FACULTY OF THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

School of Philosophy

Online

SEMESTER 1, 2021

**PHCC320: The Just Society
&
PHIL320: Ethics, Justice, and the Good Society**

UNIT OUTLINE

Credit points: 10.

Prerequisites/incompatibles: Nil

Incompatible units: PHCC320/PHIL320

Lecturer in Charge: Caleb Perl

  Office location: Zoom/Facetime/Skype/… as needed

  Email: caperl@acu.edu.au

  Telephone: [No local number established yet]

  Contact me: Email is best; I aim to reply in a day

Unit rationale, description and aim: We live in a time of great social, ethical, and political uncertainty. This unit responds to this context by leading students into an engagement with a range of contemporary philosophical debates and perspectives on the nature of the good society. It provides them with the knowledge and analytical skills to participate constructively in dialogue regarding matters of fundamental social importance. Students engage in careful examination of some key concepts, theories, and debates concerning issues such as the fair distribution of the burdens and benefits of society, the rights and duties of individuals and communities in local and global contexts, and the understanding and implementation of basic freedoms in areas such as speech, religion, and opportunity. In so doing, the meaning and contours of key ideas such as human dignity, social justice, human solidarity and human value are explored. The unit provides students with an opportunity to develop a

scholarly and integrated personal account of the good society that draws directly on contemporary moral, social, and political philosophy, including some key themes in Catholic social thought.

Mode: MEL_Online Online. The lectures will be held online Via Zoom:

https://acu.zoom.us/j/83301913827

Attendance pattern: Each week students are expected to participate in a class meeting consisting of one three hour block, divided between lecture time and tutorial activities.

Duration: 12 week-semester

 You should anticipate undertaking 150 of study for this unit, including class attendance, readings and assignment preparation.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

On successful completion of this unit, you should be able to:

LO1: identify and accurately explain some of the central problems and key theories in social and political philosophy and public ethics (GA5);

LO2: critically analyse and evaluate selected debates in the field, and develop logical and consistent positions in relation to them (GA3; GA4; GA8);

LO3: demonstrate skills in the clear, well-structured and well-referenced presentation of a philosophical argument, in formal oral and written contexts (GA5; GA9).

GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES

Each unit in your course contributes in some way to the development of the ACU Graduate Attributes which you should demonstrate by the time you complete your course. All Australian universities have their expected graduate attributes – ACU's Graduate Attributes have a greater emphasis on ethical behaviour and community responsibility than those of many other universities. All of your units will enable you to develop some attributes.

On successful completion of this unit, you should have developed your ability to:

GA3   apply ethical perspectives in informed decision making

GA4   think critically and reflectively

GA5   demonstrate values, knowledge, skills and attitudes appropriate to the discipline and/or profession

GA8   locate, organise, analyse, synthesise and evaluate information

GA9   demonstrate effective communication in oral and written English language and visual media

CONTENT

Topics will include:

- Key concepts in social and political philosophy and public ethics
- · Theories of the just and fair society
- · The nature and scope of social equality
- · The ethics of distributive justice
- · Political authority and the good society
- · Public ethics and the Law
- · Work and the good life
- · Charity and mutual obligation in a globalised world.
- · Free speech, toleration, and harm in a diverse society
- · Religion, civil society, and diversity

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

This unit has been evaluated through the 'Student Evaluation of Learning and Teaching' (SELT) online surveys. In response to student feedback there has been some simplification of the assessment package, some re-sequencing of the material studied and some revision of the reading list. SELT surveys are usually conducted at the end of the teaching period. Your practical and constructive feedback is valuable to improve the quality of the unit. Please ensure you complete the SELT survey for the unit. You can also provide feedback at other times to the unit lecturers, course coordinators and/or through student representatives.

LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGY AND RATIONALE

This unit involves 150 hours of focused learning, and will be offered in both semester attendance mode, and intensive mode. Different modes are required in order to provide all students with the opportunity to satisfy their Core Curriculum requirements in the context of a diverse range of course structures across the University. Semester attendance mode allows students to develop their understanding and engagements across an extended period, while intensive mode offers a more concentrated experience with completing readings and activities in LEO during and shortly after extended class meetings.

The unit has been designed as a blend of collaborative learning and a project-based learning approach, combined with some direct instruction to ensure that unfamiliar concepts and theories are understood. The collaborative learning aspect emerges most strongly in the case of the interactive oral presentations and debates by students in class that will emerge out of a team learning and presentation context while drawing in all other class

members. The project-based aspect relates to the research project that students will engage in throughout the unit, culminating in their research essay.

ASSESSMENT STRATEGY AND RATIONALE

The assessment strategy for this unit reflects the nature of the students who undertake it: i.e., those with some grounding in philosophical analysis from first- and second-year units in the field, or otherwise students with a demonstrated capacity for critical analysis from other fields. The early structured analysis task serves to reinforce the skill-base needed for effective philosophical analysis. The oral presentation/debate task is designed to facilitate collaborative learning and the presentation of coherent and carefully structured arguments in dialogue with others (thereby modelling effective civic dialogue). The research essay task provides students with the opportunity to undertake sustained philosophical reading and research, culminating in an extended piece of formal writing that develops a coherent central argument.

LECTURE CAPTURE

Lectures and tutorials will be recorded using Echo360 and once available, will be posted on LEO and the link made available to students.

https://leo.acu.edu.au/course/view.php?id=37262#topic-0

SCHEDULE

For the most up-to-date information, please check your LEO unit and also note advice from your lecturing and tutoring staff for changes to this schedule.

Week	Starting	Insert tutorial or lecture content, readings ...	Insert other weekly information, such as assessment deadlines
1	01/03/2021	Bernard Boxill, ``The Morality of Reparation''; Bernard Boxill, Section 8 of 'Black Reparations'	

2	08/03/2021	Judith Jarvis Thomson, ``A Defense of Abortion'',pp. 47--59    Don Marquis, ``Why abortion is immoral'', section II, pp. 189-197	
3	15/03/2021	David Boonin, ``Is Racial Profiling Immoral? A Reluctant Defense of America's Least Popular Form of Discrimination'' John Rawls, *Justice as Fairness,* §2 (pp. 5-8)	
4	22/03/2021	John Rawls, *Justice as Fairness,* §§6-7 (pp. 14-24)	
5	29/03/2021	John Rawls, *Justice as Fairness,* §§20-22 (pp. 72--79)	**ASSIGNMENT 1 DUE**
6	12/04/2021	Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, pp. 150 - 164	
7	19/04/2021	Susan Moller Okin, *Justice, Gender, and the Family*, Chapter 7	
8	26/04/2021	Serene Khader, *Adaptive Preferences and Women's Empowerment*, pp. 41-2, 46-53	
9	03/05/2021	Susan Moller Okin, "Toward a humanist justice", in *The Broadview Anthology of Social and Political Thought*	
10	10/05/2021	Charles Mills, "Race and the Social Contract Tradition"	**REWRITTEN PAPERS TO PEERS**
11	17/05/2021	Charles Mills, *Black Rights, White Wrongs,* pp. 206-215	**ASSIGNMENT 2 DUE**

12	24/05/2021	John Finnis, *Aquinas*, pp. 200-215	

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION, MARKING AND RETURN

All assignments will be submitted electronically as indicated below. Hard copy submissions are not required. Written feedback will be emailed back to students.

Assessment tasks	Due date	Weighting	Learning outcomes assessed	Graduate attributes assessed
Structured written analysis task (Requires students to demonstrate understanding of key concepts and debates)	29/03/2021	20%	LO1; LO2; LO3	GA3; GA4; GA5; GA8; GA9
Peer comments (Requires students to demonstrate critical thinking skills in dialogue with others)	17/05/2021 (Papers sent to assigned peers on 10/05/2021)	30%	LO1; LO2; LO3	GA3; GA4; GA5; GA8; GA9
Research Essay (Requires students to critically analyse an important philosophical issue, and argue for a coherent position)		50%	LO1; LO2; LO3	GA3; GA4; GA5; GA8; GA9

I.   STRUCTURED WRITTEN ANALYSIS TASK

You will write a paper on one of four arguments.

Options

Boxill's argument for reparations
1. Before European settlers arrived, Indigenous Australians had a moral right to the land they lived on, like Tom has a moral right to his bike.
2. Their land was stolen by settlers who ultimately passed the land down to their descendants, like Henry stole the bike and passed it down to Mark.
3. Indigenous Australians presumably have conferred ownership of what they owned on their descendants, like Tom presumably conferred ownership of his bike on his son Bob.
4. Thus, the descendants of settlers are in possession of wealth to which the descendants of indigenous Australians have rights, just like descendants of Henry are in possession of wealth to which Tom's descendants have rights.
Conclusion: Hence, the descendants of settlers must return an equivalent amount of wealth to the descendants of indigenous Australians, with a concession that they were not rightfully in possession, just like Henry's descendants must return an equivalent amount of wealth to Tom's descendants with a concession that they were not rightfully in possession.

Thomson's Argument for a Moral Right to Abortion
1. If it is permissible to unplug the famous violinist, a moral right to life does not does not guarantee having either a moral right to be given the use of another person's body or a moral right to be allowed continued use of another person's body.
2. It is permissible to unplug the famous violinist.
3. If the moral right to life does not include a right to continued use of another person's body, abortion is permissible.
Conclusion: abortion is permissible.

Marquis' argument that a fetus is a person with the same right to life that you and I have
1. A two week old infant has the same right to life that you and I have.
2. If a two week old infant has the same right to life that you and I have, then anything with a future like our own has the same right to life that you and I have.
> (If you reject Premise 2, your whole paper must focus on giving an alternative explanation of why Premise 1 is true. Don't say anything at all about Marquis, or about a future like our own. Just explain in the last sentence of the paper why your explanation predicts that the fetus does not *have the same right to life as the infant.*)
Conclusion: a fetus has the same right to life that you and I have.

Boonin's argument that racial profiling is morally permissible

1. If members of some races in a country are more likely, on average, to commit certain kinds of criminal offenses than are members of other races, it's rational for police departments to adopt those policies that will enable them to apprehend a larger proportion of offenders.

2. If racial profiling is rational but morally wrong, then either use of physical descriptions from witnesses in investigation or sobriety checks are morally wrong.

3. Neither use of physical descriptions from witnesses in investigations nor sobriety checks are morally wrong.

Conclusion: If members of some races in a country are more likely, on average, to commit certain kinds of criminal offenses than are members of other races, racial profiling is morally permissible.

REDO FOR NEXT TIME

1. It's rational for police departments to adopt policies that enable them to apprehend a larger proportion of offenders.

2. If racial profiling is morally wrong because it uses statistical evidence, purely random sobriety checks are also morally wrong.

> *(If you reject Premise 2, your whole paper must develop exactly one reason why the use of statistical evidence in racial profiling is wrong even though purely random sobriety checks are not wrong.)*

3. If racial profiling is morally wrong for any other reason, the use of physical descriptions from witnesses to a particular crime is also morally wrong.

> *(If you reject Premise 3, your whole paper must develop exactly one reason why racial profiling is morally wrong even though the use of physical descriptions from witnesses to a particular crime is not morally wrong)*

4. Purely random sobriety checks are **not** morally wrong, and the use of physical descriptions from witnesses from a particular crime is **not** morally wrong.

Conclusion: racial profiling is morally permissible in societies with a history of racial discrimination that produces differences in crime rates among racial groups.

Detailed Instructions

The first sentence of your paper must include a thesis statement, with the form "I reject [P1/P2/...] of [Boxill's/Boonin's/Thomson's/Marquis'] argument because [...]". The rest of the paper needs to have three parts. You must have headers for each of these parts.

Part I: One criticism of the argument

You should develop exactly one criticism of your target's argument, whichever one you think is strongest. Your criticism is a reason for rejecting one premise of the argument that's simultaneously a reason for rejecting the conclusion of the argument. The criticism that you offer should be similar to the sorts of criticisms that we discuss in class. Your thesis statement must include a one-sentence summary of your criticism.

Your criticism needs to be more than just your saying what you think. Your goal is to give a reason that would help convince an impartial observer to agree with you, and to think that there is something wrong with the argument that your target is offering.

Part II: Anticipation of what your target would say in response

You then need to explain what your target would say in response to your criticism. In grading this explanation, I'll be making sure that you do understand the assumptions that your target is making.

Your part II needs to be new: it needs to go beyond what the author says in the original paper. If the original paper contains a response to the idea that you develop in your Part I, you *must* answer that objection in your Part I. Part II is for you to develop a *new* response on behalf of the original author.

Part III: Critical discussion of what your target would say in response

Your paper needs to end with a critical discussion of what you anticipate in Part II -- you need to attempt to explain what you think is wrong with the response. As before, your goal is to give a reason that would help convince an impartial observer to agree with you, and to think that there is something wrong with the argument that your target is offering.

And your Part III needs to defend the same idea as your Part 1 -- you cannot abandon your idea from Part I and give some other objection.

Due date: 29 March 2021

Length and/or format: Approx. 1000 words. (No less than 700, no more than 1200.)

Purpose: Begin to think for yourself about the topics addressed

Learning outcomes assessed: 1, 2, 3

How to submit: Via Turnitin on LEO

Return of assignment: Individual meetings will be scheduled to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the paper, to be incorporated in further work.

Assessment criteria: Please see the Issue Analysis Marking Criteria Sheet in the appendix to this unit outline.

II PEER COMMENTS

I will assign you a partner, who will send you a version of their paper that was rewritten in light of the feedback I provided. Your goal in your peer comments is to help your partner improve their paper so that they can submit the best essay they can. You'll help your partner by identifying problems with the paper.

Due date: 17 May 2021

You must send your paper to your peer by 10 May 2021.

Weighting: 30%

Length and/or format: At least 800 words, but no word limit

You need to identify at least two *new* substantive philosophical problems for your partner's paper, drawing on the sorts of skills that we have developed through the semester. When you identify the problem, you must quote a sentence from your peer's paper to illustrate the claim of theirs that you want to reject. You may point out typos or other problems that make the paper difficult to read, but the grade for this assignment depends on the value of the *philosophical* problems that you point out. (If you are entirely unable to understand your peer's paper, you need to schedule a meeting with me well before the assessment is due to explain why you weren't able to understand it - in that meeting, I may give you permission to write a somewhat different set of peer comments.)

Everyone will email me a ranking of the peer comments they received, on a scale from 1 to 10, with two sentences explaining why -- one sentence about each substantive problem the peer identified. I take the peer ratings into account in grading, though I'll also overrule them if the peer feedback is better than was appreciated.

Purpose: To foster skills in collaborative research, and clear presentation of problems, with supporting reasons.

Learning outcomes assessed: 1, 2, 3

How to submit: Written component is to be submitted via Turnitin in LEO and also emailed to your partner

Return of assignment: Within two weeks of receipt of the rankings of comments

Assessment criteria: Please see the 'Essay Marking Criteria' in the appendix to this unit outline, though the 'research' section will not be incorporated in this assignment.

RESEARCH ESSAY

This essay is a descendent of your initial essay, rewritten in light of the feedback you received from me, the feedback you received from your peers, and your independent research. The improvements that you make *entirely* determine your grade on this final essay; it's possible to get a 95 on the initial assignment and fail the research essay. Your revisions should draw on material introduced through the semester, together with independent *philosophical* research. (The research must be research in philosophical sources.) You must keep the same structure as Assessment 1: reject just one premise, with just one reason for rejecting that premise. The aim is to develop a better version of your initial paper in light of the feedback that you received.

Due date: 7 June 2021

Weighting: 50%

Length and/or format: 2000 words

Purpose: Help you think further for yourself about the topics addressed; practice honing the skills that we've developed throughout the course.

Learning outcomes assessed: 1, 2, 3

How to submit: Via Turnitin on LEO

 When you submit your paper, you must include a cover letter that describes changes that you made to the paper in light of both my initial comments and your subsequent research.

Return of assignment: Within two weeks

Assessment criteria: Please see the 'Essay Marking Criteria' in the appendix to this unit outline.

EXTRA CREDIT:

You'll get the most out of this class if you attend the live sessions, rather than just listening to the recordings. Class discussions will include me randomly calling on a group by calling on one member. I'll provide extra credit for being present in class: If I call on you and you are present, you earn a piece of extra credit. (But if I call on you, anyone in your group can answer - you just have to be there to be a member of one of the groups.) There are two other ways of earning credit.

Everyone will get two free passes: if I call on you when you've used a free pass, and you are absent, you still get the extra credit. But in order for your free pass to be valid, you must have emailed me (at PerlPedagogy@gmail.com) before class has started that day to tell me that you will be absent. And only the first two emails received will count as free passes. If you email me three times, and I only call on you the third time that you're absent, you've already used up your two free passes with the first two emails. The same holds for ACU-approved exceptions. If I call on you but you're absent because of an ACU-approved reason, you also get extra credit. In order for those exemptions to earn the credit, you need to email me (again at PerlPedagogy@gmail.com) with the relevant documentation. The extra credit will only be calculated at the end of the semester, rather than updated throughout the semester.

Students who have been approved to attend by online recordings should get in touch with me for their alternative way of earning extra credit.

REFERENCING

This unit requires you to use a recognised referencing system such as MLA, APA, Oxford, Chicago or the like. Use of the referencing system should be consistent and communicate effectively, honestly and in relevant degree of detail your intellectual debts and sources. Usually, relevant detail includes page numbers for printed materials and something such as section and paragraph numbers or paragraph numbers for materials accessed from the Internet which do not have page numbers.

See the 'Academic referencing' page of the Student Portal for more details.

ACU POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

It is your responsibility to read and familiarise yourself with ACU policies and regulations, including regulations on examinations; review and appeals; acceptable use of IT facilities; and conduct and responsibilities. These are in the ACU Handbook, available from the website.

A list of these and other important policies can be found at the University policies page of the Student Portal.

Assessment policy and procedures

You must read the Assessment Policy and Assessment Procedures in the University Handbook: they include rules on deadlines; penalties for late submission; extensions; and special consideration. If you have any queries on Assessment Policy, please see your Lecturer in Charge.

Please note that:

(1) any numerical marks returned to students are provisional and subject to moderation;

(2) students will not be given access to overall aggregated marks for a unit, or overall unit grade calculated by Gradebook in LEO;
and,
(3) students will be given a final mark and grade for their units after moderation is concluded and official grades are released after the end of semester.

Late policy: Assessment tasks submitted after the due or extended date will incur, for each whole or part of a calendar day that the work is overdue, a 5% penalty of the maximum marks available for that assessment task up to a maximum of 15%. Assessment tasks received more than three calendar days after the due or extended date will **not** be allocated a mark. See the Student Handbook for more information.

Academic integrity

You have the responsibility to submit only work which is your own, or which properly acknowledges the thoughts, ideas, findings and/or work of others. The Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and the Academic Misconduct Procedures are available from the website. Please read them, and note in particular that cheating, plagiarism, collusion, recycling of assignments and misrepresentation are not acceptable. Penalties for academic misconduct can vary in severity and can include being excluded from the course.

Turnitin The Turnitin application (a text-matching tool) will be used in this unit, in order to enable:

- students to improve their academic writing by identifying possible areas of poor citation and referencing in their written work; and
- teaching staff to identify areas of possible plagiarism in students' written work.

While Turnitin can help in identifying problems with plagiarism, avoiding plagiarism is more important. Information on avoiding plagiarism is available from the Academic Skills Unit.

For any assignment that has been created to allow submission through Turnitin (check the Assignment submission details for each assessment task), you should submit your draft well in advance of the due date (ideally, several days before) to ensure that you have time to work on any issues identified by Turnitin. On the assignment due date, lecturers will have access to your final submission and the Turnitin Originality Report.

Please note that electronic marking, Grademark, is used in this unit using Turnitin. Turnitin will be used as a means of submitting, marking and returning assessment tasks and so a text matching percentage will appear on your submission automatically.

FIRST PEOPLES AND EQUITY PATHWAYS DIRECTORATE FOR ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER STUDENTS

Every campus provides information and support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Students. Indigenous Knowings are embedded in curricula for the benefit of all students at ACU.

STUDENT SUPPORT

If you are experiencing difficulties with learning, life issues or pastoral/spiritual concerns, or have a disability/medical condition which may impact on your studies, you are advised to notify your Lecturer in Charge, Course Coordinator and/or one of the services listed below as soon as possible.

For all aspects of support please visit ACU Info section in the Student Portal.

- **Academic Skills** offers a variety of services, including workshops (on topics such as assignment writing, time management, reading strategies, referencing), drop-in sessions, group appointments and individual consultations. It has a 24-hour online booking system for individual or group consultations.
- **Campus Ministry** offers pastoral care, spiritual leadership and opportunities for you to be involved with community projects.
- The **Career Development Service** can assist you with finding employment, preparing a resume and employment application and preparing for interviews.
- The **Counselling Service** is a free, voluntary, confidential and non-judgmental service open to all students and staffed by qualified social workers or registered psychologists.
- **Disability Services** can assist you if you need educational adjustments because of a disability or chronic medical condition; please contact them as early as possible.

ONLINE RESOURCES AND TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

The LEO page for this unit contains further readings.

https://leo.acu.edu.au/course/view.php?id=37262#topic-0

TEXTS AND REFERENCES

All readings are available on the LEO homepage under the Resources section. No particular text is required.

Philosophy 1100: Introduction to ethics

Caleb Perl

chperl@gmail.com

Class meetings	**Office Hours**
11:00 AM - 11:50 AM	Hellems 276
[HUMN 150]	Tuesdays, 2:00-3:00
12:30 PM - 01:45 PM	Fridays, 1:00 - 2:00
[HLMS 237]	

Course Description

This course will introduce you to philosophical ethics – the different approaches that philosophers have taken to figuring out what we're morally required to do. Its overarching goal is to enrich and sharpen your ability to reason about controversial ethical topics. We will open with three such topics: duties of aid to the global poor, reparations for slavery, and abortion. We will then turn to some of the central concepts that philosophers use in reasoning about these sorts of questions. Our focus will be on developing fluency with these concepts. There are important contrasts between thinking that an act is *cruel* or *unjust*, thinking that it's *wrong*, thinking that it's *bad for* someone, or thinking that there are *reasons* against doing it. Many mistakes in ordinary moral reasoning come from insufficient sensitivity to the contrasts between these concepts, or from unclarity about the sort of ethical evaluation being made. The class will continually return to the controversial topics that we started discussing, and use them to illustrate the differences between these sorts of ethical evaluations.

The class then turns to more general questions about these ethical evaluations. We start by exploring some grounds for skepticism about the value of what we're doing in this class. We will then turn to move general questions about different kinds of ethical evaluations. We will focus in particular on views about the *priority* between these different ethical facts: for example, whether truths about what's good determine what we ought to do, or whether what is virtuous is more basic, or whether it's a mistake to look for some most basic ethical concept. We will close by discussing whether our ethical beliefs really matter – whether we would lose anything if we abandoned them.

Statement of learning outcomes

- to develop fluency with concepts that are important for reasoning about controversial ethical questions

- to increase your comfort in using these concepts in oral discussion

- to write about controversial ethical questions in a clear way, and to learn how to revise written work to communicate more clearly

- to familiarize you with some of the major theories in ethics, in part to appreciate different ways that ethically significant concepts might hang together

- to explore some challenges to ordinary ethical convictions

Required readings

Readings will be available on electronic reserve, on Canvas.

Grades

The grades break down as follows:

Exams	Papers	Quizzes and Attendance
45%	45%	10%
Exam 1, 20% Exam 2, 25%	First paper 20% Peer comments 5% Final paper 20%	Quizzes 5% Attendance 5%

Papers

- The first paper will be on a topic in PART I. It needs to be between 700 and 750 words.
- The first paper will be due **September 26**, and it will be worth 20% of your grade.
- After I have returned your papers with my comments, I will randomly assign you a partner to write peer comments on your paper. The peer comments need to be at least 500 words. After you receive the peer comments, you will email PerlPedagogy@gmail.com. That email needs to contain:
  - the paper that you sent to your peer
  - the comments that your peer sent you
  - a ranking of how helpful you found the comments (between 1 and 10, with 10 being the most helpful), and a sentence or two about what you found helpful. Your ranking will be taken into account in my grading of the peer comments.
- The final paper will be a descendent of the first paper you submit. It will be evaluated on how much it improves from the most recent paper submitted. So your first paper could get an 'A' and your final paper a 'C', if it is not responsive to the most recent round of comments and the peer comments.
- The final paper will be due **November 30**, and it will be worth 20% of your grade.
- LATE POLICY: later papers will be accepted for a week after the official deadline, but will be penalized 10% for being late. They will not be accepted if they are later than that.

Quizzes and Attendance

- I will randomly give comprehension quizzes at the start of some classes. The quizzes are designed to be easy as long as you have done the readings for the day.

- Class discussions will include me randomly calling on a group by calling on one member. If I call on you and you are there, you will gain points towards your attendance grade. You will also get points towards your attendance grade if I call on you in one of the following two circumstances:
    - everyone will get two free passes. But in order for your free pass to be valid, you must have emailed me (at PerlPedagogy@gmail.com) *before class has started that day* to tell me that you will be absent. And only the first two emails received will count as free passes. If you email me three times, and I only call on you the third time that you're absent, you've already used up your two free passes with the first two emails.
    - the other circumstances concerns CU-approved exceptions. You again need to email me (again at PerlPedagogy@gmail.com) with the relevant documentation.

Equality, Diversity, and Support

Students and faculty each have responsibility for maintaining an appropriate learning environment. Those who fail to adhere to such behavioral standards may be subject to discipline. Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important with respect to individuals and topics dealing with differences of race, culture, religion, politics, sexual orientation, gender, gender variance, and nationalities. Class rosters are provided to the instructor with the student's legal name. I will gladly honor your request to address you by an alternative name or gender pronoun. Please advise me of this preference early in the semester so I'm able to make appropriate changes to my records. See policies at: www.colorado.edu/policies/classbehavior.html.

What it takes to succeed in this class

Philosophy classes are different from most other classes that you've taken. It is very important here for you to try to master the readings outside of class. Class time is best spent building on what you've read outside of class, and improving your mastery of the material. Remember that this class is three credit hours, which means that the university takes it to be a quarter of your time as a full-time student. So you should expect to be spending an average of ten hours on this class each week: three hours in class, and seven hours outside of class preparing for it. If you're not doing this, you're compromising what everyone else can get from the material.

In many cases, you will have to do the readings more than once, or more than twice. That doesn't mean that you're not good at philosophy, or at life. It's what everyone should be doing. If you find yourself getting frustrated with the readings, you should come and talk with me about them in my office hours. We can plan out strategies for getting more out of them.

I do not allow computers or phones to be used during class. It's my expectation that every device is put away when class starts. There is a great deal of evidence that relying on computers and phones make it harder to master the material: students who take their notes on a computer do worse on exams than students who take notes by hand. I want you to be as successful in this class as you can be, and banning computers and phones is one way of putting you in a position to be more successful.

But because the computer ban is aimed at putting you in a position to be more successful, it does not apply to students with a disability. If you fall into that group, meet with me as early as possible in the semester, and we will figure out the best policy for putting you in a position to succeed. And at some point, you should register with Disability Services. Please get me the letter of verification as early in the semester as possible. For further information, see https://www.colorado.edu/disabilityservices. Their number is 303-492-8671

It's also important that the class is able to trust each other, and in particular to trust the way that the work is being evaluated. You should familiarize yourself with the policy about academic honesty (https://www.colorado.edu/policies/academic-integrity-policy). We will review this policy before the first paper is assigned.

Schedule of classes

Tuesday, August 27: Introduction to the course

> [No assigned readings]

Part I: Some initial topics

Thursday, August 29:

> Peter Singer, "Famine, Affluence, and Morality"
> Article about Carol Dweck's work, called "The Effort Effect"

Tuesday, September 3:

> Bernard Boxill, "The Morality of Reparation"

Thursday, September 5:

> Judith Jarvis Thomson, "A Defense of Abortion"

Tuesday, September 10:

> Don Marquis, "Why abortion is immoral"

Part II: Tools for thinking about ethics

Thursday, September 12:

> Philippa Foot, "The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of Double Effect"

Tuesday, September 17:

> Judith Jarvis Thomson, "Killing, letting die, and the trolley problem"

Thursday, September 19:

> Jonathan Bennett and Samuel Gorovitz, "Improving Academic Writing"

Tuesday, September 24:

> Rachels: "The challenge of cultural relativism"

Thursday, September 26:

    J.J.C. Smart, "Free-Will, Praise, and Blame", especially pp. 302 – 306.
Paper 1 due in class

Tuesday, October 1:

    Peter Strawson, "Freedom and resentment"

Thursday, October 3:

    Re-read Peter Strawson, "Freedom and resentment"

Tuesday, October 8:

    Judith Jarvis Thomson, chapter 1 of *The Realm of Rights*

Thursday, October 10:

    Derek Parfit, Appendix I to *Reasons and Persons*

Tuesday, October 15:

    Julia Annas, §§1.1–1.2 of "Virtue ethics"

Thursday, October 17:

    Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack"

Tuesday, October 22:

    Samia Hesni, "How to disrupt a social script"

Thursday, October 24:

    Exam 1 in class

Part III: Theories of ethics

Tuesday, October 29:

    Philip Quinn, §§3-4 of "Theological voluntarism"

Thursday, October 31:

    Philip Quinn, §§3-4 of "Theological voluntarism"

Tuesday, November 5:

    J. S. Mill, selections from *Utilitarianism*

Thursday, November 7:

    Peter Railton, §4 of"Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality"

Tuesday, November 12:

Hobbes, selections from *Leviathan*

Thursday, November 14:

T. M. Scanlon, chapter 5, §9 from *What We Owe to Each Other*

Tuesday, November 19:

Julia Annas, §§1.3, 2 of "Virtue ethics"
Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I-2, Q6 a1, Q9 a1, Q55

Part IV: How ethical thinking can go wrong

Thursday, November 21:

Stanley Milgram, "The Perils of Obedience"
Peer comments due

Tuesday, November 26:

No class: Fall break

Thursday, November 28:

No class: Thanksgiving

Tuesday, December 3:

Solomon Asch, "Opinions and Social Pressure"

Thursday, December 5:

Diana Jeske, chapter 6 of *The Evil Within: Why We Need Moral Philosophy*

Tuesday, December 10:

Ann Tenbrunsel and Max Bazerman, "Ethical Breakdowns"
Paper 2 due

Thursday, December 12:

Exam #2

FACULTY OF THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

School of Philosophy

Online

SEMESTER 2, 2020

PHIL210: Language, Meaning, and Truth

UNIT OUTLINE

Credit points: 10.

Prerequisites/incompatibles: PHIL100 Philosophy: The Big Questions or PHIL102 Theories of Human Nature or PHIL104 Introduction to Ethics or PHIL107 Philosophy of World Religions

Lecturer in Charge: Caleb Perl

       Office location: Zoom/Facetime/Skype/… as needed

       Email: caperl@acu.edu.au

       Telephone: [No local number established yet]

       Contact me: Email is best; I aim to reply in a day

Unit rationale, description and aim: Over the last century, problems concerning the connections between and among thinking, concepts, language, meaning, truth and reality have loomed large in philosophical concerns and debates. This unit focuses on a variety of issues and schools of thought in the philosophy of language, and considers the importance of the "linguistic turn" for a range of traditional philosophical questions.

Mode: MEL_Online Online. The lectures will be held online Via Zoom:

https://acu.zoom.us/j/91573540236?pwd=cGlYQWxEMWNudlQ4bVJDRytZM05jQT09

Attendance pattern: Each week students are expected to participate in a class meeting consisting of one three hour block, divided between lecture time and tutorial activities.

Duration: 12 week-semester

You should anticipate undertaking 150 of study for this unit, including class attendance, readings and assignment preparation.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

On successful completion of this unit, you should be able to:

1. identify and accurately explain some of the central problems and important theories in the philosophy of language (GA5)

2. critically analyse selected debates in the philosophy of language, and develop coherent and consistent positions in relation to them (GA4; GA8);

3. demonstrate appropriate skills in philosophical research, and clear use of English expression (GA5; GA9).

GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES

Each unit in your course contributes in some way to the development of the ACU Graduate Attributes which you should demonstrate by the time you complete your course. All Australian universities have their expected graduate attributes – ACU's Graduate Attributes have a greater emphasis on ethical behaviour and community responsibility than those of many other universities. All of your units will enable you to develop some attributes.

On successful completion of this unit, you should have developed your ability to:

GA4   think critically and reflectively

GA5   demonstrate values, knowledge, skills and attitudes appropriate to the discipline and/or profession

GA8   locate, organise, analyse, synthesise and evaluate information

GA9   demonstrate effective communication in oral and written English language and visual media

CONTENT

Topics will include:

- key concepts in philosophical syntax, semantics and pragmatics;
- debates concerning the relationship between language, meaning, truth and reality involving positions such as realism, relativism and functionalism;
- the relations between words, concepts, judgements, thought and language;
- problems in semantics such as identity statements, ascriptions of belief, modal contexts, truth ascriptions, criteria for meaningful sentences;
- major theories in semantics such as referentialism, intention-based, causalism, behaviourist,
- meaning as function of use, inferentialism;
- problems in pragmatics such as types of linguistic action, meaning context and interpretation,
- speaker meaning and conventional meaning;

Other topics in the philosophy of language, such as the following, may also be included:

- the nature of religious language;
- metaphor and analogical predication;
- meaning, truth, truth conditions and truth makers;
- textual hermeneutics;

- deconstruction.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

This unit has been evaluated through the 'Student Evaluation of Learning and Teaching' (SELT) online surveys. In response to student feedback there has been some simplification of the assessment package, some re-sequencing of the material studied and some revision of the reading list. SELT surveys are usually conducted at the end of the teaching period. Your practical and constructive feedback is valuable to improve the quality of the unit. Please ensure you complete the SELT survey for the unit. You can also provide feedback at other times to the unit lecturers, course coordinators and/or through student representatives.

LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGY AND RATIONALE

This unit involves 150 hours of focused learning, or the equivalent of 10 hours per week for 15 weeks. The 150 hours includes formally structured learning activities such as lectures, tutorials and online learning. The remaining hours typically involve reading, research, and the preparation of tasks for assessment. The unit has been designed as a blend of project learning along with direct instruction within a collaborative context. The direct instruction ensures that students develop a grounding in understanding basic problems, concepts and arguments in the philosophy of language (LO1). The project learning enables the students to apply those concepts and theories critically and reflectively to problems in the field, and this feeds into the achievement of the other aim of the unit concerning the development of philosophical skills of analysis, interpretation and argumentation (LO2-3). The collaborative context of the unit is focused especially on the weekly tutorial, during which the emphasis is on small group discussion of the weekly readings. Students engage in class discussions, provide written critiques of significant theories, and present their reasoned position on matters at issue, after being introduced to them through readings and lectures.

ASSESSMENT STRATEGY AND RATIONALE

The assessment strategy for this unit has been designed to examine students' understanding of the philosophical issues and theories under consideration, as well as their ability to critically analyse those issues and theories. It does so through a series of three graduated assessment tasks. The first two tasks prepare students for the third and principal task of writing an extended research essay. The two structured written tasks require students to demonstrate an understanding of the key concepts and theories, and increasingly to examine their capacity to engage critically with some key texts in the field. The research essay examines students' capacity to research an area of the unit in further detail, and to develop and defend a coherent position of their own in a formally structured argumentative essay.

LECTURE CAPTURE

Lectures and tutorials will be recorded using Echo360 and once available, will be posted on LEO and the link made available to students.

SCHEDULE

For the most up-to-date information, please check your LEO unit and also note advice from your lecturing and tutoring staff for changes to this schedule.

Week	Starting	Insert tutorial or lecture content, readings ...	Insert other weekly information, such as assessment deadlines
1	31/07/2020	Introduction: why philosophy of language might matter	
2	07/08/2020	Gottlob Frege, "On Sense and Reference", pp. 36-41	
3	14/08/2020	Bertrand Russell, "On denoting"	**OPTION FOR SUBMITTING PART A OF PROBLEM SET 1**
4	21/08/2020	Carl Hempel, "Empiricist criteria of cognitive significance: problems and changes", pp. 41-54	**PROBLEM SET 1 DUE**
5	28/08/2020	Saul Kripke, *Naming and Necessity*, pp. 71-89	
6	04/09/2020	Saul Kripke, *Naming and Necessity*, pp. 89-105	
7	11/09/2020	Robin Jeshion, "Two Dogmas of Russellianism" pp. 67-70, 81-88	**OPTION FOR SUBMITTING PART A OF PROBLEM SET 2**
8	18/09/2020	H. P. Grice, "Logic and Conversation"	**PROBLEM SET 2 DUE**
9	25/09/2020	Jennifer Saul, "Dogwhistles, Political Manipulation, and the Philosophy of Language", pp. 360-371, 377-382	
10	09/10/2020	Sarah-Jane Leslie, "The Original Sin of Cognition", pp. 393-408	**HURDLE TASK DUE**
11	16/10/2020	Robin Dembroff and Daniel Wodak, "He/She/They/Ze", pp. 371-379, 389-395	**ANALYTICAL ESSAY DUE**
12	23/10/2020	Samia Hesni, "Illocutionary Frustration", pp. 947-956, 959-964	

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION, MARKING AND RETURN

All assignments will be submitted electronically as indicated below. Hard copy submissions are not required. Written feedback will be emailed back to students.

Assessment tasks	Due date	Weighting (%)	Learning outcome(s) assessed	Graduate attribute(s) assessed
Hurdle task	9 October 2020	0%	LO1, LO2, LO3	GA4, GA5, GA8, GA9
Problem set I	21 August 2020	20%	LO1, LO2	GA5
Problem set II	18 September 2020	30%	LO1, LO2	GA4, GA5, GA8,
Analytical essay	6 November 2020	50%	LO1, LO2, LO3	GA4, GA5, GA8, GA9

ANALYTICAL ESSAY HURDLE TASK

The assignment is to write an outline of the analytical essay, to check progress for final submission

Due date: At the start of class in week ten, 9 October

Length and/or format: 100 words

Purpose: Help students prepare to write the analytical essay by giving them feedback on an outline of the paper

Learning outcomes assessed: 1, 2, 3

How to submit: Assignment submitted electronically

Return of assignment: Assignment returned electronically three days after submission

Assessment criteria: Assignment will be checked for completeness and returned with feedback to be incorporated

ASSIGNMENT 1

This is a problem set that develops skills in identifying philosophical concepts, applying distinctions and analysing philosophical questions in terms of basic concepts for philosophy of language

Due date: At the start of class in week four, 21 August

	Students will have an option to submit part A of the problem set in week three, 14 August, for a grade and feedback before submitting part B
Weighting:	20%
Length and/or format:	800 words
Purpose:	to prepare the student with necessary background technical concepts and skills for philosophy of language.
Learning outcomes assessed:	1, 2
How to submit:	Assignment submitted electronically to me; students will also submit electronically through Turnitin
Return of assignment:	If students submit part A by 14 August, they'll receive feedback by 18 August; for the rest, assignment returned electronically one week after submission;
Assessment criteria:	Please see the 'Essay Marking Criteria' in the appendix to this unit outline.

ASSIGNMENT 2

This is a problem set that develops skills in identifying philosophical concepts, applying distinctions and analysing philosophical questions in terms of basic concepts for philosophy of language

Due date:	At the start of class in week eight, 18 September
	Students will have an option to submit part A of the problem set in week seven, 11 September, for a grade and feedback before submitting part B
Weighting:	30%
Length and/or format:	1200 words
Purpose:	to prepare the student with necessary background technical concepts and skills for philosophy of language.
Learning outcomes assessed:	1, 2
How to submit:	Assignment submitted electronically to me; students will also submit electronically through Turnitin
Return of assignment:	If students submit part A by 11 September, they'll receive feedback by 15 August; for the rest, assignment returned electronically one week after submission;
Assessment criteria:	Please see the 'Essay Marking Criteria' in the appendix to this unit outline.

ASSIGNMENT 3

Argumentative/ Research essay to argue a case on a topic in the Philosophy of Language

Due date:	At the start of class in week eleven, 6 November

Weighting:	50%
Length and/or format:	1800 words
Purpose:	for students to research a topic in philosophy of language and argue a case for its resolution in debate with the literature on the topic.
Learning outcomes assessed:	1, 2, 3
How to submit:	Assignment submitted electronically to me; students will also submit electronically through Turnitin
Return of assignment:	Students will be emailed written feedback after the ratification of grades
Assessment criteria:	Please see the 'Essay Marking Criteria' in the appendix to this unit outline.

REFERENCING

This unit requires you to use a recognised referencing system such as MLA, APA, Oxford, Chicago or the like. Use of the referencing system should be consistent and communicate effectively, honestly and in relevant degree of detail your intellectual debts and sources. Usually, relevant detail includes page numbers for printed materials and something such as section and paragraph numbers or paragraph numbers for materials accessed from the Internet which do not have page numbers.

See the 'Academic referencing' page of the Student Portal for more details.

ACU POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

It is your responsibility to read and familiarise yourself with ACU policies and regulations, including regulations on examinations; review and appeals; acceptable use of IT facilities; and conduct and responsibilities. These are in the ACU Handbook, available from the website.

A list of these and other important policies can be found at the University policies page of the Student Portal.

Assessment policy and procedures

You must read the Assessment Policy and Assessment Procedures in the University Handbook: they include rules on deadlines; penalties for late submission; extensions; and special consideration. If you have any queries on Assessment Policy, please see your Lecturer in Charge.

Please note that:

(1) any numerical marks returned to students are provisional and subject to moderation;

(2) students will not be given access to overall aggregated marks for a unit, or overall unit grade calculated by Gradebook in LEO;
and,
(3) students will be given a final mark and grade for their units after moderation is concluded and official grades are released after the end of semester.

PHILOSOPHY 442: Topics in the history of ethics:

Aristotle, Kant, Sidgwick

Caleb Perl

chperl@gmail.com

Class meetings	**Office Hours**
1:00pm to 2:30pm,	2:00 - 3:00, Mondays
Tuesdays and Thursdays	4:00 - 5:00, Wednesdays

Course Description

This course focuses closely on the moral philosophy of Aristotle, Kant, and Sidgwick. Each philosopher will serve to illustrate a distinctive tradition in philosophical theorizing about ethics. But the class will focus on delving deep into the particular commitments that each philosopher undertakes, rather than comprehensively illustrating the three traditions under discussion. In doing that, we will be working towards an appreciation of systematic connections that run through moral philosophy. Aristotle, Kant, and Sidgwick disagree about a wide range of philosophical questions: about the will, about rational action, about virtue, about obligation, and a host of other topics. But there are systematic patterns, amid all the disagreements. Aristotelian claims about the will lead naturally to particular claims about virtue, and about obligation. A central goal of the class will be to put you in a position to appreciate these systematic patterns.

The class tackles this goal by focusing carefully on each philosopher, working carefully through some of the central texts. We will delve into some of the interpretative controversies about each philosopher. But I will privilege some interpretations, as the ones that best balance interpretive fidelity with broader philosophical significance. (I will, for example, spend a good amount of time on the way that Aquinas reads Aristotle.) I'll keep an eye on the broader philosophical significance of the debates described, because those debates are still live, and the positions that Aristotle, Kant, and Sidgwick took are perennially appealing.

Statement of learning outcomes

- to develop fluency with the main contours of what Aristotle, Kant, and Sidgwick thought about moral philosophy
- to develop appreciation of the systematic patterns in moral philosophy – of the ways that commitments in one part make other views more or less natural
- to improve written and oral fluency in communicating about difficult and abstract issues

Required readings

- Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*

- Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*
- Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*
- The other readings will be available on electronic reserve, on Blackboard.

Grades

The grades break down as follows:

Exams	Papers	Attendance
60%	30%	10%
Midterm, 25% Final, 35%	Final paper 30%	Attendance 10%

Exams

- The midterm exam will be on **February 21**, and it will be worth 25% of your grade.
- The final exam will be on **May 4**, and it will be worth 35% of your grade.

Papers

- The final paper needs to be about fifteen pages.
- It will be due **April 20**, and it will be worth 30% of your grade.
- Papers will be graded blind. When you submit your paper, include only your ACU ID number. Do not include your name.
- I will give you comments up to a week before April 20, if you want a chance to incorporate them into the final draft that you submit to me.
- LATE POLICY: later papers will be accepted for a week after the official deadline, but will be penalized 10% for being late. They will not be accepted if they are later than that.

Attendance (and Quizzes)

- I reserve the right to start giving comprehension quizzes at the start of some classes, if I start to think that you are not doing the reading. Those quizzes will be designed to be easy as long as you have done the readings for the day. (If I start giving those quizzes, they will be factored into the attendance portion of your grade.)
- Class discussions will include me randomly calling on a group by calling on one member. If I call on you and you are absent, your attendance grade will be penalized. There are two exceptions.
  - everyone will get two free passes. But in order for your free pass to be valid, you must have emailed me (at perlteaching@gmail.com) *before class has started that day* to tell me that you will be absent. And only the first two emails received will count as free passes. If you email me three times, and I only call on you the third time that you're absent, you've already used up your two free passes with the first two emails.

– the other exception concerns ACU approved emergencies. In order for those exemptions to be valid, you need to email me (again at perlteaching@gmail.com) with a signed form approving the absence.

Equality, Diversity, and Support

This classroom is a safe environment. Any discrimination on the basis of race, gender, sex, sexuality, socioeconomic status, disability, national origin, religion, or age will not be tolerated. If at any time while at ACU you feel you have experienced harassment or discrimination, you can file a complaint: see http://equity.ACU.edu for more information. You are also welcome to bring the complaint to any faculty or staff member at ACU.

What it takes to succeed in this class

Philosophy classes are different from most other classes that you've taken. It is very important here for you to try to master the readings outside of class. Class time is best spent building on what you've read outside of class, and improving your mastery of the material. Remember that this class is three credit hours, which means that ACU takes it to be a quarter of your time as a full-time student. So you should expect to be spending an average of ten hours on this class each week: three hours in class, and seven hours outside of class preparing for it. If you're not doing this, you're compromising what everyone else can get from the material.

In many cases, you will have to do the readings more than once, or more than twice. That doesn't mean that you're not good at philosophy, or at life. It's what everyone should be doing. If you find yourself getting frustrated with the readings, you should come and talk with me about them in my office hours. We can plan out strategies for getting more out of them.

I do not allow computers or phones to be used during class. It's my expectation that every device is put away when class starts. There is a great deal of evidence that relying on computers and phones make it harder to master the material: students who take their notes on a computer do worse on exams than students who take notes by hand. I want you to be as successful in this class as you can be, and banning computers and phones is one way of putting you in a position to be more successful.

But because the computer ban is aimed at putting you in a position to be more successful, it does not apply to students with a disability. If you fall into that group, meet with me as early as possible in the semester, and we will figure out the best policy for putting you in a position to succeed. In the course of this discussion, you should register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP). Please get me the letter of verification as early in the semester as possible. DSP is in STU 301, and is open 8:30am - 5pm, Mon - Fri; their number is (213) 740 - 0776.

It's also important that the class is able to trust each other, and in particular to trust the way that the work is being evaluated. You should familiarize yourself with the university policy about plagiarism as stated in SCampus (http://scampus.ACU.edu/1100-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions/). We will review this policy before the first paper is assigned.

Schedule of classes

NOTE: *there is significant repetition in assigned readings. (The same passages from Aristotle are assigned for several days.) I expect that you re-read those passage between the classes. There is an enormous amount going on in these passages, and you will appreciate more and more as you re-read.*

<div align="center">PART I: ARISTOTLE'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY</div>

Tuesday, January 10: Introduction to the class, introduction to Aristotle

Article about Carol Dweck's work, called "The Effort Effect"

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk 1, focusing especially on I.6
Sarah Broadie, "Philosophical Introduction", 9-17

Thursday, January 12: Aristotle on the final good

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk 1, focusing especially on I.7
Julia Annas, chapter 18 of *The Morality of Happiness*

Tuesday, January 17: Aristotle on the nature of virtue

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk II, esp. II.1,2
Sarah Broadie, "Philosophical Introduction", 17- 23

Thursday, January 19: Aristotle on the nature of virtue, continued

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk II, esp. II.6
Hursthouse, Rosalind. "Moral Habituation." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 6 (1988), pp. 201–19.

Tuesday, January 24: Aristotle on what is virtuous

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk II.6, Bk IX, 8-9
Irwin, *The Development of Ethics*, Volume 1, §§112–121

Thursday, January 26: Three possible lives

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk X, esp 6-8
Sarah Broadie, "Philosophical Introduction", 74-81

Tuesday, January 31: Aquinas on the will

Summa Theologica, Ia q80, Ia q83
Eleonore Stump, *Aquinas*, pp. 277–300

Thursday, February 2: Aquinas on the will, continued

Re-read *Summa Theologica*, Ia q80, Ia q83
Irwin, §§235–248

Tuesday, February 7: Aquinas on Virtue

Summa Theologica, I-2, q6 a1, q9, q24
Irwin, §§249–259

Thursday, February 9: Aquinas on moral virtues

Summa Theologica, I-2, q50, q56, q63
Irwin, §§284–290, 294

PART II: KANT'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Tuesday, February 14: Introduction to Kant

> *Groundwork*, Preface and First Section [Ak 4:387-405]
> Christine Korsgaard, 'An introduction to the ethical, political, and religious thought of Kant' in her *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*

Thursday, February 16: Kant's ambitions

> Re-read *Groundwork*, Preface and First Section [Ak 4:387-405]

Tuesday, February 21: Kant's formula of universal law

> *Groundwork*, Second Section to Ak 4:424 [Ak 4:06 - 424]
> Christine Korsgaard, "Kant's formula of universal law", in her *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*

Thursday, February 23: Kant's formula of universal law, continued

> Re-read *Groundwork*, Second Section to Ak 4:424 [Ak 4:06 - 424]
> Allen Wood, chapter 4 of *Kantian Ethics*

Tuesday, February 28: Kant's formula of humanity

> *Groundwork*, remainder of the Second Section [Ak 4:25 - 445]
> Allen Wood, chapter 5 of *Kantian Ethics*

Thursday, March 2: What are the ambitions of Kantian Ethics?

> Re-read *Groundwork*, remainder of the Second Section [Ak 4:25 - 445]
> Barbara Herman, chapter 4 of *The Practice of Moral Judgment*

Tuesday, March 7: Review Day

Midterm, *Thursday*, March 9

SPRING BREAK, March 13 - 17.

Tuesday, March 21: Kant's vindication of moral belief

> *Groundwork*, Third Section [Ak 4:46-463]
> Onora O'Neill, 'Reason and autonomy in Grundlegung III', in her *Constructions of Reason: Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*

Thursday, March 23: Kant's vindication of moral belief, continued

> Re-read *Groundwork*, Third Section [Ak 4:46-463]
> Allen Wood, chapter 7 of *Kantian Ethics*

Tuesday, March 28: Kant on duties to oneself

> Selections from the *Critique of Practical Reason* [Ak 6:417–424, 429–437]

Thursday, March 30: Kant on our duties to others as merely human beings

> Selections from the *Critique of Practical Reason* [Ak 6:448 - 461]

PART III: SIDGWICK'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Tuesday, April 4: Introduction to Sidgwick

    Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Bk I chs I, VII, VIII

Thursday, April 6: Sidgwick on Egoism

    Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Bk II, chapter 1, IV

Tuesday, April 11: Sidgwick on common-sense morality

    Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Bk III; chs I, XI

Thursday, April 13: Sidgwick on common-sense morality, continued

    Re-read Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Bk III; chs XI,
    W. D. Ross, selections from *The Right and the Good*

Tuesday, April 18: Sidgwick on formulating utilitarianism

    Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Bk IV chs I-II

Thursday, April 20: Sidgwick on defending utilitarianism

    Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Bk IV chs III
    Final Paper paper due

Tuesday, April 25: Problems about the defense of utilitarianism

    Re-read Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Bk IV chs III
    Philippa Foot, "Utilitarianism and the virtues"

Thursday, April 27: Sidgwick on the dualism of practical reason

    Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Bk IV: concluding chapter

Final on May 4.

Moral and Political Questions in Mental Health Care

Ashley Perl   Caleb Perl
ashley.perl@cuanschutz.edu   chperl@gmail.com

Course Description

This course covers central moral and political questions about mental health care. We begin with questions about individual treatment, with particular attention to the ways that mental health diagnoses can threaten our capacity to make autonomous decisions. We focus on eating disorders like anorexia and bulimia to illustrate several of the threats. (One of us is a practicing clinician specializing in eating disorders.) We then turn to institutional and political questions about the provision of mental health care – asking, for instance, what sort of care a just insurance system would cover. Those questions push us to explore what, if anything, distinguishes providing mental health care from providing other kinds of health care. The course aims to strengthen your ability to think carefully and critically about these questions, by giving you a systematic set of conceptual tools for leadership, advocacy, and provision of care.

Statement of learning outcomes

- to develop fluency with concepts that are important for reasoning about difficult moral and political questions about mental health care
- to increase your comfort in using these concepts in oral discussion
- to write about difficult moral and political questions in a clear way, and to learn how to revise written work to communicate more clearly
- to explore some difficulties with standard practice in mental health care, and to help you develop your own perspective on what's standard practice

Required readings

Readings will be available on electronic reserve, on Canvas.

Equality, Diversity, and Support

This classroom is a safe environment. Any discrimination on the basis of race, gender, sex, sexuality, socioeconomic status, disability, health status (including mental health status), national origin, religion, or age will not be tolerated. If at any time while here you feel you have experienced harassment or discrimination, you can file a complaint: see https://www.colorado.edu/policies/discrimination-and-harassment-policy-and-procedures for more information. You are also welcome to bring the complaint to any faculty or staff member here.

The first week will describe current best practices in avoiding stigmatizing language for mental health. For example, we'll prefer to say someone 'died by suicide', rather than saying 'committed suicide,' since 'committed' can make it seem like someone committed a crime.

What it takes to succeed in this class

Philosophy classes are different from most other classes that you've taken. It is very important here for you to try to master the readings outside of class. Class time is best spent building on what you've read outside of class, and improving your mastery of the material. If you're not doing this, you're compromising what everyone else can get from the material.

In many cases, you will have to do the readings more than once. That doesn't mean that you're not good at philosophy, or at life. It's what everyone should be doing. If you find yourself getting frustrated with the readings, you should come and talk with me about them in my office hours. We can plan out strategies for getting more out of them.

I do not allow computers or phones to be used during class. It's my expectation that every device is put away when class starts. There is a great deal of evidence that relying on computers and phones make it harder to master the material: students who take their notes on a computer do worse on exams than students who take notes by hand. I want you to be as successful in this class as you can be, and banning computers and phones is one way of putting you in a position to be more successful.

But because the computer ban is aimed at putting you in a position to be more successful, it does not apply to students with a disability. If you fall into that group, meet with me as early as possible in the semester, and we will figure out the best policy for putting you in a position to succeed. And at some point, you should register with Disability Services. Please get me the letter of verification as early in the semester as possible. For further information, see https://www.colorado.edu/disabilityservices. Their number is 303-492-8671

It's also important that the class is able to trust each other, and in particular to trust the way that the work is being evaluated. You should familiarize yourself with the policy about academic honesty (https://www.colorado.edu/policies/academic-integrity-policy). We will review this policy before the first paper is assigned.

Grades

Thesis submission	Week 10	0%
Paper 1	Week 11	25%
Peer comments	Week 14	15%
Final paper	Exam week	50%
Participation		10%

Schedule of classes

PART I: Background

Week 1: Mental health's complex relationship with physical health

> Elizabeth Reisinger Walker and Benjamin G. Druss, "Mental and Addictive Disorders and Medical Comorbidities", *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 20 (2018)

Week 2: Blame and non-judgmentalism

> Nomy Arpaly, "How It Is Not 'Just Like Diabetes': Mental Disorders and the Moral Psychologist", *Philosophical Issues*, 15 (2005)

PART II: Questions in individual treatment

Week 3: Basic analytical tool: autonomy and adaptive preferences

> Serene Khader, *Adaptive Preferences and Women's Empowerment*, (OUP, 2011) pp. 41-2, 46-53

Week 4: Overview of ethical questions in eating disorder treatment

> Jill Anne Matusek and Margaret O'Dougherty Wright, "Ethical dilemmas in treating clients with eating disorders: A review and application of an integrative ethical decision-making model" *European eating disorders review*, 18 (2010-11)

Week 5: Eating disorders and gendered oppression

> Megan Dean, "Eating Identities, 'Unhealthy' Eaters, and Damaged Agency', *Feminist Philosophy Quarterly*, 4 (2018)

Week 6: Coercive treatment for anorexia, bulimia, ARFID, and binge eating disorder

> Heather Draper, "Anorexia nervosa and respecting a refusal of life-prolonging therapy: a limited justification", *Bioethics*, 14 (2000)

Week 7: Depression and physician-assisted death

> Bonnie Steinbock, "Physician-Assisted Death and Severe, Treatment-Resistant Depression", *The Hastings Center Report*, 47 (2017)

Week 8: Harm reduction and eating disorders

> Andria Bianchi, Katherine Stanley, and Kalam Sutandar, "The Ethical Defensibility of Harm Reduction and Eating Disorders", *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 21 (2021)

Week 9: Responsibility without blame in providing services

> Hanna Pickard, "Responsibility without blame: philosophical reflections on clinical practice?" *Oxford Handbook of Philosophy and Psychiatry*: 1134-1152 (2013)

PART III: Questions in institutional settings

Week 10: Basic analytical tool: a theory of health-care needs

> selection from Norman Daniels, "Health-Care Needs and Distributive Justice", *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10 (1981)

Thursday, September 27: Parity between coverage for mental and physical health

> Robert L. Woolfolk and John M. Doris, "Rationing Mental Health Care: Parity, Disparity, and Justice", *Bioethics*, 16 (2002)

Week 11: Diagnoses of mental health

> George Szmukler, "When psychiatric diagnosis becomes an overworked tool", *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 40 (2014)

Week 12: Mental health care and racialized individuals

> Hae Lin Cho, "Can Intersectionality Help Lead to More Accurate Diagnosis?", *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 19 (2019)

Week 13: On the medicalization of mental health

> Stephen Wilkinson, "Is 'Normal Grief' a Mental Disorder?", *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 50 (2000)

Week 14: Tarasoff and duty to warn

> Jeremy Holmes, Richard Lindley, and R. D. Hinshelwood, *The Values of Psychotherapy* (Taylor & Francis 2018), pp. 203–213

Week 15: Confidentiality and electronic health records

> Melissa M. Goldstein, "Health Information Technology and the Idea of Informed Consent", *The Journal of Law, Medicine, and Ethics*, 38 (2010)

Week 16: The moral authority of advance directives

> Agnieszka Jaworska, "Respecting the Margins of Agency: Alzheimer's Patients and the Capacity to Value," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, (28) 1999.