in the highest degree in the activity which is concerned with theoretical knowledge."[24] This is the activity of the "self-sufficient" and wise person engaged in using the best capacity of the human person, reason. "Hence the best activity of all is the best activity of the best capacity,"[25] and Aristotle appears to have presented us with an ultimate end -- the use of reason, study, contemplation.

---

[23] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 308.

[24] Abraham Edel, Aristotle (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1962), p. 416.

[25] Irwin, NE, note to 1177a14, p. 378.

Yet almost immediately, Aristotle says that although this activity of study is the highest single good of all, it still does "not contain all the goods needed to make life lack nothing."[26] If it were the only and ultimate end we would be as gods, which we are not. Our human nature requires the physical and the social as well, for it is "not self-sufficient for engaging in study; our body must be healthy and we must have food and generally be cared for."[27] Eudaimonia is the highest good of all, but is found in the whole of human nature, man's contemplative self and his practical self.

We learn and actively practice the "science" of ethics as part of our participation in the "science" of politics, the human community. The growth of the good in the person striving for the good is inseparable from the growth of the good in the community. Since all human life is a process of growth it is this growth of the good in conduct and character in the person and in society that is the ultimate good. If this ultimate good is the end, the telos of Aristotle's ethics, then it can be said that growth is the end of his ethics.

---

[26] Irwin, NE, note to 1177a27, p. 379.

[27] Edel, Aristotle, p. 419.

Conclusion

The teleology of Dewey's ethics and of Aristotle's is the same in that both arise from human experience. Each requires a process by which the meaning of experience is recognized, understood, and used to continue the process. Finally, the process itself is one of growth in morality, the good for the person and for society, that is, in effect, an end in itself.

CONCLUSION

It has been shown that for Dewey, as for Aristotle, human acts include the element of virtue in both the conduct and consequence of action as well as the character of the agent. However, it is not simply that persons are virtuous if their conduct is virtuous and the consequences of that conduct is virtuous. That is, for each philosopher the morality or good of the act begins with the inherent good of human nature realized in the individual acting with full awareness and understanding of that good in relation to other persons. For Dewey, Neil Coughlin says, "the definition of virtue that seems eventually to have most satisfied him was conduct that served society's end."[1]

As a social animal we learn of the good by contact with other humans. We become virtuous by becoming more of the best of being human, through good habituation, inculcation in customary morality, and by using our power of reason. Thus, like Aristotle's phronesis, Dewey's concept of reflective morality requires the person to weigh and discard alternatives while striving for that resolution in which the good inheres, using the conclusion to lead into a continuation of the process.

---

[1] Neil Coughlin, Young John Dewey (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1975), p. 85.

For both Aristotle and Dewey moral reasoning, that is, the practice of ethics, has a social function rather than a formal function, the systematization of rules for the individual. Aristotle certainly does not offer a great deal of practical guidance for actually solving moral problems because he is:

> ...more concerned with identifying the right states of character than with specifying the range of actions associated with them. He thinks detailed ethical instructions require reference to social and political conditions, and these are discussed in the Politics.[2]

In the same way, Dewey maintains that there is:

> ...[no] final and unquestionable knowledge on which we can fall back in order to settle automatically every moral problem...[for] this would involve commitment to a dogmatic theory of morals.[3]

Dewey calls his method "experimental" in that his reflective morality, like Aristotle's dialectic, involves the observation of particular situations.

The society in which Dewey lived was one in which there was greater change than Aristotle could have imagined.

> In consequence the demand for a truly reflective, a thoughtful, morality was never so great. This is almost the only alternative to either moral drifting or else to unreasoning and dogmatic insistence upon arbitrary, formal codes...[4]

---

[2] Irwin,tr., NE, p. xix.

[3] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 329.

[4] Dewey, 1932 Ethics, p. 233.

The goal is good conduct, a good life, a good society, for both Dewey and Aristotle. That is, a life that is good in itself, something worth striving for its own sake. To this end reconstruction of experience is not only the means but also the end that Dewey calls growth, toward which, like Aristotle's eudaimonia, human acts are directed.

Finally, both for Dewey and for Aristotle ethics are teleological in their orientation to both the goals of the individual and of society. And for both the end is growth. The points in the two structures and the processes connecting them have been identified in Aristotle and in John Dewey's 1932 Ethics. The resulting structures are similar enough to claim that Dewey's 1932 Ethics is Aristotelian.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS BY JOHN DEWEY

BOOKS

The Collected Works of John Dewey, 1882-1953. ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Art as Experience. (James Lectures, 1931.) New York: Capricorn Books, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1958. The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 10: 1934. Introduction by Abraham Kaplan. (1987)

Democracy and Education. (1st ed., 1916.) New York: The Free Press, 1966. The Middle Works, 1899-1924, Volume 9: 1916. Introduction by Sidney Hook. (1985)

Essays in Experimental Logic. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916. In The Middle Works, 1899-1924, Volume 10: 1916-1917. Introduction by Lewis Hahn. (1980)

Ethics. Written with James H. Tufts. The Middle Works, 1899-1924, Volume 5: 1908. Introduction by Charles L. Stevenson. (1978)

Ethics. Revision of 1908 version written with James H. Tufts. The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 7: 1932. Introduction by Abraham Edel and Elizabeth Flower. (1985)

Experience and Nature. rev. ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1929. The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 1: 1925. Introduction by Sidney Hook. (1981)

German Philosophy and Politics. New York: Henry Holt, 1915. In The Middle Works, 1899-1924, Volume 8: 1915. Introduction by Sidney Hook. (1985)

Human Nature and Conduct. New York: Henry Holt, 1944. The Middle Works, 1899-1924, Volume 14: 1922. Introduction by Murray G. Murphey. (1984)

Logic: The Theory of Inquiry. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1938. The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 12: 1938. Introduction by Ernest Nagel. (1986)

Outlines of a Critical Theory of Ethics. In The Early Works, 1882-1898, Volume 3: 1889-1892. Introduction by S. Morris Eames. (1969)

The Public and Its Problems. Denver: Alan Swallow, 1954. In The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 2: 1925-1927. Introduction by James Gouinlock. (1987)

The Quest for Certainty. New York: Minton, Balch, 1929. The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 4: 1929. Introduction by Stephen Toulmin. (1984)

Reconstruction in Philosophy. New York: Henry Holt, 1920. In The Middle Works, 1899-1924, Volume 12: 1920. Introduction by Ralph Ross. (1982)

Theory of Valuation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. Experience and Education. New York: Macmillan 1983. In The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 13: 1938-1939. Introduction by Steven Cahn. (1987)

WORKS ON JOHN DEWEY

BOOKS

Bernstein, Richard J. John Dewey. New York: Washington Square Press, 1966.

Boydston, Jo Ann, ed. Guide to the Works of John Dewey. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.

Boydston, Jo Ann and Kathleen Poulos. Checklist of Writings about John Dewey. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978.

Coughlan, Neil. Young John Dewey. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Dykhuizen, George. The Life and Mind of John Dewey. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

Gouinlock, James. John Dewey's Philosophy of Value. New York: Humanities Press, 1972.

_____. The Moral Writings of John Dewey. New York: Hafner Press 1976.

Lamont, Corliss, ed. Dialogue on John Dewey. New York: Horizon Press, 1959.

Peterson, Forrest H. John Dewey's Reconstruction In Philosophy. New York: Philosophical Library, 1987.

Schlipp, Paul Arthur, ed. The Philosophy of John Dewey. The Library of Living Philosophers, Vol. I. Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press: 1939.

Thomas, M.H. J. Dewey: A Centennial Bibliography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Tiles, J.E. Dewey. London and New York: Routledge, 1988.

ARTICLES

Anderson, Frederick M. "Dewey's Experiment with Greek Philosophy." International Philosophical Quarterly 7 (1967): 86-100.

Anton, John P. "John Dewey and Ancient Philosophies." Philosophy and Phenomenological Research 25 (1965): 477-499.

Beloff, Max. "Can the University be Conceived as a Model of Democracy?" In G.R. Urban, ed. Hazards of Learning. LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court, 1977. pp. 153-176.

Betz, Joseph. "John Dewey on Human Rights." Transactions of the Charles Sanders Peirce Society 14 (1978): 18-41.

_____. "Dewey and Socrates." Transactions of the Charles Sanders Peirce Society 16 (1980): 329-356.

Boller, Paul F., Jr. "Freedom in John Dewey's Philosophy of Education." Teachers College Record 79 (1977): 99-118.

Boydston, Jo Ann. "John Dewey and the New Feminism." Teachers College Record 76 (1975): 441-448.

Callan, Eamonn. "Education for Democracy: Dewey's Illiberal Philosophy of Education." Educational Theory 31 (1981): 167-176.

Gouinlock, James. "The Moral Value of Philosophic Education." Teaching Philosophy 3 (1979): 37-49.

_____. "Social Intelligence." In Excellence in Public Discourse. John Stuart Mill, John Dewey, and Social Intelligence. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986. pp. 52-73.

Meenan, Daniel F.X., S.J. "John Dewey's Theory of Valuation." Modern Schoolman 30 (1953): 187-201.

Stevenson, Charles L. "Reflections on John Dewey's Ethics." Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society 62 (1961-62): 77-98.

Stuhr, John J. "Dewey's Notion of Qualitative Experience." Transactions of the Charles Sanders Peirce Society 15 (1979): 68-82.

Wellman, R.R. "Dewey's Theory of Inquiry: The Impossibility of Its Statement." Educational Theory 14 (1964): 103-110.

White, Morton G. "Value and Obligation in Dewey and Lewis." The Philosophical Review LVIII (1949): 321-29.

Wirth, Arthur. "John Dewey's Philosophical Opposition to Smith-Hughes Type Vocational Education." Educational Theory 22 (1972): 69-77.

BOOK REVIEWS

(Reviews of 1st edition; John Dewey and James Tufts. Ethics. New York: Henry Holt, 1932.)

Bugg, Eugene G. American Journal of Psychology 46 (1934): 693-94.

Sharp, Frank Chapman. International Journal of Ethics 44 (1933-34): 155-160.

Parker, DeWitt H. Philosophical Review 43 (1934): 523-25.

Rynin, David University of California Chronicle 35 (1933): 134-36.

Woodburne, A. Stewart Crozer Quarterly 10 (1933): 125.

E.N. Boston Evening Transcript, 14 December 1932, p. 2.

(Review of SIU Collected Works Edition [LW: 7].)

Rucker, Darnell. Journal of Social Philosophy, Volume XVII, Number 3 Fall 1987, pp. 64-66.

WORKS BY ARISTOTLE

Nicomachean Ethics. Terence Irwin, tr. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1983.

Poetics. In S.H. Butcher, tr. Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, 4th ed. New York: Dover, 1955, Bks. 1-3.

Posterior Analytics. G.R.G. Mure, tr. In Richard McKeon, ed. Introduction to Aristotle. New York: Random House, 1947.

The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle. 2nd ed. F.H. Peters, tr. London: Keagan Paul, Trench, 1884.

The Politics of Aristotle. J.E.C. Welldon, tr. London: Macmillan, 1883.

WORKS ON ARISTOTLE

BOOKS

Ando, Takatura. Aristotle's Theory of Practical Cognition. The Hague: Marcus Nijhoff, 1971.

Aquinas, St. Thomas. Commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics. 2 Vols. Chicago: Regnery, 1964.

Asselin, Don. Human Nature and Eudaimonia in Aristotle. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Butcher, S.H. tr. Aristole's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art. 4th ed. New York: Dover, 1955

Edel, Abraham. Aristotle. New York: Dell Publishing, 1962.

_____. Aristotle and His Philosophy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Irwin, Terence. Aristotle's First Principles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Jaeger, Werner. Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of His Development. Richard Robinson, tr. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Randall, John Herman, Jr. Aristotle. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Rorty, Amelie Oksenberg, ed. Essays on Aristotle's Ethics. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California

Press, 1980.

Sherman, Nancy. The Fabric of Character: Aristotle's Theory of Virtue. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

REFERENCE WORKS

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Achenstein, Peter. Concepts of Evidence. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Aquinas, St. Thomas. Summma Theologica I-II 90-97. Chicago: Regnery, no date.

Bloom, Allan. The Closing of the American Mind. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Bradley, F.H. "My Station and Its Duties." In Ethical Studies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. pp. 160-213.

Brumbaugh, Robert S., and Nathaniel A. Lawrence. Philosophers on Education: Six Essays on Foundations of Western Thought. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1968, reprinted 1986.

Chambliss, J.J. Educational Theory as the Theory of Conduct. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.

Davis, John and Alan Bollard. As If People Mattered. London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1986.

DeGeorge, Richard and Fernande DeGeorge. The Structuralists from Marx to Levi-Strauss. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1972.

Green, Thomas F. "Work and Job." In Work, Leisure and the American Schools. New York: Random House, 1968. pp. 76-114.

Irwin, Terence. Classical Thought. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

James, William. "Habit." In The Principles of Psychology. New York: Dover Publications, 1950. pp. 104-127.

Jonas, Hans. The Imperative of Responsibility. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Jonsen, Albert R., and Stephen Toulmin. The Abuse of

Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.

Klubertanz, George P., S.J. The Discursive Power. Carthagena: Messenger Press, St. Louis: Modern Schoolman, 1952.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. After Virtue. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Press, 1984.

_____. Whose Justice? Which Rationality? Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Press, 1988.

Maritain, Jaques. Art and Scholasticism. London: Sheed & Ward, 1947.

Mead, George Herbert, The Philosophy of the Present. Ed. by Arthur E. Murphy. Lectures upon the Paul Carus Foundation, Third Series plus supplementary essays. Chicago: London: Open Court, 1932.

Peirce, Charles Santiago Sanders, Pragmatism and Pragmaticism. Vol. V. Collected Papers. ed. by Chas. Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931-1958.

Piaget, Jean. Structuralism. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Regan, Tom, ed. Just Business: New Introductory Essays in Business Ethics. New York: Random House, 1984.

Roth, Robert J., S.J. American Religious Philosophy. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967.

Schutz, Alfred. Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality. Ed. and intro. Maurice Natanson. Pref. by H.L. Van Breda. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962.

Toulmin, Stephen. The Uses of Argument. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Westermarck, Edward. The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1912.

Williams, Bernard. Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1985.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Patricia Haggard has been read and approved by the following committee:

Fr. Walter P. Krolikowski, S.J., Director
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Dr. Gerald L. Gutek
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
and History

Dr. Stephen I. Miller
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date

Director's Signature