

Notes on Syllabi

- 1) To save space within this dossier, I have removed boilerplate sections on academic policy, online access, reading access, inclusivity/respectful participation policy, formatting information, etc., from all but one syllabus: FC-0503-4—Mind and Behaviour
- 2) Syllabi with a schedule spread across 24 lectures are modeled for two weekly meetings, while syllabi with schedules spread across 12 lectures are modeled for one weekly meeting.

* * *

Currently and Previously Taught

Mind and Behaviour (100 Level).....6-12

Advanced Philosophy of Mind (300 Level).....13-16

Philosophical Issues in Artificial Intelligence (300-level).....17-19

Perception, Knowledge, and Causality (200 Level)20-22

Climate Change: Ethical and Political Issues (300 Level)23-25

Sample Syllabi

Social Epistemology (400 Level).....26-27

The Epistemology of Self-Knowledge (Graduate).....28-29

What Is Inference? (Graduate).....30-31

Mind and Behaviour (Fall 2022—100 Level)**Instructor:** Dr. Benjamin Winokur**Times and Dates:** 11:50AM-1:20PM, T/TH**Contact:** benjamin.winokur@ashoka.edu.in**Location:** AC 04-005 (LT)**Office hours / Location:** AC 01-609,
2:00PM-3:00PM, Tuesdays**Teaching Fellow:** REDACTED

*

Course Description

Each of us has a mind that undergoes all sorts of thoughts and experiences. But what exactly *is* the mind? Is it a non-physical substance, like a *spirit* or *soul*? Or is it just a complex physical system within the brain? Is the mind not a *thing* at all, whether physical or otherwise? How does the mind relate to what we call *the self*? What are the *boundaries* of the mind and the self? Are they confined to our individual bodies, or do they reach beyond our bodies and into the physical (and perhaps even digital) world around us? As beings that occupy complex worlds full of (mis)information and other living beings, how should we conduct ourselves? Are we free to do whatever we want, or must we constrain our behaviour according to *moral principles*? Does moral behaviour give *meaning* to our lives, or must we somehow create the meaningfulness of life for ourselves? These questions are very important to philosophers, though some of them are also of great interest to psychologists, neuroscientists, and other academics. We will explore various answers to these questions over the course of the semester, all while gaining experience writing in a reflective, careful, and systematic way about some of life's most challenging puzzles.

Class Readings

- All class readings will be made available for free on our course website.
- With some exceptions, the readings for each class are fairly short. You should not expect any of our texts to be *easy*, however; philosophy is a difficult subject matter!
- To make the readings easier for you, try engaging in an *active reading* process where you (1) summarize the reading's main thesis and supporting arguments, and (2) articulate some questions, either about terminology or the philosophical ideas, to raise with me during lecture, or during your discussion sections, or via the '*Questions About Course Ideas!*' discussion board on our course website.
- We will also discuss reading strategies during our second class together
- Occasionally, I may define some key terms *before* you read a paper, to help with the process.

Course Objectives

Students will learn to carefully evaluate philosophical arguments regarding the nature of the human mind, the nature of the self, the importance of various kinds of mental and physical behaviour, and the importance of valuable pursuits in the course of a fulfilling life. Students will also gain skill in the arts of philosophical argumentation, reading, and writing.

Assignments

All assignment deadlines are listed on the 'Lecture and Deadline Schedule' section of this syllabus. The assignments and their grade weights are described here.

(1) Reflection Exercises—10%

Two times during the semester, you should submit a 300-word reflection regarding a course reading. Each reflection exercise will be worth up to 5% of your grade. The objective is to give you practice in the art of interpreting and critically evaluating philosophical arguments. To complete a reflection exercise, you should complete the following steps: identify a central argument in the reading (with proper citation), explain that argument in your own words, and consider one possible objection to that argument (space permitting, you might also consider a response to the objection that you raise). *Three important notes are these:*

1. Reflections that are submitted *prior* to the lecture during which we are discussing your chosen reading are graded less strictly than those submitted afterwards.
2. You must submit one reflection piece before the Monsoon semester break week, and one reflection piece afterwards, on a topic contained within either half of the class. This is to ensure that your reflections cover sufficiently different topics.
3. You are free to submit a third reflection piece. If the resultant grade is higher than either of your earlier submissions, then this grade will replace your lowest grade.
 - *Submit this third reflection to me only, in order to not overburden your Teaching Fellow.*

(2) Eleven Short Quizzes—30%

These short quizzes are intended to test your comprehension of key concepts and arguments from our course readings. They will involve some combination of true/false, fill in the blanks, and multiple-choice questions. You will have twenty minutes to complete each quiz once you begin. The quizzes will be made available online after each Thursday's lecture, and closed before the subsequent Tuesday's lecture. Only ten quizzes will contribute to your final grade, and each is worth up to 3% of your final grade. The eleventh quiz is a 'make-up quiz' which you can either skip or write in order to eliminate a lower grade from an earlier quiz.

(3) Two Short Papers—40%

You will write two papers this semester. Each will be approximately 1000 words long and worth up to 20% of your final grade, for a total of up to 40%. You will have an opportunity to choose your paper topic from a list that I curate in advance. The goal of each paper will be to defend a thesis about a philosophical position (topics can be discussed through any number of related course readings). Early in the semester, I will share philosophical argument strategies with you. You will also be free to pursue your own argument strategies as long as they conform to high standards of logical rigor. If you are unsure about the thesis you intend to defend or the arguments that you wish to develop in defense of your thesis, please email me in advance of the deadline. *Note that neither myself nor your Teaching Fellow will read and comment on full drafts of your papers*, though we will happily discuss your thesis and arguments during office hours.

(4) Discussion Sections—10%

Every week, you will attend a discussion section with your Teaching Fellow. Your Teaching Fellow can decide exactly how this portion of your grade is calculated, though the total will factor both attendance and participation.

(5) Poll and Retrospection Exercise—5%

In our final class together, we will consider a list of questions about course concepts and arguments. You will have a chance to answer them, and to submit these answers as a pass/fail assignment worth 5% of your final grade. You may be asked to explain whether you have changed your mind about any of the theories or ideas presented throughout the course. In any such cases, you should submit a brief (one or two-sentence) explanation of why you have changed your mind.

(6) Attendance—5%

A small portion of your grade is allotted to frequent attendance in my lectures. This grade reduces by 1 point out of the possible 5 for each absence miss beyond your third. *Your first three absences need not be excused in advance; you can take them for any reason.*

Deadline Policy

You are entitled to *five grace days* for late submissions. These have two special features:

- You can submit late work without having to provide an explanation, and;
- You will receive no late penalty on any overdue assignments during these days.

After the five grace days, you should contact me to discuss the issues you are having for completing your work. Late penalties will be 3/100 grade points per day unless I grant you further extensions.

Importantly, **this policy does not apply to quizzes**, as these are designed to be completed by all students within the same time frame, in order to prevent academic misconduct. You can write the eleventh quiz in order to overcome a missed quiz.

Academic Integrity: Plagiarism, Citation Norms, and Research Practices

- (1) Plagiarism refers to any case where an author reproduces material from a source without citing it, even accidentally.
- (2) *Self-plagiarism is plagiarism*. If you have past work of your own that you wish to use in this course, please speak with me first.
- (3) Footnotes, endnotes, and in-text citations are all legitimate ways of citing a source in your papers. Whenever possible, please provide page numbers for cited passage(s). A standard citation will follow the format (AUTHOR'S LAST NAME, PUBLICATION YEAR; PAGE NUMBER)
- (4) In addition to citing sources within the paper itself (see previous point), please also include bibliographies at the end of your papers. You may use any humanities-specific format as long as you use only one format per assignment.
- (5) Generally speaking, acceptable *primary research sources* are scholarly works from academic journals, books, and anthologies. Papers that do not engage sufficiently with primary sources will be downgraded accordingly.
- (6) I will not require additional research in this class. The papers that we discuss in this class are sufficiently rich and complex, so you can do well by just citing and engaging with them.
- (7) Sparknotes is not a scholarly source and should not be consulted in your research.

- (8) Wikipedia, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (SEP) entries, and Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (IEP), while often high-quality, are considered *secondary sources* that you may cite. However, citing them does not excuse you from citing primary sources in your research.
- (9) There are other legitimate secondary sources that you may consult for your course work, such as presentations or article drafts from authors whose work has since been published in scholarly venues, or unpublished materials from authors whose publication records legitimate it. Please consult me if you are unsure about the scholarly value of any source.

Email Policies

Please include “M&B” in the subject line of all emails. Please note your name at the beginning of the body of all e-mails. I will always aim to reply to your queries within 24 hours. If I do not respond by then, please send me a follow-up email.

Further Resources For Students

- 1) On Writing Philosophy: <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/writing.html>
- 2) On Reading Philosophy: <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/reading.html>
- 3) More on Reading Philosophy: <https://writing.dawsoncollege.qc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Concepcion-Reading-Philosophy.pdf>
- 4) On learning how to produce and engage with objections to philosophical arguments: <https://dailynous.com/2021/11/11/how-philosophers-respond-to-objections/>
- 5) On learning how to participate well in philosophy discussions: <https://obailey.weebly.com/uploads/1/0/5/6/105611057/but-how-do-i-participate.pdf>

Inclusivity and Participation Policies

You are expected to pay attention to your peers when they speak. This is part of why I believe that using electronic devices while others are talking can be disrespectful. While I will not be implementing a ban on the use of electronics, research suggests that the use of electronics in class can harm both your learning and your peer’s learning *even when you use them for educational purposes* (see the following link): https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1vmQ548UJ0WnoSwkfREU3iR-m2Co1xTWzGkhcv6bFbY8/edit#slide=id.g23ec572590_0_9

Please contact me if you are having a conflict with myself or a student. You will not be penalized in any way.

*

Course Schedule

September 13th—Introduction: Course Overview

Readings: none (syllabus overview)

September 15th—Philosophical Reasoning: Guides for Comprehension and Argumentation

Readings: David W. Concepción, “Reading Philosophy with Background Knowledge and Metacognition” (*appendix*); Michael Cholbi, “How Philosophers Address Objections to Their Positions”; Olivia Bailey, “But How Do I Participate?”

September 20th—Doubt as a Guide to Philosophical Inquiry
Readings: René Descartes, <i>Meditation I</i>
*September 22nd—Dualism About Mind and Body
Readings: René Descartes, <i>Meditation II</i>
<i>*Short quiz, available online after lecture</i>
September 27th—The Problem of Interaction for Mind-Body Dualism
Readings: Elisabeth of Bohemia, <i>Correspondences with Descartes</i> (read from 6.v.1643 until xi.1643)
*September 29th—Mental Monism: The World as Ideas
Readings: George Berkeley, <i>The Principles of Human Knowledge</i> (Part I, §I-§XX, or read farther if you wish!)
<i>*Short quiz, available online after lecture</i>
*October 1st—Physicalist Monism: The World as Matter (Or: The Mind as Brain)
Readings: J. J. C. Smart, “Sensations and Brain Processes” (<i>don’t worry about Objection #8</i>)
<i>This is a scheduled make-up class due to the one-week postponement of our first class.</i>
October 4th—Physicalist Monism: The Problem of Conscious Experience
Readings: Amy Kind; “Nagel’s ‘What is it Like to be a Bat’ Argument”; Frank Jackson, “Epiphenomenal Qualia”
*October 6th—Physicalism Redux (Plus One Final Alternative)
Readings: Patricia Churchland, “The Hornswoggle Problem”; Thomas Polger, “Functionalism” (IEP)
<i>*Short quiz, available online after lecture</i>
October 11th—Historical Accounts of Personal Identity
Readings: John Locke, <i>An Essay Concerning Human Understanding</i> (Chapter 27: §9-28); David Hume, <i>Treatise of Human Nature</i> (Book I, §6)
*October 13th—Contemporary Approaches to Personal Identity: “Bundle Theory”
Readings: Derek Parfit, “Divided Minds and the Nature of Persons”
<i>*Short quiz, available online after lecture</i>
*October 18th—Contemporary Approaches to Personal Identity: “Animalism”
Readings: Eric Olson, “An Argument for Animalism”
<i>*Topics available for your first short paper.</i>

*October 20th—Review Session 1
Readings: None – please come prepared to ask questions about course readings and concepts
*Short quiz, available online after lecture
October 25th—Monsoon Semester Break
Readings: none
October 27th—Monsoon Semester Break
Readings: none
*November 1st—Widening the Boundaries of the Mind and the Self?
Readings: Andy Clark and David Chalmers, “The Extended Mind”
*First short paper deadline
November 3rd—The Ethics of Extended Mind
Readings: David Brooks, “Outsourcing the Brain”
*Short quiz, available online after lecture
November 8th—The Ethics of Inquiry
Readings: C. Thi Nguyen, “The Seductions of Clarity”
November 10th—Moral Behaviour: Creating Utility for as Many People as Possible
Readings: Jeremy Bentham, <i>An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation</i> (Chapters I-IV)
*Short quiz, available online after lecture
November 15th—The Moral Value of Utility and Authenticity
Readings: Robert Nozick, <i>Anarchy, State, and Utopia</i> (excerpts); <i>The Examined Life</i> (excerpts)
November 17th—Behaving Morally by Conforming Oneself to the Law of Reason
Readings: Immanuel Kant, <i>Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals</i> (§1 required; Introduction optional)
*Short quiz, available online after lecture
November 22nd—How Morally Well Should We Behave?
Readings: Susan Wolf, “Moral Saints”
November 24th—Religious Accounts of Life’s Meaning
Readings: Leo Tolstoy, <i>My Confession</i> (excerpts); Christopher Gowans, “The Buddha’s Message”
*Short quiz, available online after lecture

<p>*November 26th—Pessimism About Life’s Meaning</p>
<p>Readings: Arthur Schopenhauer, “On the Sufferings of the World”</p> <p><i>This is a scheduled make-up class due to the one-week postponement of our first class.</i></p>
<p>November 29th—Creating Life’s Meaning for Ourselves</p>
<p>Readings: Erik Van Aken, “Camus on the Absurd: The Myth of Sisyphus” (<i>consider also reading Albert Camus, “The Myth of Sisyphus”</i>); Richard Taylor, “The Meaning of Life”</p>
<p>December 1st—Questioning the Question of Life’s Meaning</p>
<p>Readings: Susan Wolf, “The Meaning of Lives”</p> <p><i>*Short quiz, available online after lecture</i></p>
<p>*December 6th—Review Session 2</p>
<p>Readings: none—come prepared to ask questions about course content</p> <p><i>*Topics available for your second short paper</i></p>
<p>*December 8th—Final Class</p>
<p>Readings: none</p> <p><i>*In-class assignment: see ‘Polls and Retrospection Exercise’ above</i></p> <p><i>*Short quiz, available online after lecture (this make-up quiz will include potential questions from topics discussed during our review session)</i></p>
<p>*December 20th—Second Short Paper Deadline</p>
<p><i>No lecture—second short paper is due</i></p>

Advanced Philosophy of Mind (Fall 2022—300 Level)**Course Description**

This is an advanced course in philosophy of mind. After examining some theories—old and new—about the nature of the mind, we will turn to some more recent issues in contemporary analytic philosophical literature. The prevailing themes are about the *boundaries* and *knowability* of the mind. Questions to be considered include: how much of a role does the physical world play in shaping our language and thought? Can parts of the physical world be parts of our minds? If our thoughts are determined by the physical world around us and we have to work hard to know this world, must we therefore work hard to know our own minds? If we must work hard to know our own minds, why does it often seem as though we have *easy, direct access* to what we think, feel, and so on? Does the mind have states or processes going on within multiple *layers* or *systems*, some of which we can become aware of more easily than others? In exploring these and other questions, you will have several opportunities to improve your philosophical knowledge and writing.

Assignments**(1) Poll and Retrospection Exercise—(5%)**

In our final class together, we will consider a list of questions about course concepts and arguments. You will have a chance to answer them, and to submit these answers as a pass/fail assignment worth 5% of your final grade. You may be asked to explain whether you have changed your mind about any of the theories or ideas presented throughout the course. For such cases, you should write a brief explanation of why you changed your mind.

(2) Short Reflection Exercises—(30%)

Three times through the semester, you will submit a 300-to-600-word reflection piece that engages carefully with one of our course readings. Each is worth up to 10% of your final grade. The topics for these reflections are open-ended, though they should try to engage with the arguments within your chosen reading in a critical way. Because the pieces are short, your best strategy is to try and engage with *one* aspect of your chosen reading—perhaps just one particular argument within it, or one particular question that the reading raises but fails to (adequately) answer.

- *Note 1:* you can choose to reflect on whatever readings you like, with one caveat: you must choose at least one reading within three of the four ‘blocks’ of the course. These blocks of the course are marked on the course schedule.
- *Note 2:* you must submit your reflection piece no later than 2:00PM on the day that the relevant reading is being discussed.

(3) First Philosophical Essay—20%

You will write a philosophical essay on a topic related to our course readings. I will supply a list of possible essay topics in advance. You will also be free to choose your own topic, as long as you get my permission first. The essay will be approximately 1200-1500 words in length. Details about formatting and structure will be explained in advance.

(4) First Philosophical Essay Peer Review—10%

Before submitting your essays to me, you will first submit them to one of your peers (your peer will be chosen randomly), and you will in turn receive a paper from that peer. You will grade your peer's paper according to a rubric that I provide. Details about formatting and structure will be explained in advance.

(5) Final Philosophical Essay—25%

You will write a second philosophical essay on a topic related to our course readings. I will supply a list of possible topics in advance. You will also be free to choose your own topic, as long as you get my permission first. The essay will be approximately 1800-2100 words in length. Details about formatting and structure will be explained in advance. There is no peer review component associated with your final philosophical essay.

(6) Participation—10%

This is a course where in-class discussion is crucial. During my lectures, I will routinely ask for your input and may occasionally require you to discuss questions or problems within smaller groups. This portion of your grade is evaluated holistically for both attendance, quantity of participation, and quality of participation. Students with anxiety about in-class participation are encouraged to speak with me privately.

Course Schedule

September 6th—Introduction
Readings: none—I will provide an overview of our course content and explain the elements of our syllabus
September 8th—Mind/Body Dualism
Readings: Descartes, <i>Meditations II, VI</i>
September 13th—The Interaction Problem for Mind/Body Dualism
Readings: Elisabeth of Bohemia, <i>Correspondences with Descartes</i> (read from 6.v.1643 until xi.1643); Jen McWeeny, “Princess Elisabeth and the Mind-Body Problem”
September 15th—Consciousness and Intentionality
Readings: Louis Antony, “The Mental and the Physical”
September 20th—Functionalism and Computationalism
Readings: Louise Antony, “Thinking” (<i>Appendix optional</i>)
September 22nd—Functionalism Extended: Artificial Minds?
Readings: Nino Cocchiarella, “Can an AI System Think? Functionalism and the Nature of Mentality”
September 27th—Thought and Language
Readings: Donald Davidson, “Rational Animals”

September 29th—Animal Minds
Readings: Kristin Andrews, “Chimpanzee Mind Reading: Don't Stop Believing”
*October 4th—Review Session (End of Block 1)
Readings: none—come prepared to ask questions about course content
Topics for your first essay will be provided on this date
October 6th—Content Externalism
Readings: Rachel Bourbaki, “Semantic Externalism”; “Externalism About the Mind” (<i>only read §1, §3.1, §4</i>); Benjamin Winokur, “Content Externalism Handout”
October 11th—Self-Knowledge and Externalism (1)
Readings: Tyler Burge, “Individualism and Self-Knowledge”
October 13th—Self-Knowledge and Externalism (2)
Readings: Donald Davidson, “On Knowing One’s Own Mind”
*October 18th—A Paradox About Self-Knowledge
Readings: Paul Boghossian, “Content and Self-Knowledge”
Deadline: submit your first essay for peer review by Sunday, October 23 rd .
October 20th—Review Session #2 (End of Block 2)
Readings: none—come prepared to ask questions about course content
October 25th—Monsoon Semester Break
Readings: none
*October 27th—Monsoon Semester Break
Readings: none
Deadline: submit your peer review to me by Sunday, October 30 th .
November 1st—Extended Mind Theory
Readings: Andy Clark & David Chalmers, “The Extended Mind”
*November 3rd—Clarifying and Improving Extended Mind Theory
Readings: Mark Sprevak, “Extended Cognition”; Victor Loughlin, “Extended Mind” (<i>optional reading</i>)
Deadline: submit your first essay to me by November 6 th .

November 8th—Extended Cognition Without Extended Mind?
Readings: David Brooks, “The Outsourced Brain” (<i>optional preface to Heersmink reading</i>); Richard Heersmink, “Extended Mind and Cognitive Enhancement: The Moral Aspects of Cognitive Artifacts”
November 10th—Challenging Extended Mind Theory
Readings: Brie Gertler, “Overextending the Mind”
November 15th—Self-Knowledge of Your Extended Mind
Readings: Lukas Schwengerer, “Extending Introspection”
November 17th—Review Session (End of Block 3)
Readings: none—come prepared to ask questions about course content
November 22nd—“Confabulating” the Causes of Our Judgments, Beliefs, and Decisions
Readings: Richard Nisbett & Timothy Wilson, “Telling More than We Can Know” (<i>you may read only as many of the ‘Erroneous Reports About...’ sections as you feel is necessary</i>)
November 24th—Confabulating our Moral Judgements
Readings: Jonathan Haidt, “The Emotional Dog and its Rational Tail” (<i>this is a long paper; focus on the first few sections if you are pressed for time</i>)
November 29th—Self-Knowledge of Our Attitudes and Reasons
Readings: Matthew Boyle, “Skepticism About Self-Understanding” (<i>§9.2-§9.4 are most important</i>)
December 1 st —Student’s Choice
Readings: TBA—you will eventually get to vote on our final reading from a curated list of options
*December 6th—Review Session (End of Block 4)
Readings: none—come prepared to ask questions about course readings Topics for your final essay will be available on this date
*December 8th—Final Class
Readings: none In-class assignment: see ‘Poll and Retrospection Exercise’ above Deadline: final paper due on December 21st

Climate Change: Ethical and Political Issues (Fall 2021—300 Level)**Course Description**

Climate change is a growing problem for both the current living denizens of Earth and its future generations. It is also largely anthropogenic in origin. Both of these claims are common knowledge, and yet the moral and political significance of the phenomenon is not straightforward. Questions to be considered in this course include, but are not limited to, the following: Is climate change skepticism immoral, irrational, both, or neither? Who or what is harmed by climate change? Do our ecosystems themselves have rights or interests that are harmed by climate change? Who is morally culpable for anthropogenic climate change: individuals, corporations, governments, or some combination thereof? What sorts of political barriers impede progress on addressing anthropogenic climate change? What are the moral and political costs of potential solutions to our climate crisis?

Course Assignments**Reflection Pieces—20%**

Four times throughout the semester, you will submit a 300-word reflection piece on a course reading. This can take the form of a critical commentary on a philosopher's arguments, a positive expansion of those arguments, or something else entirely. Each reflection piece will be graded on a 100-point scale and will be worth up to 5% of your final grade. You may only submit one reflection piece per week. I will also drop your lowest grade of the four if you choose to submit a fifth piece, but I will not do this for a sixth submission or beyond.

Note: if you present your reflection piece live to the class, you will receive an additional 3 percentage points on the piece's grade. If you present the reflection piece on the same day that the relevant article is being discussed, you can choose any point during our lecture to read your piece. If you present the reflection piece a week later, you must read it prior to the beginning of that week's lecture.

Two Short Essays—(30%)

You will write two short essays during the semester. Both short essays should be between 1000-1500 words (excluding bibliography), and will each be worth 15% of your final grade. Possible topics will be suggested for both essays, though you can speak with me if you want to write on a different topic.

You can submit an essay proposal to me if you want feedback on your ideas before submitting your essay itself. It can be any length, and formatted to your liking. However, it should include a thesis statement and some details about the arguments you will use to defend your thesis statement. This proposal is optional and, hence, not graded.

Take-Home Exam—40%

During our final lecture I will provide a list of questions focusing on the entire semester's reading list. You will be able to choose X questions from each of Y sections to write 300-word answers for. Each question will be worth some fraction of the 40% weight for this assignment.

Participation—10%

Participation can take a number of forms in this course. Besides contributing to class discussion, I am also allowing for students to participate by meeting with me during office hours, *and by participating in climate action*. I am going to be relaxed about this requirement this semester, due to the transition from online to in-person teaching despite an ongoing pandemic. If you feel sick, please stay home! You can get the whole 10% even if you miss some class due to illness (or caution).

Course Schedule

September 14th—Climate Ethics as Environmental Ethics: General Overview
Readings: “Contested Frameworks in Environmental Ethics” by Clare Palmer (recommended; feel free to skip §3)
September 21st—Climate Change Skepticism: A Social-Epistemological Approach
Readings: Global Warming’s Terrifying New Math” by Bill McKibbon https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/global-warmings-terrifying-new-math-188550/ ; “Epistemology and Climate Change” by David Coady; “Climate Science Denial as Willful Hermeneutical Ignorance” by Sharon E. Mason (<i>recommended</i>)
September 28th—Climate Change as an Unavoidable Ethical Problem
Readings: Chapter 1 of <i>A Perfect Moral Storm: The Ethical Tragedy of Climate Change</i> by Stephen Gardiner; “Domains of Climate Ethics” by Konrad Ott and Cristian Baatz (<i>recommended</i>)
October 5th—Climate Change and Future Generations
Readings: “The Rights of Past and Future Persons” by Annette Baier; “Intergenerational Justice” by Richard B. Howarth
October 12th—Reading Week
Readings: none
*October 19th—Virtue, Vice, and the Individual in Climate Ethics
Readings: “Ideals of Human Excellence and Preserving Natural Environments” by Thomas E. Hill Jr.; “Does Nature Matter? The Place of the Nonhuman in the Ethics of Climate Change” by Clare Palmer
*Short essay #1 soft deadline Sunday, October 24th

October 26th—Individual Responsibility for Climate Change (1)
Readings: “Ethical Obligations in a Tragedy of the Commons” by Baylor Johnson; “It’s Not My Fault: Global Warming and Individual Moral Obligations” by Walter Sinnott-Armstrong
November 2nd— Individual Responsibility for Climate Change (2)
Readings: “Climate, Collective Action and Individual Ethical Obligations.” By Marion Hourdequin; “The Possibility of a Joint Communiqué: My Response to Hourdequin.” By Baylor Johnson; “Climate Change and Individual Responsibility: A Reply to Johnson” by Marion Hourdequin
November 9th—Climate Change and Procreation (1)
Readings: Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of Travis Rieder’s <i>Toward a Small Family Ethic How Overpopulation and Climate Change Are Affecting the Morality of Procreation</i>
November 16th—Climate Change and Procreation (2)
Readings: Chapters 4 and 5 of Travis Rieder’s <i>Toward a Small Family Ethic How Overpopulation and Climate Change Are Affecting the Morality of Procreation</i>
November 23rd—Geoengineering the Planet (1)
Readings: “Is “Arming the Future” with Geoengineering Really the Lesser Evil? Some Doubts About the Ethics of Intentionally Manipulating the Climate System” by Stephen Gardiner
November 30th—Geoengineering the Planet (2)
Readings: “Indigeneity in Geoengineering Discourses: Some Considerations” by Kyle Powys White; “Climate Change, Climate Engineering, and the ‘Global Poor’: What Does Justice Require?” by Marion Hourdequin
*December 7th—Looking Forward
Readings: Excerpts from Mark Alizart’s <i>The Climate Coup</i> ; “Beyond ‘Gloom and Doom’ or ‘Hope and Possibility’” by Cheryl Hall
*Short Essay #2 soft deadline: December 5th
**Take-home exam soft deadline: December 19th
***Hard deadline for all materials—December 30th

Philosophical Issues in Artificial Intelligence (Winter 2022—300 Level)

Course Description

Research into (and implementations of) artificial intelligence are increasingly ubiquitous across the globe. But just what is artificial intelligence, and in what ways does it differ from non-artificial intelligence? Surprisingly, different answers to these questions might lead to drastically different moral and practical concerns. Particular questions to be explored in this course include: will artificial intelligences ever possess human-level intelligence or even “superintelligence”? What should we do if and when such artificial intelligence is created? What, if anything, are the relationships between (artificial) intelligence and consciousness? Should we allow artificial intelligences to make decisions for us? If so, when should we allow this? Do we have moral obligations toward intelligent, conscious artificial intelligences? How is artificial intelligence transforming humankind’s relationship with labour? What are the greatest threats and dangers posed by artificial intelligence to human societies?

[NOTE: THE ASSIGNMENT STRUCTURE CLOSELY RESEMBLED PHIL3639 ABOVE]

Course Schedule

<p>January 14th—Introduction and Historical Overview</p> <p>Required Readings: Chapter 1 of Margaret Boden’s <i>AI: Its Nature and Future</i>.</p>
<p>January 21st—AI Techniques</p> <p>Required Readings: Chapter 4 of Margaret Boden’s <i>AI: Its Nature and Future</i>; “An AI That Knows the World the Way Children Do” by Alison Gopnik</p> <p>Supplemental Resources: “Symbolism vs. Connectionism: A Closing Gap in Artificial Intelligence” by Jieshu Wang; “If Only I had a Brain—Artificial Neural Networks” by Antonio Borges and Jordy Estevez (podcast); “But What is a Neural Network?”</p>
<p>January 28th—Limitations of AI</p> <p>Required Readings: Chapters 2 and 3 of Margaret Boden’s <i>AI: Its Nature and Future</i></p> <p>Supplemental Resources: “Making AI Intelligible: Philosophical Foundations” (interview with Herman Cappalen and Josh Dever)</p>
<p>February 4th—The Turing Test</p> <p>Required Readings: “Computing Machinery and Intelligence” by Alan Turing (§5 is optional); “Can Machines Think?” By Daniel Dennett (‘Postscript’ section is optional)</p> <p>Supplemental Resources: “What It’s Like to Be a Computer? An Interview With GPT-3” (Youtube video); A Quick Look at Some Funny Failures in the Loebner Competition</p>

February 11th—Machine Life and Consciousness
<p>Required Readings: Chapters 5-6 of Margaret Boden’s <i>AI: Its Nature and Future</i> (stop before ‘Moral Community’ section); “Artificial Intelligence: Does Consciousness Matter?” by Elisabeth Hildt</p> <p>Supplemental Resources: “Christof Koch: Consciousness” (interview by Lex Fridman)</p>
February 18th—Superintelligence
<p>Required Readings: Chapter 7 of Margaret Boden’s <i>AI: Its Nature and Future</i>; “Thinking Inside the Box” by Armstrong et al.</p> <p>Supplemental Resources: “I Have No Mouth, and I Must Scream”, by Harlan Ellison; “The Doomsday Invention: Will Artificial Intelligence Bring us Utopia or Destruction?”, By Nick Bostrom</p>
*February 25th—Reading Week
<p>Required Readings: *none: no class!*</p> <p><i>*Short essay proposal #1 soft deadline: Tuesday, February 22nd</i></p>
*March 4th— Ethics of AI—Overview
<p>Required Readings: “The Ethics of AI” by Bostrom, Yudkowsky; “Artificial Intelligence and the Ethics of Self-Learning Robots” by Shannon Vallor</p> <p>Supplemental Resources: “Can We Design Machines to Make Ethical Decisions?” by Tom Chatfield;</p> <p><i>*Short essay #1 soft deadline: Sunday, March 6st</i></p>
March 11th—AI as Moral Patients and Agents
<p>Required Readings: “Designing People to Serve” by Steve Petersen; “On the Moral Status of Social Robots: Considering the Consciousness Criterion” by Kestutis Mosakas</p> <p>Supplemental Resources: “Creating Robots Capable of Moral Reasoning is Like Parenting” by Regina Rini</p>
March 18th—AI in Warfare
<p>Required Readings: “Killer Robots” by Robert Sparrow; “Autonomous Machines, Moral Judgement, and Acting for the Right Reasons” by Duncan Purves et al.</p>

Supplemental Resources: “Can We Program or Train Robots to Be Good?” By Amanda Sharkey; [“Artificial Intelligence is The Future of Warfare \(Just Not in the Way You Think\)”](#) by Paul Maxwell; [“The Third Revolution in Warfare”](#) by Kai Fu Lee

March 25th—AI and the Future of Work

Required Readings: “Technological Unemployment and Human Disenhancement” by Michele Loi; “Will Life Be Worth Living in a World Without Work? Technological Unemployment and the Meaning of Life” by John Danaher

Supplemental Resources: [“How AI Will Impact the Future of Work and Life”](#), by Ashley Stahl

April 1st—Algorithmic Bias

Required Readings: “The Ugly Truth About Ourselves and Our Robot Creations: The Problem of Bias and Social Inequity” by Ayanna Howard and Jason Borenstein; “Seeing Without Knowing: Limitations of the Transparency Ideal and its Application to Algorithmic Accountability” by Mike Ananny and Kate Crawford

Supplemental Resources: [“How Big Data is Unfair”](#) by Moritz Hardt; [“Google Has a Striking History of Bias against Black Girls”](#) by Safiya Noble

*April 8th—Deepfakes (And Recap)

Required Readings: “Deepfakes and the Epistemic Backstop” by Regina Rini; “The Epistemic Threat of Deepfakes” by Don Fallis (§5 and §9.1 are optional)

Supplemental Resources: [“What Are Deepfakes and Are They Dangerous?”](#) (Youtube video)

**Short essay proposal #2 soft deadline: April 5th*

***Short essay #2 soft deadline: April 17th*

****Take-home exam soft deadline: April 24st*

*****Hard deadline for all materials—May 1st*

Perception, Knowledge, and Causality (Winter 2022—200 Level)

Course Description: this is an introduction to epistemology and metaphysics. Epistemology is, roughly, the study of the nature of knowledge and surrounding questions, such as when and how we can have justified beliefs about the world and ourselves. Metaphysics is, roughly, the study of what exists, the structure of existence, and questions about whether any entities or structures are “fundamental”. In this course we will survey various issues in these philosophical subdisciplines, using both contemporary and historical sources.

Assignments

(2) Reflection Pieces—(20%)

Two times throughout the term, you will submit a 300-500 word reflection piece on a course reading. Your reflection can offer a criticism of an argument in a course reading, or an interpretation of a cryptic passage. You might also raise questions that the reading does not discuss (and try to provide an answer). Examples of strong reflection pieces will be posted on eClass to help inspire you. Each reflection is worth 10% of your final grade. If you score below 60% on either of your reflection pieces, I will allow you submit a third to drop your lowest grade.

You can submit a reflection piece in one of two ways: the first way is to submit it at the *beginning* of the lecture where the reading you have reflected on is being discussed. If you do this, your piece is graded with the understanding that your thoughts have been developed without the benefit of the lecture. Alternatively, you can submit the piece to me any time before the *subsequent* lecture begins. If you submit this way, your piece is graded with the understanding that you have had additional time and resources with which to write it.

(3) Tests—(40%)

There will be two tests, one at the end of our readings on epistemology and one at the end of our readings on philosophy of mind and metaphysics. These tests will contain some mixture of true or false questions, matching questions, multiple choice questions, and short answer questions. They will be open-book. Each test is worth 20% of your final grade. I will make myself available for additional (online) office hours the week before each test.

(4) Paper—40%

You will write a 1200 to 1500-word paper on a topic from a curated list of options (provided in advance). I will explain the parameters of the paper closer to the deadline.

Course Schedule

January 11th—Introduction

Readings: none required, though feel free to peruse the “Metaphysics” and “Epistemology” on the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*; also consider Chapter 13 of Bertrand Russell’s *The Value of Philosophy*

January 13th—Ancient Reflections on Knowledge

Readings: *Republic* (514a-520), Plato; *Theaetetus* (chosen excerpts), Plato

January 18th—Rationalist Epistemology
Readings: <i>Meditations on First Philosophy</i> , I-II, René Descartes
January 20th—Empiricist Epistemology
Readings: <i>An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding</i> , §IV, David Hume
January 25th—Inductive Skepticism
Readings: <i>An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding</i> , §V, David Hume
January 27th—A “Skeptical Solution”?
Readings: <i>An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding</i> , §VII, David Hume
February 1st—Transcendental Epistemology
Readings: <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i> , Introduction in A, Immanuel Kant
February 3rd—The Forms of Cognition: Space
Readings: <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i> , Transcendental Aesthetic in A, Immanuel Kant
February 8th—The Forms of Cognition: Time
Readings: <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i> , Transcendental Aesthetic in A (cont.), Immanuel Kant
February 10th—Inductive Skepticism Revisited
Readings: <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i> , Second Analogy, Immanuel Kant
February 15th—Realism, Idealism, and Dualism (1)
Readings: <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i> , Fourth Paralogism in A., Immanuel Kant
*February 17th—First Test
Readings: Readings: none
<i>*first test</i>
March 1st—Deflating Analyticity
Readings: “Two Dogmas of Empiricism” W. V. O. Quine (<i>skip §4</i>)
March 3rd—Naturalizing Epistemology
Readings: “Epistemology Naturalized” by W. V. O. Quine
March 5th—Transcendental Epistemology Reborn
Readings: “Epistemology Externalized”, Donald Davidson

March 10th—Epistemology Review
Readings: none
March 12th—Metaontology (1)
Readings: “On What There Is”, W. V. O. Quine
March 17th—Metaontology (2)
“On the Very Idea of a Conceptual Scheme”, Donald Davidson
March 22nd—Personal Identity (1)
Readings: “Divided Minds and the Nature of Persons”, Derek Parfit
March 24th—Personal Identity (2)
Readings: “Personal Identity in African Metaphysics”, Leke Adeofe
*March 29th—Second Test
Readings: none
<i>*second test</i>
March 31st—What’s New(er) in Epistemology
Readings: “White Ignorance”, Charles W. Mills
April 5th—What’s New(er) in Metaphysics
Readings: “The Metaphysics of Social Kinds”, Rebecca Mason
*April 7th—Student’s Choice
Readings: TBA (choices provided on eClass poll after second test)
<i>*Final Paper deadline: April 21st</i>

Sample Syllabus—Social Epistemology (400 Level)

Course Description

Epistemology—the study of theories of knowledge and justified belief—has taken an increasingly “social” turn in recent decades. Questions to be considered in this course include: what kind of justification do we have to believe what other people tell us? When should we defer to claims made by people from specific backgrounds? How do we harm people when we dismiss what they say on the basis of their ethnicity, culture, etc.? In what ways does the internet enhance and impede our access to knowledge? Are we obligated to trust our friends and family more than strangers? How can we identify so-called “fake news”, and what obligations do we have to identify it? Can we trust audio and video recordings in an age of “deepfakes”? When, if ever, is it rational to believe conspiracy theories? How do you know when you are in an echo chamber? Should we allow people with reprehensible views to share them at, e.g., university conferences? Is it irresponsible to make claims about matters outside one’s areas of expertise?

Course Assignments

Participation—20%

You are expected to actively participate in class discussion, both by engaging with your peers and the course readings. You are expected to attend seminar as regularly as possible, and to take the initiative to meet with me to discuss your progress if necessary.

Weekly Investigation Exercises—30%

Each week, you will be asked a question or posed a problem that is inspired by the week’s readings. Typically, this will take the form of a case study or a ‘hunt’ in which you either examine a recent case, chosen by me, or where you unearth a case from popular culture or the news. You will have eleven opportunities to write weekly investigations exercises. Only your best 8 grades will be counted (this means that you can either abstain from writing up to three investigations, or write any number over 8 in order to drop your lowest grades).

Quizzes—20%

Five times throughout the semester, you will be quizzed *at the end of class* on concepts and issues related to that week’s readings. These quizzes are designed merely to gauge reading comprehension. They will usually consist of a mix of true/false, fill in the blanks, or multiple-choice questions. Occasionally, there will be opportunities for reflection. Each quiz will be weighted equally. Only the highest four of your five quiz grades will be counted toward your final grade.

Final Paper—30%

Near the end of the semester, I will provide a list of topics for a final paper. These might invite you to expand on your weekly investigation exercises, or they might challenge you to evaluate various course concepts and arguments in a more systematic way. You are encouraged to get in touch with me as soon as possible if you wish to write on a topic of your own choosing. Your paper should be approximately 2100-2400 words.

Course Schedule

Week 1: Syllabus & Orientation
Readings: none necessary, though consider reading Alvin Goldman’s SEP entry “Social Epistemology”, especially §1, §3.1-3.3, §3.6, and §5.2-5.3
Week 2: Testimony
Readings: “Testimony: Acquiring Knowledge From Others” by Jennifer Lackey; “Being-in-the-Room: Elite Capture and Epistemic Deference” by Olúfémi O. Táíwò
Week 3: Testimonial Injustice
Readings: “Testimonial Injustice” by Miranda Fricker; “Content Focused Epistemic Injustice” by Robin Dembroff and Dennis Whitcomb
Week 4: Hermeneutical Injustice
Reading: §7.1 and §7.3 of Miranda Fricker’s <i>Epistemic Injustice</i> ; “Hermeneutical Injustice: Distortion and Conceptual Aptness” by Arianna Falbo
Week 5: Epistemic Trust
Readings: “Trust and Antitrust” by Annette Baier; “Trustworthiness and Truth: The Epistemic Pitfalls of Internet Accountability” by Karen Frost-Arnold
Week 6: Epistemic Partiality
Readings: “Epistemic Partiality in Friendship” by Sarah Stroud; “The Epistemic Demands of Friendship: Friendship as Inherently Knowledge-Involving” by Cathy Mason
Week 7: Fake News
Readings: “Fake News and Partisan Epistemology” by Regina Rini; “Fake News, Conspiracy, and Intellectual Vice” by Marco Meyer
Week 8: Deepfakes
Readings: “Deepfakes and the Epistemic Backstop” by Regina Rini; “The Epistemic Threat of Deepfakes” by Don Fallis
Week 9: Conspiracy Theories
Readings: Selections from Quassim Cassam’s <i>Conspiracy Theories</i>
Week 10: Echo Chambers
Readings: “Echo Chambers and Epistemic Bubbles” by C. Thi Nguyen; “Fake News vs. Echo Chambers” by Jeremy Fantl
Week 11: Deplatforming
Readings: “No Platforming” by Robert Mark Simpson and Amia Srinivasan; “The Epistemology of No Platforming: Defending the Defense of Stupid Ideas on University Campuses” by Michael DiPaolo
Week 12: Epistemic Trespassing
Readings: “Epistemic Trespassing” by Nathan Ballantyne; “What’s Wrong With Epistemic Trespassing?” by Joshua DiPaolo

Sample Syllabus—The Epistemology of Self-Knowledge (Graduate Level)

Course Description

When we know our own current mental states—our fears, desires, beliefs, tickles, pains, and so on—we often seem to know them in *privileged* and *peculiar* ways. In other words, we often seem to know our own minds better than other minds, and by means that we do not use in order to gain other sorts of empirical knowledge. But is self-knowledge really epistemically distinctive in these respects and, if so, why? In this course we tackle these and other questions, using Annalisa Coliva’s *The Varieties of Self-Knowledge* as our primary guide. After finishing the book, we dive deeper into certain philosophical puzzles about self-knowledge.

Course Requirements

Your grade will be calculated as follows:

Seminar Participation—20%

Weekly Reflections—20%

Paper #1 Proposal—5%

Paper #1—25%

Paper #2 Proposal—5%

Paper #2—25%

Alternative to papers #1 and #2: one longer paper—50% (plus 10% for proposal)

Your weekly reflections should be around 600 words (or 2 pages). Submit them no later than three hours before seminar. Your reflection can ask questions about or offer criticisms of that week’s reading(s). All else being equal, though, I will grade critical reflections more favourably.

Your paper proposal(s) will be due one week before the corresponding paper is due. I will provide feedback on your proposal(s) within 24 hours of receipt. A small list of paper topics will be made available for each paper. However, you are encouraged to consult with me if you are interested in writing on a topic of your own choosing.

Deadlines for the papers will be set in the weeks to come.

Course Schedule

Week 1—The Epistemology of Self-Knowledge: General Overview
Suggested Readings: Brie Gertler’s SEP entry “Self-Knowledge”
Week 2—Taxonomizing Mental State Types
Required Readings: chapters 1 and 2 of <i>The Varieties of Self-Knowledge</i> by Annalisa Coliva; Suggested Readings: Chapter 1 of “Self-Knowledge” by Brie Gertler
Week 3—Varieties of Self-Knowledge
Required Readings: Chapter 3 of <i>The Varieties of Self-Knowledge</i> by Annalisa Coliva; “Introspection, What?” by Eric Schwitzgebel Suggested Readings: Selections from Peter Carruther’s <i>The Opacity of Mind</i>

Week 4—Empiricist Versus Rationalist Accounts of Self-Knowledge (1)
Required Readings: Chapter 4 of <i>The Varieties of Self-Knowledge</i> by Annalisa Coliva; Chapter 1 of “Authority and Estrangement” by Richard Moran Suggested Readings: “Is Self-Knowledge an Empirical Problem?” By Victoria McGeer
Week 5—Empiricist Versus Rationalist Accounts of Self-Knowledge (2)
Required Readings: Chapter 5 of <i>The Varieties of Self-Knowledge</i> by Annalisa Coliva; “Our Entitlement to Self-Knowledge” by Tyler Burge Suggested Readings: “The Agential Point of View” by Ben Sorgiovanni
Week 6—Expressivist Accounts of Self-Knowledge
Required Readings: Chapter 6 of <i>The Varieties of Self-Knowledge</i> by Annalisa Coliva; “Speaking My Mind” by Dorit Bar-On Suggested Readings: “Wittgenstein on Self-Knowledge and Self-Expression” by Rockney Jacobsen
Week 7—Constitutivist Accounts of Self-Knowledge
Required Readings: Chapter 7 of <i>The Varieties of Self-Knowledge</i> by Annalisa Coliva; “Self-Blindness and Self-Knowledge” by Matthew Parrott Suggested Readings: “Mind-Making Practices: The Social Infrastructure of Self-Knowing Agency and Responsibility” by Victoria McGeer
Week 8—Coliva’s Pluralist Account of Self-Knowledge
Required Readings: Chapter 8 of <i>The Varieties of Self-Knowledge</i> by Annalisa Coliva; “First-Person Authority: Dualism, Constitutivism, and Neo-Expressivism” by Dorit Bar-On Suggested Readings: “Self-Knowledge, Belief, Ability, and Agency” by Lucy Campbell
Week 9—Transparency Methods (1)
Required Readings: “Introspection” by Alex Byrne; “The Puzzle of Transparency and How to Solve It” by Wolfgang Barz Suggested Readings: “Transparency, Expression, and Self-Knowledge” by Dorit Bar-On
Week 10—Transparency Methods (2)
Required Readings: “Extending the Transparency Method Beyond Belief: A Solution to the Generality Problem” by Adam Andreotta; “The Value of Transparent Self-knowledge” by Fleur Jongepier Suggested Readings: “Transparency, Expression, and Self-Knowledge” by Dorit Bar-On
Week 11—The Functions and Value of Self-Knowledge (1)
Required Readings: “Deferring to Others About One’s Own Mind” by Casey Doyle; “Changing One’s Mind: Self-Conscious Belief and Rational Endorsement” by Adam Leite Suggested Readings: “Deliberation and the First Person” by David Owens
Week 12—The Functions and Value of Self-Knowledge (2)
Required Readings: “What Good is Self-Knowledge?” by A. Minh Nguyen; “The Value of Privileged Access” by Jared Peterson Suggested Readings: “Mind-Making Practices: The Social Infrastructure of Self-Knowing Agency and Responsibility” by Victoria McGeer

Sample Syllabus—What Is Inference? (Graduate Level)

Course Description: When an agent infers one proposition from another, she thereby transitions from one mental state to another. However, not all transitions between mental states are inferential transitions. To better distinguish inferences from other mental transitions, many philosophers now contend that inferences necessarily involve (1) an agent’s *taking* her premises to support her conclusion, and (2) drawing an inference *because* of this taking. This seems to suggest that the agent must have higher-order awareness of her inferences, for she must be aware of the epistemic support relations between different components of her inferences. However, some philosophers argue that this view over-intellectualizes our inferential capacities. In this seminar we explore this and other debates concerning the nature and epistemology of inference.

Course Requirements

Your grade will be calculated as follows:

Seminar Participation—20%

Weekly Reflections—20%

Paper #1 Proposal—5%

Paper #1—25%

Paper #2 Proposal—5%

Paper #2—25%

Alternative to papers #1 and #2: one longer paper—50% (plus 10% for proposal)

Your weekly reflections should be around 600 words (or 2 pages). Submit them no later than three hours before seminar. Your reflection can ask questions about or offer criticisms of that week’s reading(s). All else being equal, though, I will grade critical reflections more favourably.

Your paper proposal(s) will be due one week before the corresponding paper is due. I will provide feedback on your proposal(s) within 24 hours of receipt. A small list of paper topics will be made available for each paper. However, you are encouraged to consult me in advance of submitting your paper proposal if you are interested in writing on a topic of your own choosing. Deadlines for the papers will be set in the weeks to come.

Course Schedule

Week 1—Introduction
Required Readings: N/A—syllabus and orientation, though consider perusing an annotated bibliography that I will provide
Week 2—A Non-Reflective Conception of Inference
Required Readings: Chapters 1-2 of <i>On Reflection</i> , By Hilary Kornblith
Week 3—A Reflective Conception of Inference
Required Readings: “What is Inference?” By Paul Boghossian; “Comments on Boghossian” by John Broome; “Comments on Paul Boghossian” by Crispin Wright

Week 4—The Initial Debate
Required Readings: “Against Boghossian, Wright, and Broome on Inference” by Ulf Hlobil; “Reasoning and Reflection: A Reply to Kornblith” by Paul Boghossian
Week 5—Objections to the “Taking Condition” on Inference
Required Readings: “Reasoning Without Regress” by Luis Rosa; “Against the Taking Condition” by Conor McHugh & Jonathan Way
Week 6—A Return to the Taking Condition
Required Readings: “What Reasoning Might Be” by Markos Valaris; “Inference and the Taking Condition” by Christian Kietzmann
Week 7—Inference as a Necessarily Self-Conscious Activity
Required Readings: “Inference as a Way of Knowing” by Nicholas Koziolk; “Inference as Consciousness of Necessity” by Eric Marcus
Week 8—Addressing Concerns About Over-Intellectualization
Required Readings: “Reasoning and Normative Beliefs” by Andreas Müller; “Inferring By Attaching Force” by Ulf Hlobil
Week 9—One More Push Against Intellectualism About Inference
Required Readings: “Reasoning as a Social Competence” by Dan Sperber & Hugo Mercier; “Have Mercier and Sperber Untied the Knot of Human Reasoning?” by Ladislav Koreň
Week 10—Inference and Doxastic Responsibility
Required Readings: “Inference, Agency, and Responsibility” by Paul Bogossian; “On Fundamental Responsibility” by Anna-Sara Malmgren
Week 11—Critical Reasoning and Reflective Inference
Required Readings: “Our Entitlement to Self-Knowledge” by Tyler Burge; Chapters 4 and 12 of <i>Self Knowledge for Humans</i> , by Quassim Cassam
Week 12—Inference and Self-Knowledge
Required Readings: “Transparent Self-Knowledge” by Matthew Boyle; “Inference and Self-Knowledge” by Benjamin Winokur