

Edgar I. Temam

Courtesy Postdoctoral Research Scholar
Philosophy Department
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1295
etemam@uoregon.edu

Home: 259 East 13th Ave., Apt. 304; Eugene, OR 97401; (541) 338-8721

Education:

Ph.D. in Philosophy, University of Oregon, Mar. 2014
M.A. in Philosophy, San Francisco State University, Jun. 2005
Auditing courses on nonviolence, Berkeley, 2003-2004
City College of San Francisco, 1991-1999
B.S. in Electrical Engineering, Northeastern University, Dec. 1977

AOS: Social and political Philosophy, Ethics, Philosophy of Nonviolence,
Philosophy of education
AOC: History of Philosophy, Logic, Critical thinking

Employment:

Adjunct Instructor in the Conflict & Dispute Resolution Master's Program, University of Oregon, School of Law -- teaching philosophy of conflict resolution in 2014-2017 and an interdisciplinary capstone course in 2017

Adjunct Instructor in the Composition Program, University of Oregon, Department of English, 2015-2017

Academic tutoring, assisting, or teaching, 1997-2013:

University of Oregon 2006-2013

Philosophy -- assisting and teaching, 2006-2009 2010-2011
English Composition -- teaching, 2011-2013

San Francisco State University 2001-2005

Philosophy -- taught, Fall, Spring, and Summer 2002-2005
Read for a blind, ESL, philosophy graduate student
through the Disability Resource Center, 2001-2002

City College of San Francisco 1997-1999

Tutored in symbolic logic and philosophy

Software Engineering and System Analysis, 1978-2003

Awards and Grants:

Graduate Teaching Fellow, University of Oregon, English, 2011-2013

Graduate Teaching Fellow, University of Oregon, Philosophy, 2006-2011

Fighting Fund Fellowship, University of Oregon, Philosophy, 2005-2006, and
Summers 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009

Graduate Student Award for Distinguish Achievement, San Francisco State
University, 2005

Graduate Teaching Assistant, San Francisco State University, 2002-2003

Teaching Training:

University of Oregon:

ENG 613: GTF Comp Apprentice, Winter 2011

ENG 612: Comp GTF Seminar II, Fall 2011

ENG 611: Comp GTF Seminar I, Winter 2011

PHIL 607: Seminar Phil & Teaching, Fall 2006 & Winter 2007

San Francisco State University:

PHIL 777: Teaching Critical Thinking, Fall 2001

ENG 657: Grammar & Rhetoric of Sentence, Spring 2001

City College of San Francisco:

LERN 11: Advanced Tutoring, Spring 1998

LERN 10: Intro to Tutoring, Fall 1997

Pedagogical Experience:

Teaching:

University of Oregon:

WR 122: College Composition II, Spring 2012, Fall 2012,
Winter 2013

WR 121: College Composition I, Fall 2011, Winter 2012,
Spring 2013

PHIL 102: Ethics, Spring 2011

San Francisco State University:

PHIL 110: Critical Thinking, Fall, Spring, Summer 2002-2005

PHIL 101: Introduction to Philosophy, Fall 2003

(co-taught with other assistant on Fridays)

Assisting:

University of Oregon:

PHIL 103: Critical Reasoning, Winter 2011

PHIL 307: Social and Political Philosophy, Fall 2010

PHIL 312: History of Philosophy: 19th Century, Spring 2009

PHIL 308: Social and Political Philosophy, Winter 2009

PHIL 307: Social and Political Philosophy, Fall 2008

PHIL 170: Love and Sex -- Spring 2008

PHIL 102: Ethics -- Winter 2008

PHIL 101: Philosophical Problems -- Fall 2007

PHIL 211: Existentialism -- Spring 2007

PHIL 120: Ethics of Enterprise and Exchange -- Winter 2007

PHIL 310: History of Philosophy: Ancient and Medieval, Fall
2006

San Francisco State University:

PHIL 220: Political Philosophy, Spring 2005

PHIL 101: Introduction to Philosophy, Fall 2003

NEXA 392: Nature, Culture, and Technology, Fall 2001

PHIL 110: Critical Thinking, Summer 2001

PHIL 302: Medieval Philosophy, Spring 2001

PHIL 301: Ancient Philosophy, Fall 2000

Tutoring:

San Francisco State University:

Tutored blind, ESL, philosophy graduate student in symbolic
logic, Fall 2002-Fall 2003

Read for blind, ESL, philosophy graduate student,
2001-2002

City College of San Francisco:

Symbolic logic and philosophy, Fall 1997-Spring 1999

Collaborating and Contributing:

University of Oregon:

Mentored composition apprentice while teaching WR 121 during
Spring 2013

Presented on grading "Feedback Philosophy" at UO Composition
Conference, Fall 2013
Mentored an undergraduate philosophy student, 2011-2012
Participated in Reading Groups:
Peirce's and Royce's logic, Spring 2009
Advanced and non-classical logic, Spring 2008-Spring 2009
Walter Benjamin, Fall 2007
Heidegger -- *Being and Time*, Spring 2007-Fall 2007
Husserl -- *The Crisis of European Sciences*, Spring 2006
Husserl -- *Cartesian Meditations*, 2005-2006

San Francisco State University:

Assisted in philosophy, 2000-2005
Tutored blind, ESL, graduate student in PHIL 205 Formal Logic I,
Fall 2002-Fall 2003
Tutored my classmates in PHIL 205 Formal Logic I, Fall 1999
Proofread James Royse's manuscript for a critical thinking text

City College of San Francisco:

Assisted and tutored in logic and philosophy, 1997-1999
Tutored my classmates in PHIL 12A Symbolic Logic, Spring 1997
Proofread Bill Graves' *Activities Guide for Kahane and Cavender's*
Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric: The Use of Reason in
Everyday Life, 8th ed.

Languages:

French (native fluency)
Studied Arabic, Hebrew, Italian, Latin, German, and Ancient Greek

References:

Anatole Anton, Emeritus Faculty, Department of Philosophy, San Francisco
State University, aantons@sfsu.edu
Miriam Gershow, Associate Director of Composition, University of Oregon,
mgershow@uoregon.edu
Bill Graves, Instructor of Philosophy, City College of San Francisco,
bgraves@ccsf.edu
Naomi Zack, Professor of Philosophy, University of Oregon,
nzack@uoregon.edu
Jennifer W. Reynolds, Associate Professor of Law, University of Oregon,
jwr@uoregon.edu

Dissertation Abstract:

"Might makes right," so the saying goes. What does this mean? What does it mean to say that humans live by this saying? How can this saying that is considered by almost all as an expression of injustice play a justificatory role practically universally and ubiquitously? How can it be repulsive and yet, nonetheless, attractive as an explanation of the ways of the world? Why its long history?

I offer a non-cynical explanation, one based on a re-interpretation of the saying and of both recognized and unrecognized related phenomena. This re-interpretation relies on the notion of a tacit justification for violence.

This non-cynical, re-interpretive explanation exposes the ambiguity of the saying and the consequential unwitting, self-deceptive, fallacious equivocations that the ambiguity makes possible under common conditions. While this explanation, furthermore, focuses on thinking factors—specifically on fallacious thinking, on humans' unwittingly and self-deceptively committing the fallacy of equivocation—it does not deny the possible role of non-thinking factors; it only tries to show that the thinking factors are significantly explanatory.

What is the ambiguity? "Might makes right" expresses two principles. The first principle is the common meaning, namely, that the dominance of the mightier over the weaker is right. This principle is generally considered to be not a definition of justice but an expression of injustice. The second principle, which is almost universally shared in a tacit and unreflective way, is a principle of life, namely, that it is right for any living being to actualize its potential. This second principle is ordinary and thus primary, while the first principle is derivative and thus secondary. The use of all powers, natural or social, can be ultimately derived legitimately or illegitimately from this primary principle.

A common manifestation of "might makes right" is the unwitting abuse of power, an abuse that is not recognized as such by the so-called abuser, but that is rather suffered by this latter, who misapplies the second principle in situations that fall under the first principle, thereby unwittingly living by the saying, tacitly justifying abusive ways by it. This unwittingness calls for critical control and forgiveness.

In chapter I, I introduce the issues regarding "might makes right," offer an outline of an explanation addressing the issues, and present a historical context of attempts at advocacy and refutation of "might makes right." In chapter II, I present the broad context from which the examination is working and on which it is relying. In chapter III, I develop the explanation outlined in chapter I; I do so, in part, by examining an extended example of an actual war. In Chapter IV, I test the explanation and the assumptions on which it relies by engaging current theories of action, motivation, biases, and fallacy. In Chapter V, I examine the implications of the explanation by entertaining final objections to its main line of reasoning.