**PHIL 282 (F22) History of Modern Philosophy**

Time: M/W, 4-5:40pm

Place: New North 204 & Zoom (see Modes of Instruction below)

Instructor: Professor Huaping Lu-Adler, hl530@georgetown.edu

Office hours: by appointment (in person or via Zoom)[[1]](#footnote-1)

History, as nearly no one seems to know, is not merely something to be read. And it does not refer merely, or principally, to the past. On the contrary, the great force of history comes from the fact that we carry it within us, are unconsciously controlled by it in many ways, and history is literally present in all that we do. It could scarcely be otherwise, since it is to history that we owe our frames of reference, our identities, and our aspirations.

— James Baldwin, “The White Man’s Guilt” (1965)

**A Quasi-Autobiographical Course Description,**

**or Why I am Taking a Radically New Approach to This Course**

This course typically focuses on the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Western European philosophy (often it also extends to the nineteenth century, but again with a focus on Western philosophers). That’s at least how I was taught in graduate school (I received my PhD in 2012). That’s also how I taught it for many years at Georgetown (until last year). You may be concerned, as you should be, upon hearing the description. You may ask: why don’t other philosophical traditions—African, Arabic, Buddhist, indigenous-American, and so on—have a place in a survey course on the history of modern philosophy? (Note how the course title doesn’t include ‘Western.’) Well, someone may respond, those traditions—*if* they count as *philosophical* at all—are old, whereas we are talking about the particular period of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the European Enlightenment movements—French, Scottish, and German, etc.—defined this period, when nothing philosophically worthwhile was happening in the rest of the world; therefore, …. Very few will say this out loud, but it’s an operative line of reasoning that’s implicit in how we professional philosophers tend to approach a course titled “History of [Early] Modern Philosophy.” I’ll let you figure out how good such a response is. (If you are interested in digging further, I recommend [*Taking Back Philosophy: A Multicultural Manifesto*](http://cup.columbia.edu/book/taking-back-philosophy/9780231184373) by Bryan van Norden, published in 2017.)

 Also, it was once—and still is to a large extent—cliché to present the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century history of philosophy in terms of struggles between *rationalism* and *empiricism*—with René Descartes, Baruch Spinoza, and G. W. Leibniz representing the former and John Locke, George Berkeley, and David Hume, the latter—that ended with a conciliatory synthesis in Immanuel Kant’s *transcendental philosophy*. This account goes hand-in-hand with the view that early modern philosophy revolved around epistemology and thus distinguished itself from past traditions by an “epistemological turn.” A lot of survey textbooks in use are still written along these lines. This approach, however, is simplistic and misleading to say the least. It also serves to perpetuate the problematic tendency to omit brilliant *women* philosophers, as well as a good number of male philosophers who were much more significant and impactful than someone like Berkeley.

 Over the last few years, I tried to expand the canon by including important women philosophers (for a partial list of them, visit [Project Vox](https://projectvox.org/philosophers/)) and approaching the course with a more nuanced historical narrative. I always did so with this caveat: the period of seventeenth and eighteenth centuries “left us with an enormous amount of highly complex philosophical legacies. Precisely due to its complexity, it is not feasible to survey it from every angle. It is important to recognize that, from whichever angle we choose to tell this history, the narrative is inevitably selective and limited” (quoted from my Fall 2020 syllabus for this course). In other words, try as I might, I could never construct a truly inclusive syllabus just by adding this or that philosopher who is not yet part of the old canon. It will always remain an arbitrary decision on my part as to who of all the important and interesting philosophers I choose to include in the syllabus.

 I had an epiphany last fall: if we can never be inclusive enough in such a course, why don’t we investigate, at a *meta-philosophical* level, how the *mechanisms of exclusion* took hold in the first place? If non-white, non-Western, and women philosophers have been largely absent from the old canon, it’s not because such philosophers were non-existent or had no worthy philosophical insights to offer. Their *omission* from a historical narrative was rather rooted in the mistaken assumption that non-whites (e.g., Amerindians, black Africans, and Chinese), whitish non-Europeans (e.g., Persians and Northern Africans), and women were *incapable* of *philosophy properly so called* (the “Orientals” were sometimes granted “wisdom,” but not true philosophy worthy of an aspiring philosopher’s time). Today’s historians, me included, who are *in theory* opposed to such an assumption may nevertheless inadvertently reinforce it *in practice*—by, for instance, focusing on a narrow set of philosophical issues (e.g., the mind-body problem) as the *core* ones, while ignoring or downplaying many other topics as merely tangential or uninteresting. Some of the topics included in this syllabus belong in the latter category. For example, what makes a “race”? What should be the place of women in a society? How does one’s social position affect one’s self-knowledge or, for that matter, one’s knowledge of the world? By including these oft-neglected issues, I intend to show how the historical past is nevertheless present—as Baldwin concisely put it in the passage quoted above.

 A more general message I wish to convey, one that we should always keep in mind as aspiring students of philosophy in today’s world, is that philosophers are spatiotemporally located *human beings* first and foremost. No matter how much they claim or attempt to transcend the empirical constraints of their world, their worldview is *always a* *view from somewhere*. So, we should not study them just as dead people whose views we are obliged to read and dissect, but as examples of how one *philosophizes* in the real world. All the philosophical writers included in this syllabus were, in one way or another, responding to the world as they saw it. We may disagree with—in some cases feel utterly repelled by—their views. But even their mistaken ways of thinking can have humbling lessons for us. How would *we* have philosophized if we occupied a similar social location? How could *we* do better? Or could we?

**Learning Goals**

There are elements of meta-cognition and critical thinking to the course. You are to

1. Gain contextualized understanding of certain themes and arguments from the early modern period.
2. Be able to evaluate a philosophical theory in terms of the quality of its content, regardless of what status historians have assigned to its author.
3. Learn about and critically reflect on different ways in which the history of early modern philosophy has been and can be told.
4. Appreciate, more generally, that there are many ways to construct a history and that the now-canonical ways of presenting it may be (i) historically inaccurate, (ii) incomplete, (iii) biased, or (iv) accidental and dependent on, say, who happens to be the narrator.
5. Develop transferable skills for engaging one another in a respectful and open-minded way, with the shared goal of pursuing knowledge and becoming a better thinker in community with others.

These learning goals determine what kind of readings are assigned in this class, how you will be assessed, and what roles you are expected to play in the collective learning process. This will be reflected in the rest of the syllabus and in the specific instructions that you will receive on their assignments.

**Commitment to Active-Authentic Learning & Pedagogies of Care**

I believe that true learning happens in a class only when *all* students are encouraged and given opportunities to be actively involved in the learning activities and when each of them can find a way to connect the course materials with real-world issues that they, based on their own *lived experience*, care about. I also believe that learning is an emotional and social process as well as an intellectual one.

For these reasons, I am committed to fostering a caring and supportive—as well as intellectually responsible and rigorous—learning community where each of you feel that you *belong* and have a voice. Although some of the topics we discuss may sound remote to you (you are studying philosophical ideas from a few centuries ago after all), you’ll see that many of the issues that intrigued past philosophers and their perspectives continue to be relevant. Interrogating them will give us opportunities to reflect on certain problems that confront us today. It may require courage for us to take up such reflections with honesty and with a willingness to be vulnerable with one another in the shared space of this class. The following poem says it all.[[2]](#footnote-2)



**The Engelhard Project**

Because of its attention to pedagogies of care, this course has been named an Engelhard course through Georgetown’s [Engelhard Project for Connecting Life and Learning](https://engelhard.georgetown.edu/). The goal of Engelhard courses is to integrate college health and well-being issues into course content and/or pedagogy by creating meaningful connections between students’ lived experiences and what/how they are learning. You will be asked to reflect on this practice in your “meta-cognitive reflection,” due near the end of the semester (explained below).

I believe that **feeling well and happy makes you a better learner**. Please prioritize your well-being throughout the semester. Take advantage of the many [institutional recourses](https://studenthealth.georgetown.edu/mental-health/on-campus-resources/) that our university has to offer. Depending on your taste, you can also find many useful tips and tools from these podcast series that draw on current scientific understandings as well as philosophical traditions: [Chasing Life](https://www.cnn.com/audio/podcasts/chasing-life) (hosted by CNN’s science correspondent, neurosurgeon Dr. Sanjay Gupta); [The Science of Happiness](https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/podcasts/series/the_science_of_happiness) (run by UC Berkeley’s Greater Good Science Center); [The Happiness Lab](https://www.happinesslab.fm/) (hosted by Yale professor Dr. Laurie Santos); [Ten Percent Happier](https://www.tenpercent.com/podcast) (this one has short, themed meditations guided by expert practitioners).

**Modes of Instruction**

By default, our meetings are in person. For pedagogical reasons, I will occasionally hold the class over Zoom (as indicated in the schedule below). To attend a virtual meeting, please use the link provided in Canvas>Zoom Conferencing. Please mute your microphone upon entry. But you must *keep your camera* *on* for the entire duration of the class (unless I tell you otherwise or you have specific problems that prevent you from doing this). If you use a virtual background for your camera appearance, please choose a minimalist and static one to avoid distraction. Please also mute your phone and all other devices that can distract you. The wisest thing to do is to keep them out of reach altogether, so that you can be fully present during the entire session.

Typically, I will arrive at the (physical or virtual) classroom about 5 minutes before the class. I encourage you to arrive a few minutes early as well. This way, we can check in with one another. The design of “learning cohorts” (see Participation below) is partly intended to make such check-ins less awkward but more fun, intentional, and therefore rewarding.

After each meeting, I’ll stay for a few minutes. You should feel free to stay and ask me any lingering questions you may have.

All Zoom sessions will be recorded. The recordings will be password protected. Access to the recordings (for a limited period of time) will be granted upon request.

**Classroom Norms and Policies**

* Unless you are instructed otherwise, you should **put away your personal electronic devices while you are in class** (virtually or physically). Be fully present for each other. Unauthorized use of electronic devices during the class may affect your participation grade.
* Since this is a 100 min-long class, there will be a short break roughly 50 minutes into the class. You are **required to take this break**, not to check on your devices but to really take a break for your mind and your body. The purpose of this break is to make you feel refreshed and reenergized for the second half of the class. So, when I announce it’s time for the break, please get up, walk around, stretch, take a few deep breaths, chat with your peers, etc. Just relax.
* You should also feel free to stand up and stretch during the class, so long as this does not disrupt others.
* While no physical distancing is required in class, please keep in mind that not everyone will feel comfortable being very close to another person. Please make sure to communicate with each other about your respective comfort zones. **Open and respectful communication** is the key here.
* I will respect everyone’s privacy. If you contact me and tell me, for instance, that you tested positive for covid (fingers crossed that this won’t happen!), I will approach the matter with the greatest discretion possible and keep it between you and me.
* The Covid-19 pandemic is not behind us yet. Teaching/learning during such times can be challenging and stressful. Let’s remind ourselves and each other that **we are in this together**. Be patient and understanding. Be compassionate both toward yourself and toward others. If someone doesn’t seem to be in a good mood on a given day, try not to take it personally. Check in with them. Remember: communication is the key.

**Academic Integrity and Academic Support**

It’s your responsibility to understand [our university’s Honor System](https://honorcouncil.georgetown.edu/system/policies/). All assignments submitted through Canvas will undergo an automated screening process. I will report all suspected cases of academic dishonesty. If the Honor Council confirms a violation, the violator will receive an F for the course.

Any students with disabilities will receive appropriate accommodations with a letter from the Academic Resource Center: <http://academicsupport.georgetown.edu>.

**Assignments & Assessment**

1. **Participation (15%).** The grade is based on the following.
2. **Attendance.**
* Unless you’ve been granted special accommodation, you must attend each of our meetings at the scheduled time. An accumulation of 2 *unexcused* absences will disqualify you from receiving a participation grade of A. 7 unexcused absences will result in an F as your participation grade. 10 unexcused absences will result in an F for the course. Tardiness can also affect your participation grade.
* If circumstances prevent you from attending a meeting in person, please contact me in advance. The default option is for you to attend the class via Zoom (in that case, you’ll still be asked to participate in discussions; I’ll pair you up with a couple of students in the classroom). If even Zooming in is not an option for you, please give me a *specific proposal* as to what a reasonable plan may look like for you to make up for the lost class time—especially the lost opportunity to have a quality discussion of the materials with your peers.
1. **Quality of your participation in discussions in class**.[[3]](#footnote-3)
* A close acquaintance with the assigned readings is essential to an informed and thoughtful participation. You are expected to arrive at each meeting with thoughts and questions about the readings.
* During a typical in-person meeting, you will share your thoughts about the assigned readings with a couple of peers (I ask you *not* to sit next to the same peers throughout the semester; you should aim at talking to every single peer at least once). I walk around the room and listen in quietly (unless you have questions for me). When we reconvene, I may call on one student from each group to debrief the rest of the class. The points and questions that emerge from these debriefings will then provide the launchpad for further discussion and/or a mini lecture on my part.
* Similar arrangements for discussion will be made during a Zoom meeting.
* I value the following practices most: you show that you’ve been *listening attentively* to others by, for example, picking up a thread from what they just said and adding to it or raising a question about it; and, if you are asked to summarize the main takeaways from your group’s discussion, you do so by *synthesizing* them in your own words, not merely repeating this or that remark that others made.
1. **Your contribution to learning-community building** in this class. Each of you will be assigned to a “learning cohort,” with 3-4 students in each cohort. This arrangement is meant to ensure that *everyone* in the class feels genuinely supported by and supportive of one another. Besides regularly checking in with the peers within one’s own cohort, each cohort will also take turns to guide a portion of the class discussions and come up with small community-building activities. I will provide more detailed instructions about this once I’ve set up all the cohorts.

1. **Learning portfolio** (**15%**, completion requirement).
* You will maintain a portfolio of your learning experiences in this class. The basic idea is that you will keep brief records of, say, your initial reactions to a reading before the class, whether you’ve gained a new appreciation of the same reading after the class, or something of the sort. I will create a google doc, with detailed instructions, for each of you and share it with you. This way, I can easily follow you along throughout the semester. I may comment on your portfolio now and then (you are also encouraged to discuss any parts of your portfolio with me). But you should feel free to write down your thoughts without feeling judged. The intention behind the portfolio is to provide you with a **low-stakes opportunity to develop meta-cognitive skills and habits** on a regular basis. You can also use this opportunity to collect materials and develop ideas for higher-stakes writing assignments.
* Add a brief **meta-cognitive reflection** at the end of your portfolio after the semester has ended (due at 8pm on Wednesday, Dec.7). You will write briefly about your learning experience in this class with respect to some of its pedagogical designs. Please follow this prompt (supplied by the Engelhard Project mentioned above):

“I’d like you to be reflective about your experience in this class and describe specific ways this class facilitated your learning. Tell me about the best learning moments for you. What worked for you and why do you think this happened? Was there something different about your learning in this course as compared to other classes? If so, how?”

A couple of paragraphs will suffice, so long as they are informative and you sufficiently *explain* your observations.

1. **Two short reflections** (**30%**, around 1,000 words, excluding notes/bibliography). Instructions TBA.
2. **Research paper** (**40%**, around 2,500 words, excluding notes/bibliography). Instructions TBA.

*Point to letter grade conversion*: A=94-100; A-=90-93.9; B+=87-; B=84-86.9; B-=80-83.9; …

In case you wonder, I do *not* grade on a curve. Also, when you calculate your final grade, please *do not rely on the results that Canvas shows* you (the percentages of the various categories of assessment are not reflected there). Instead, you should create a spreadsheet and calculate the grades yourself, in accordance with the assessment criteria listed above.

**Schedule (subject to change)**

**Week 1**

Aug. 24 (W) General introduction (no preparation required)

**Unit 1. Philosophy and Racism**

**Week 2**

Aug. 29 (M) Francis Bacon (1561-1626): “New World” and a new way to do philosophy

*Required reading:*

* Bacon, *The Great Renewal* (1620, excerpt)

*Supplementary/optional reading:*

* John Gascoigne, “Crossing the Pillars of Hercules: Francis Bacon,the Scientific Revolution and the New World” (2013)

Aug. 31 (W) Georges Buffon (1707-88): human varieties and degeneration

*Required readings:*

* Buffon, *On the Varieties of the Human Species* & *Of the Degeneration of Animals* (excerpt)

*Supplementary/optional reading:*

* Andrew Curran, *The Anatomy of Blackness: Science & Slavery in an Age of Enlightenment* (Chapter 2)

**Week 3**

Sept. 6 (T; Monday schedule) Johann Blumenbach (1752-1840): skulls and human varieties

*Required reading:*

* Blumenbach, *On the Natural Variety of Mankind* (excerpt)

*Supplementary/optional reading:*

* Raj Bhopal “The Beautiful Skull and Blumenbach’s Errors”

Sept. 7 (W) Immanuel Kant (1724-1804): scientific racialism and racism

*Required readings:*

* Kant, “Determination of the Concept of a Human Race”
* Kant, *Anthropology Menschkunde* (excerpt)

*Supplementary/optional reading:*

* Robert Bernasconi, “Who Invented the Concept of Race? Kant’s Role in the Enlightenment Construction of Race”

**Week 4**

Sept. 12 (M) Racism and exclusionary views of philosophy

*Required readings:*

* Kant, remarks about history of philosophy
* Peter Park, “The Exclusion of Africa and Asia from the History of Philosophy: The Formation of the Kantian Position”
* Kristi Dotson, “How is This Paper Philosophy?”

Sept. 14 (W) Review and reflect: in light of what we have read and discussed so far, (how) is philosophy suited to confront injustices? (Both “before” and “after” entries are required.)

<For the “before” portion, write down and briefly explain your answer to this question, the kind of answer that you would like to share in class. A few short paragraphs should suffice. Please connect your answer with the materials covered in this unit. These instructions apply to all “review and reflect” sessions.>

**Unit 2. From Social Contract to Racial Contract**

**Week 5**

Sept. 19 (M) Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679): from the state of nature to the commonwealth

*Required reading:*

* Hobbes, *Leviathan* (excerpt)

Sept. 21 (W) John Locke (1632-1704): from the state of nature to property rights

*Required reading:*

* Locke, *Second Treatise on Government* (excerpt)

**Week 6**

Sept. 26 (M) Bernard Mandeville (1670-1733): from the state of nature to morality

*Required reading:*

* Mandeville, *An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue* (excerpt)

Sept. 28 (W) Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-78): the origin of inequality

*Required reading:*

* Rousseau, *On the Origin and the Foundations of Inequality among Men* (excerpt)

**Week 7**

Oct. 3 (M) Ottobah Cugoano (1757-91): slavery and universal emancipation

*Required reading:*

* Cugoano, *Thoughts and Sentiments on the Evil of the Slavery* (excerpt)

Oct. 5 (W) Charles Mills (1951-2021): the social contract as a racial contract

*Required reading:*

* Mills, *Racial Contract* (excerpt)

**Week 8**

----------------------------- Mid-semester break (enjoy!) -----------------------------

Oct. 12 (W; on Zoom) Review and reflect: if you are asked whether there is a “racial contract” in this country, how would you approach the question? (Both “before” and “after” entries are required.)

First graded reflection due at 8pm on Saturday, Oct. 15.

To prepare for this, watch the 3-part documentary “Race: The Power of an Illusion” well in advance (linked below). You’ll be asked to connect the documentary with any of the philosophical issues that we discussed in the last 8 weeks. The quality of your work will have a lot to do with what kind of connections you’ll see and how well you explain it. I’ll provide more detailed instructions two weeks before the assignment is due. In the meantime, I highly recommend that you watch the documentary with others (not necessarily from this class) and discuss it with them. This may help you see connections that you would not recognize otherwise.

<https://wrlc-gu.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01WRLC_GUNIV/1e3l7r1/alma991037787526604111>

**Unit 3. On the Status of Women**

**Week 9**

Oct. 17 (M) Rousseau and Kant on the difference between the sexes

*Required readings:*

* Rousseau, education of Emile vs Sophie (excerpt)
* Kant, on the difference between the sexes

Oct. 19 (W) François Poulain de la Barre (1648–1723): “the mind has no sex”

*Required reading:*

* De La Barre, *On the Equality of Two Sexes* (excerpt)

**Week 10**

Oct. 24 (M) On marriage

*Required reading:*

* Hobbes on paternal dominion (from the *Leviathan*)
* Locke on marriage and civil society (from the *Second Treatise*)

Oct. 26 (W) What if you choose not to marry?

*Required reading:*

* Madame de Maintenon (1653-1719), “On the Drawbacks of Marriage”
* Gabrielle Suchon (1632–1703), “On the Celibate Life Freely Chosen” (excerpt)

**Week 11**

Oct. 31 (M) Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-97): women deserve more

*Required reading:*

* Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (excerpt)

Nov. 2 (W) Review and reflect: what’s your view on the relation between women and philosophy, looking at it from a historical perspective? (Both “before” and “after” entries are required.)

**Unit 4. Passions, Happiness, and Self-Knowledge**

**Week 12**

Nov. 7 (M) René Descartes (1596-1650) vs. Princess Elisabeth (1618–80): passions, reason, and happiness

*Required readings:*

* Descartes-Elisabeth correspondence on passions (excerpts)
* Descartes, *Passions of the Soul* (excerpt)

(Please read these in the order in which they are listed.)

Nov. 9 (W) Baruch Spinoza (1632-77): passions, virtue, and human freedom

*Required reading:*

* Spinoza, *Ethics* (excerpt, with preparatory handout)

[Note: this is a dense and difficult reading. Consult the handout. You’ll likely love Spinoza once you’ve figured him out.]

**Week 13**

Nov. 14 (M) David Hume (1711-76): reason as “the slave to the passions”

*Required reading:*

* Hume, A Treatise of Human Nature (excerpt)

Nov. 16 (W) Adam Smith (1723-90) vs. Sophie de Grouchy (1764-1822) on moral sentiments

*Required reading:*

* Smith, *A Theory of Moral Sentiments* (excerpt)
* Grouchy, *Letters on Sympathy* (excerpt)

Second graded reflection due at 8pm on Saturday, Nov.19.

**Week 14**

Nov. 21 (M; in person, with Zoom-in option) Émilie du Châtelet (1706-49): some illusion is good for happiness

*Required reading:*

* Du Châtelet, “Discourse on Happiness”

*Required supplementary materials (but you don’t have to talk about these in your portfolio):*

* [Part 1](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QefQbkN2CNE) of [Part 2](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aXhHcqQTrIg) of Prof. Andrew Janiak’s presentation on Émilie du Châtelet.

(Both videos are short, under 4 minutes each. They together provide a concise and informative account of Du Châtelet as a leading philosopher of science in her days and a very influential one for that. Although we are not reading her work on philosophy of science, you may find it interesting to keep that background in mind as you read her piece on happiness.)

----------------------------- Happy Thanksgiving! -----------------------------

**Week 15**

Nov. 28 (M; on Zoom) Madeleine de Scudéry (1607–1701): knowing oneself vs. knowing others

*Required reading:*

* Scudéry, “Of the Knowledge of Others, and of Our Selves”

Nov. 30 (W) Caroline Auguste Fischer (1764-1842): race and self-knowledge

*Required readings:*

* Fischer, “William the Negro”
* W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (excerpt on double consciousness)

[Reading this excerpt can give you an angle to explore Fischer’s novella at a deeper level.]

**Week 16**

Dec. 5 (M) Review and reflect: what’s your take on the relation between reason and emotions, given your own lived experiences? What’s your view on the relation between self-knowledge and happiness? (Both “before” and “after” entries are required.)

----------------------------- Good luck with your finals! -----------------------------

**Meta-cognitive reflection** due at 8pm on Wednesday, Dec.7.

**Research paper** due at 8pm on Wednesday, Dec.14.

1. Office hours are for many purposes. You can talk to me about your ideas for papers, lingering questions about the readings, and other things of the sort. This also gives us an opportunity to get to know each other a bit more. My schedule is most flexible on Tuesday and Friday afternoons and early evenings this semester (if you would like to talk via Zoom). For in-person meetings, sometime before the class works best. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A better-known version of this poem is entitled “Invitation to Brave Space” and attributed to Mickey ScottBey Jones). But it turned out to be plagiarized from the version I’m quoting here, the original author of which is Beth Strano (<https://sojo.net/articles/progressive-christian-leader-admits-plagiarizing-influential-poem>). The latter version is found at <https://www.facinghistory.org/resource-library/untitled-poem-beth-strano>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. If you suspect that you are an introvert and that this affects your participation, check out Susan Cain’s [Quiet Revolution](https://www.quietrev.com/), her fabulous [TED talk](https://www.ted.com/talks/susan_cain_the_power_of_introverts/discussion?nolanguage=en%C2%A0%C2%A0) about the power of introverts, or a longer [TED Interview](https://www.ted.com/talks/the_ted_interview_susan_cain_takes_us_into_the_mind_of_an_introvert?language=en) with her on that subject. Reading her book *Quiet* a few years ago fundamentally changed my approach to teaching. It also empowered me personally (I am one of those super introverts, although it’s not always obvious to others). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)