

FALL 2016 Course Descriptions

Bloomington - Fall 2016 (4168)

Instructor – Adam Leite

PHIL-P100 (5538) INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

Topic: Appearance and Reality

- What is the nature of reality?
- What is the relation between how things seem to us and how they really are?
- How can we get knowledge of reality?

In this course we will consider these and related questions by reading some central texts of the European philosophical tradition, including works by Plato, Descartes, and Kant. We will strive to develop an understanding and appreciation of the nature of philosophical questions and the tools philosophers use to answer them. The course is specifically designed to develop students' abilities to reason carefully, write clearly, work with deeply challenging texts, and think about difficult issues from a variety of viewpoints.

Instructor – Kirk Ludwig

PHIL-P100 (14502) INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy studies foundational questions. The answers to these questions form the framework for our thinking about ourselves and the nature of the world around us, and our relations both to it and to each other. What is the grounding of morality? How ought one to live? What is the importance of the examined life? Is death an evil? What is the relation of the mind to the world in general? How do we know anything about the world around us? What is the relation of the mind to the body? Do we have free will or only the illusion of free will? Is there a rational basis for belief in God? This course will introduce students to philosophical thinking and writing through (i) the close study of a number of classical philosophical texts that take up these questions and (ii) reflection on the difficulties that arise in trying to answer them.

1. Plato, *Defence of Socrates, Euthyphro, Crito*, Oxford World Classics, Oxford University Press, 2008.
2. Plato, *The Phaedo*, Oxford World Classics, Oxford University Press, 2009.
3. René Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Oxford World Classics, Oxford University Press, 2008.
4. George Berkeley, *Three Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous*, Hackett, 1979.
5. David Hume, *Dialogues and Natural History of Religion*, Oxford World Classics, Oxford University Press, 2008.

Instructor – David McCarty
P105 (28314) THINKING AND REASONING

Logic is the study of persuasive reasoning and the principal goal of our P105 is to offer students a working knowledge of informal logic at the introductory level. This we separate into three component areas: recognition, analysis, and evaluation of reasoning. In the first, we learn to distinguish reasoning from other forms of communication, among them narratives and causal explanations. Next, in analyzing reasoning, we apply such techniques from logic as argument diagrams to understand the structures of reasoning. Finally, we learn to evaluate reasoning and to improve our own reasoning by employing the important notions of validity and fallacy.

Instructor – Allen Wood
P135 (28340) INTRODUCTION TO EXISTENTIALISM

In this course basic arguments in philosophy about knowledge, the relation between mind and body, morality, and freewill and determinism are discussed. In order to prepare for these arguments, the course starts with an introduction on arguments and argumentation.

A survey of five nineteenth and twentieth century philosophers who question the meaning of existence, confront the absurdity of the human condition and challenge the authority of reason over our lives. Many readings will present philosophical ideas through literary forms (novels, aphorisms, prose-poetry, pseudonymous writings). Philosophers surveyed: Nietzsche, Dostoevsky, Kierkegaard, Sartre, Beauvoir.

Instructor – Janelle DeWitt
P140 (30186) INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS

What, exactly, is morality? Is it something we invent or something we discover? What makes an act right or wrong? Is there an objective standard, or do we each “decide for ourselves”? How do we know/decide what is right or wrong? What motivates us to do the right thing? How do we explain why we sometimes don’t? Can someone knowingly and willingly do something evil? Or is there always something "off" with such individuals? In this course, we will explore, through reading, discussion, and writing, several of the major moral theories attempting to answer these questions.

Instructor – Tim O’Connor
P140 (30186) INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS

How does moral action — *doing* the right thing — connect to *being* a good person and *living* a good life? What is the source of moral value and obligation? Is there an objective meaning of life that is deeper than the subjective meanings we see, or try to see, in our individual lives? What is a human person, and what is the place of human persons in the wider scheme of things? And how do different answers to these questions affect how we approach and answer specific moral questions?

In this course, we will study what philosophers past and present have had to say concerning these foundational questions. Deep disagreement persists, both among the philosophers and out in the street. But, somewhat alarmingly, we find as we come of age that we cannot avoid embracing one or another disputed answer to these questions, however tentatively or unreflectively. One aim for this course is to learn to do so thoughtfully and (one hopes) wisely. One does so not by standing aloof and saying, ‘Oh, I don’t know’ – and then proceeding to live by a particular set of half-baked assumptions. Instead, the thoughtful and wise path is to consider carefully the alternatives (including honestly drawing out their consequences), and then take an explicit stand. This involves marshaling considerations in favor of one’s particular positions and responding intelligently and carefully to reasoned arguments for opposing positions. It also involves a willingness to re-think matters when opposing arguments come to seem decisive – moral commitment need not be dogmatic.

Finally, we will not restrict ourselves to the general and foundational moral questions above. We will explore the nature of specific moral virtues and vices (sloth, pride/humility, and love) and address particular moral questions (the morality of aborting human fetuses, killing and eating animals, and waging war).

Instructor – Leah Savion

P150 (12923 & 10849) ELEMENTARY LOGIC

This elementary logic course is concerned with:

(i) Basic notions of the theory of reasoning, such as correctness of inference, deductive and inductive evaluations of arguments, soundness, conditionals, incompatibility, contradiction, and truth-functionality;

(ii) Symbolization of English sentences and arguments into logical languages, and methods for discerning correct from incorrect inferences (truth-tables and natural deduction). The primary subject of the course is the formal language of Propositional Calculus and a short introduction to Predicate Logic.

Course objectives include installing critical and analytical reasoning, enhancing the abilities to detect logical structures in natural ordinary language and provide rigorous proofs of validity, and developing the application metacognitive skills to cognitive operations.

Final grade for the course is determined by weekly quizzes, assignments, two midterms and a final exam.

The textbook for the course is Savion: "Brain Power: Symbolic Logic for the Novice" 2016 edition, published by CoursePak.

Instructor – Pieter Hasper

P201 (14078) INTRODUCTION ANCIENT GREEK PHILOSOPHY

In this course we will acquire an overview of the most important philosophers and philosophical ideas from ancient Greece, ranging from Presocratic philosophers like Heraclitus, Parmenides and Democritus over Socrates, Plato and Aristotle to the Hellenistic philosophers (Epicurus, Stoics, Sceptics). We will discuss idea about the basic constituents of reality, about knowledge and about moral psychology and ethics.

Required literature:

C. Shields (ed.), *The Blackwell Guide to Ancient Philosophy* (Blackwell; Oxford, 2003), 978-0-631-22215-6 [Perhaps this will be changed into another book!]

S.M. Cohen, P. Curd & C.D.C. Reeve (eds.) *Readings in Ancient Greek Philosophy. From Thales to Aristotle*. 4th Edition (Hackett; Indianapolis, 2011), 978-1-60384-462-8

B. Inwood & L.P. Gerson (eds.), *Hellenistic Philosophy. Introductory Readings*. 2nd Edition (Hackett; Indianapolis, 1998) 978-0-87220-378-5

Instructor – Rosa Cao

Hon-H P240

This is a course on the ethics of neuroscience and the neuroscience of ethics, examining the ethical issues raised by new technologies and our expanding perspective on how the brain works, as well as the implications of these new developments for our understanding of moral decision making. We'll start by looking at neuroscientific and ethical foundations, addressing questions such as: Can neuroscience teach us anything about the status of morality? How are moral decisions made? How do we reason about what is right? Later in the course we will move on to questions about freedom and responsibility, and what, if anything, neuroscience might tell us about those core notions.

I have three recommended texts (none required).

1. The Norton Introduction to Philosophy, ed. Rosen, Byrne, Cohen, & Shiffrin (WW Norton & Co. 2015)

ISBN-13: 978-0393932201

ISBN-10: 0393932206

2. Moral Psychology: The Neuroscience of Morality, ed. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008), Vol. 3

ISBN-13: 978-0262693554

ISBN-10: 0262693550

3. Moral Psychology: The Neuroscience of Morality, ed. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008), Vol. 4
ISBN-13: 978-0262525473
ISBN-10: 026252547X

Instructor – Mark Kaplan

P250 (5541) INTRODUCTORY SYMBOLIC LOGIC

“Does this conclusion follow from those premises?” This seems to be a question that calls upon us to exercise our imaginative powers. To determine the answer, our only option seems to be to try to imagine circumstances under which the premises come out true and the conclusion comes out false: if (and only if) we find no such circumstance imaginable, should we conclude that the answer is “Yes”.

But what a risky procedure this is! After all, the mere fact that we haven't been able to imagine a circumstance under which the premises come out true and the conclusion comes out false does not mean that there *is* no such circumstance. How can we know that we haven't simply overlooked the crucial circumstance?

The central aim of this course is to show that there is a better, and very different, way to go about answering the question. We will see that a significant portion of English discourse exhibits a structure that enables it to be translated into a purely symbolic language. And we will see that, once premises and conclusion are translated into a purely symbolic language, the question “Does this conclusion follow from these premises?” can be decisively answered by a technique which involves nothing more than the manipulation of symbols according to precise rules.

Instructor – Rega Wood

P270 (30392) INTRO TOPICS IN PHILOSOPHY: MELANCHOLY BEAUTY

An introduction to art analysis from a philosophical perspective based on readings from modern art historians Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968), Ernst Gombrich (1909-2001), and Richard Wollheim (1923-2003) and past philosophers: Aristotle (384-322 BCE), Augustine (354-430), Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), & Henry of Ghent (1217-1293), & Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Taught jointly by Rega Wood & Juliet Graver Istrabadi of the IU Art Museum. IU masterpieces considered will include Greek Vase Paintings, Portrait Busts, Engravings by Durer, and Oil Paintings from the 15th - 19th century.

Instructor – Mark Kaplan

P312 (30393) TOPICS IN THE THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE

“Aristotle said it is so; therefore it must be so.” To a significant portion of established academia in early seventeenth century Europe, this was a decisive form of argument. But Rene Descartes held that this argument consists is nothing more than a blind appeal to authority. He maintained that it could not establish the truth of any claim; it could not justify our believing any claim; it

could not secure us knowledge of any claim. He undertook to provide us with the wherewithal to determine what is true, what we ought to believe, what we know. In so doing he profoundly influenced the way we have thought about these matters ever since. Beginning with an assessment of Descartes' efforts, this course will explore what it takes to have reasonable beliefs, and what it takes to have knowledge.

Instructor – Kate Abramson
P 340 (12712) CLASSICS IN ETHICS

In this class, we will study some of the major themes in the philosophical ethics of Aristotle, Hume, Kant and Mill. We will unify our study of their disparate works in ethics by trying to think of how each of these philosophers would complete the sentence “A good person would...” For instance, we might say that a good person would see the world in a particular way, or that she would be motivated by certain considerations and not others, or that she would take some things into account in deciding what to do but not others, and so on.

Instructor – Allen Wood
P343 (30599) CLASSICS IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

This course will study four social and political philosophers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who profoundly influenced our conceptions of freedom, justice and oppression, as they relate to social structure, politics and economics. We examine the foundations and criticisms of social contract theory, the function of the state, and the relation of the modern state and modern economy to human history. Our principal texts will be: Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *On the Social Contract*; Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *The Closed Commercial State*; Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*; and Karl Marx: *Communist Manifesto*, *Capital* and other writings.

Instructor – David McCarty
P347 (30601) CONTEMP CONTROV IN PHIL OF ART

Course will be a close, critical examination of original writings on art and philosophy of art by several significant German and German-speaking philosophers of the 20th Century, among them Adorno, Benjamin, Gadamer, and Heidegger. During the semester, there will be two in-class, sit down examinations as well as an in-class, sit-down final. In addition to weekly, graded writing assignments, there will be frequent quizzes and other written exercises.

Instructor – Pieter Hasper
P370 (15113) ANCIENT ETHICS

In this course we will get an overview of the main ideas and arguments put forward by philosophers from antiquity on the topic of living and acting well. What are the ultimate sources of value in our lives and actions? How is virtue related to this ultimate source of value? How important are knowledge and reason for being virtuous and for living and acting well? What is

the place of friendship and of other-regarding virtue and justice within the accounts of living and acting well? We will start with Democritus and some sophists, then discuss at length Socrates and Plato, and finish with the two main schools from the Hellenistic period: the Stoics and the Epicureans.

The literature will consist of chapters from books and of articles as well as of primary texts. Most of them will be made available during the course. One should, however, purchase the following books:

C.D.C. Reeve (transl.), *Plato, Republic* (Hackett; Indianapolis, 2004) 978-0-87220-736-3

C.D.C. Reeve (transl.), *Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics* (Hackett; Indianapolis, 2014) 978-1-62466-117-4

B. Inwood & L.P. Gerson (eds.), *Hellenistic Philosophy. Introductory Readings*. 2nd Edition (Hackett; Indianapolis, 1998) 978-0-87220-378-5

Instructor – Marcia Baron **P375 (30613) PHILOSOPHY OF LAW**

The focus of this course is philosophical issues in criminal law. After examining some basic principles of law, we'll ask "What justifies punishment?" and "What sorts of things should be illegal, and why?"

We'll then discuss the two key elements of (almost) any crime: The act component (that the accused actually did something illegal, or omitted to do something required by law, and didn't merely intend to) and the mental component or mens rea (that the accused had a "guilty mind" and intended to commit the act, or knew she was committing it, or acted recklessly or negligently). We will pay particular attention to mens rea issues. Should negligence ever suffice to meet the mens rea requirement? What sorts of mistakes of fact should exculpate? Only reasonable mistakes? (This will vary with the crime.) If only a reasonable mistake should exculpate, what sort of standard of reasonableness is appropriate?

We'll examine mens reas issues both in the abstract and through an examination of two crimes, rape and homicide. This will also lead us into related questions that arise in connection with one or the other crime. What constitutes consent? Does the fact that the defendant, accused of murder, killed in the "heat of passion" warrant the lesser conviction of voluntary manslaughter? What background assumptions about emotion and self-control are at work here? We'll also discuss self-defense (including the use of self-defense justifications by battered women who have killed their batterers). A recurring question will be the tenability of the "reasonable person" standard.

Readings will include cases (and discussions of cases, e.g. NYT pieces on Anna Stubblefield, a Rutgers professor recently convicted of rape) and articles or excerpts from work by Aristotle, Jeremy Bentham, Jean Hampton, H.L.A Hart, and J.S. Mill, among others.

Requirements: Regular class attendance (and coming to class prepared to discuss the assigned reading); an exam; and two papers (6-8 pages, double-spaced).

Instructor – Fred Schmitt

P401 (8363) HIST OF PHIL: SPECIAL TOPICS: Locke, Berkeley, and Hume

This is a course on early modern empiricism. We will consider the views of the major empiricists—Locke, Berkeley, and Hume—on the nature of the mind, knowledge, and reality. We will begin with Locke’s systematic story, in opposition to the rationalists, of how we build our picture of the world from our sensory experience. We will examine the account of language, substance, knowledge, and probability with which Locke supplements that story. We will then turn to Berkeley’s application of Locke’s story to metaphysics. Berkeley criticizes some elements of Locke’s story and then argues that the result supports a metaphysics on which the material world depends on the mind. By contrast, Hume argues that Locke’s story leads, not to an idealist metaphysics, but to skepticism. In short, the course will be about the viability and consequences of empiricism—one of the essential episodes in the history of philosophy. We will read portions of Locke’s *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Berkeley’s *Principles and Three Dialogues*, and Hume’s *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. We will presuppose no knowledge of the history of philosophy or of the philosophical issues—all background needed for comprehending the material will be supplied.

Instructor – Fred Schmitt

P522 (14945) TOPICS IN HIST OF MODERN PHIL – HUME: METAPHYSICS, EPISTEMOLOGY, AND PHILOSOPHY OF MIND

In this course we will examine Book I of Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature*, generally regarded as the culminating expression of empiricism in early modern philosophy. I will assume no knowledge of Hume or other history of philosophy, and little understanding of metaphysics, epistemology, and philosophy of mind--background will be filled in as we go. We will focus on the following topics. Under the heading of Hume's philosophy of mind, we will treat his theory of perceptions, impressions, ideas, and beliefs, and his theory of mental representation, especially abstract ideas. We will set Hume’s philosophy of mind in the broader background of the debate between rationalists and empiricists. Hume attacks rationalist innatism by developing a detailed account of the derivation of philosophically important ideas (such as substance and causation) from experience than anyone had before him. We will use Thomas Reid's criticism of the theory of ideas and of Hume’s Copy Principle in Reid’s great work, the *Inquiry*, as a critical source on Hume’s empiricism about ideas. We will then turn to Hume’s epistemology. There is no doubt that Hume is in some sense an empiricist about justified belief and not merely an empiricist about ideas. But there remains a question of the source of his empiricism. Is there an underlying epistemology that drives him to restrict justification to an experiential basis, or is his epistemological empiricism basic? There are various interpretive options for a deeper basis for his empiricism—natural function, reliability, and stability theories among them. We will examine Hume’s treatment of causal inference, inferences to identity, and beliefs in external objects (material substances, physical bodies, and matter) more generally. Hume is clearly working on the assumption that there is no room for causal inference in the domain of knowledge understood as the perception of relations holding with necessity. He is accordingly trying to find a home for causal inference in the domain of probability. In the process, he radically rethinks that domain. Many have held that in doing so he comes to the conclusion that causal inference is not a source of justified belief. We will inquire whether this skeptical interpretation is correct. That

Hume is a skeptic in some sense is clear enough. But what sort of skeptic? We will examine the alternatives for a skeptical interpretation. We will touch here and there on the New Hume--the question whether Hume is in some sense a realist about causal power. Hume's metaphysics will come under discussion throughout--e.g., whether he is an idealist about relations, just what he takes causation and bodies to be, his stance on the mind-body problem. If time permits, we will discuss personal identity and space and time in Hume. If even more time permits, we can move on to consider the basics of Hume's treatment of the teleological argument in the Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion.

Instructor – Adam Leite

P562 (30686) THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE: EXTERNAL WORLD SKEPTICISM

This course will introduce some central themes in contemporary epistemology through consideration of the problem of external world skepticism. Do we really know or have good reason to believe anything about the world around us? Often the topic is approached from the vantage point of developed epistemological theory, or it is assumed that one must develop an epistemological theory in order to come to terms with skeptical concerns. It is likewise often assumed that it is quite clear what exactly the issue or problem is and what intellectual need(s) would be addressed in a satisfactory response. Since I find such matters far from clear, my approach will rather be to use the topic of external world skepticism to explore issues that arise on the way into philosophical theorizing: issues such as the relationship between skeptical arguments, epistemological theorizing, and ordinary life and practice; what it would take to get a skeptical argument going, given our ordinary pre-philosophical position; the aspirations of traditional epistemological theorizing and the minimal theoretical resources needed in order to reach an intellectually satisfying position vis a vis skeptical concerns. Along the way, we will discuss a wide variety of important issues and theories on the current epistemological scene. We will read both classics and recent work in analytic epistemology, including work of Barry Stroud, G.E. Moore, J.L. Austin, Robert Nozick, Sherilyn Roush, Ernest Sosa, Jim Pryor, Crispin Wright, Krista Lawlor, Penelope Maddy, and Timothy Williamson, as well as some of my own work on these topics.