

# Teaching Portfolio

Michelle M. Dyke  
Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow  
New York University  
Center for Bioethics  
[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)  
[www.michellemdyke.net](http://www.michellemdyke.net)

## Contents

<b>Teaching Experience and Qualifications.....</b>	<b>pages 2-3</b>
Courses Taught.....	2
Training Completed & Additional Experience.....	2-3
<b>Statement of Pedagogical Objectives and Practices.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Syllabi from Previous Courses, NYU Dept. of Philosophy.....</b>	<b>5-22</b>
Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism.....	5-11
Central Problems in Philosophy.....	12-15
Philosophy of Mind.....	16-18
History of Modern Philosophy.....	19-22
<b>Syllabus for Current Course, NYU Center for Bioethics (Fall 2019).....</b>	<b>23-29</b>
Advanced Introduction to Bioethics	
<b>Additional Sample Syllabi.....</b>	<b>30-36</b>
Introductory Ethics.....	30-31
Seminar: Collective Responsibility and the Ethics of Group Agency.....	32-34
Seminar: British Empiricism and the Scientific Revolution.....	35-36
<b>Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness</b>	
Course Evaluation Results from NYU Students.....	38-55
Teaching Letter of Recommendation	
from Don Garrett, Silver Professor of Philosophy, New York University.....	see page 37

## Teaching Experience and Qualifications

I have several years of experience teaching as the sole or primary course instructor at New York University, in addition to experience as a teaching assistant. I have taught material in Ethics, Meta-Ethics, Bioethics, Epistemology, Philosophy of Mind and Metaphysics, as well as the History of Philosophy. Syllabi for all of my current and past courses are included as part of this portfolio, as are the results from my student course evaluations.

I have also included sample syllabi for Introductory Ethics as well as an advanced seminar in Ethics (titled “Is There Anything *We* Ought to Do? Collective Responsibility and the Ethics of Group Agency,”) and a seminar in the History of Modern Philosophy (titled “British Empiricism and the Scientific Revolution”).

## Courses Taught

### As Primary Instructor, Graduate Seminar (NYU Center for Bioethics)

- Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Fall 2019)

### As Primary Instructor, Undergraduate Lecture (NYU Dept. of Philosophy)

- Central Problems in Philosophy (Fall 2018)

### As Sole Instructor, Undergraduate Seminar (NYU Dept. of Philosophy)

- Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism (Spring 2019)
- Central Problems in Philosophy (Summer 2018)
- Philosophy of Mind (Summer 2017)
- History of Modern Philosophy (x3: Summers 2015, 2016 & 2017)

### As Teaching Assistant, Undergraduate Lecture (NYU Dept. of Philosophy)

- History of Modern Philosophy (for Anja Jauernig, Spring 2016)
- History of Ancient Philosophy (for Jessica Moss, Fall 2015)
- History of Modern Philosophy (for Kristin Primus, Spring 2015)
- Existentialism & Phenomenology (for John Richardson, Fall 2014)

### As Teaching Assistant, Undergraduate Lecture (NYU College of Arts & Science Core Curriculum)

- Texts & Ideas: Attachment, Loss, and the Passage of Time (for Sharon Street, Spring 2018)

### Upcoming Courses in Bioethics, Spring 2020

- Topics in Bioethics: Controversies and Politics (Graduate Seminar)
- Ethics and Identity: Race, Gender and Disability (Undergraduate Seminar)

## MA Thesis Supervision

As a faculty member at the Center for Bioethics, I am responsible for the academic advising of a share of our MA students in Bioethics. Advising includes, for students in their final term of the program, supervision of the writing and defense of an MA thesis. This thesis incorporates discussion of the student’s work experience in a required practicum component as well as analysis of relevant ethical issues encountered.

## Experience with Students Outside of Philosophy

While most of my teaching experience has been within the Department of Philosophy at NYU, I also have experience teaching philosophical ideas and methods to students from a broad range of academic concentrations. For instance, many of my current students are pursuing their MA in Bioethics as a way of supplementing their interest in a variety of other disciplines and industries including law and public policy, healthcare, and healthcare technology.

Additionally, in a previous term, I was a teaching assistant for a course taught as part of NYU's general undergraduate Core Curriculum by the Philosophy Department's Professor Sharon Street. Our students represented a wide range of academic majors, including the sciences, mathematics, and business, as well as the arts and humanities. Readings for the course included philosophy texts as well as ancient spiritual texts such as the Pāli Canon of Buddhism, along with works of fiction, poetry and journalism.

## Supervisory Experience

As part of teaching the introductory lecture course "Central Problems in Philosophy" in fall 2018, I was responsible for supervising two graduate student teaching assistants. At NYU, the duties of a teaching assistant include leading a weekly discussion section intended to supplement the lecture, grading the students' assignments, and holding open office hours for student meetings.

## Teacher Training Completed

- Workshop: Improving Student Writing, New York University Center for the Advancement of Teaching, October 5, 2018
- Workshop: Teaching Large Lectures, NYU Center for the Advancement of Teaching, November 29, 2018

## Public Outreach and Teaching at the High School Level

During my time at NYU, I have also worked with New York City public high school students on a volunteer basis. In the fall of 2018, I led small-group discussions of issues in Applied Ethics at NYC's High School for Environmental Studies as part of a team of four visiting volunteers from NYU. I will be returning to the same school in the fall of 2019. In spring 2019, I participated in the team-teaching of an elective course in Philosophy for students at East Side Community High School as part of the "Corrupt the Youth" program directed by Briana Toole.<sup>1</sup> Each year, I also volunteer as a judge for New York City's High School Ethics Bowl.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://corrupttheyouth.weebly.com/about.html>

<sup>2</sup> <https://highschoolethicsbowl.com>

## Statement of Pedagogical Objectives and Practices

At all levels, my courses in philosophy seek to help students strengthen three important skills: the ability to critically evaluate complex arguments, the ability to articulate and defend original viewpoints, and the ability to express those ideas clearly and professionally in writing. It is my intention that by making the development of these skills a priority in each of my courses, I can ensure that all of my students, whatever their academic or career goals, will benefit from taking each course.

My assignments are designed to enable students to learn by doing in a way that builds incrementally on their existing skills. For beginning students, I have found that an effective way of promoting the development of their written communication skills is through a series of short writing assignments (<5 pages) of a similar style. For advanced undergraduates writing term papers (>10 pages), I give students the option of either building from a midterm paper or pursuing a new topic. I “scaffold” the assignment by introducing small increases in the requirements for the final assignment in comparison to the midterm, such as citation of additional works from the syllabus and consideration of an additional pair of objections & replies. For seminars that treat one topic in depth throughout the term, I assign a series of 2-page “mini-papers” that provide an incentive for students to keep up with the readings and to begin thinking early about a term paper topic. My past students have commented in their evaluations that these assignments, which are graded mostly for participation credit but with plenty of written comments, have been especially effective in helping them to stay engaged with the material and to receive consistent feedback in a way that is constructive with minimal pressure.

I also seek to make it possible for my students to learn by doing during our class sessions. For example, in medium-size classes, I have found it effective to break up a typical lecture format by occasionally dividing students into pairs and allowing them a few minutes (about 3-5) to discuss short passages from our assigned readings with each other in order to identify and debate crucial steps in the philosophical arguments. Once the students are finished talking through the arguments with their partners, I call on students to share their findings with the larger group. This exercise promotes a higher degree of engagement with the texts than a lecture alone. It also helps the more reserved students in the group to become more comfortable speaking and asking questions in class, since it is far easier to start by sharing an opinion with one other student than to immediately volunteer one’s perspective in front of the whole class.

I often structure class sessions by dedicating a few minutes at the beginning to a review of the main ideas from the previous session before moving on to the day’s new material, while also leaving plenty of time for discussion. Especially in smaller courses, I review previous material by asking my students a series of leading questions intended to test their recall and comprehension of content from the previous class without immediately giving away the answers. Asking students to restate philosophical views in their own words helps them to develop their own understanding and also provides me with an opportunity to correct any confusions or gaps that remain after the original presentation of the course material. Being exposed to a new idea just once, on one day, simply is not enough to make that idea stick. Several of my past students have noted that this ongoing review process helps them to enhance their understanding and develop connections between ideas, rather than forget them, as we move from one topic to another.

In a large lecture course, where it would be impractical to pause for a discussion in which everyone could participate, I still take care to flag issues that are worth debating at greater length. This helps my students, and teaching assistants, to prepare for the smaller discussion section courses that meet each week in order to supplement the lectures.

**Phil-UA 103 : Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology:  
“Moral Epistemology & The Debate Over Moral Realism”**

NYU Spring 2019

Course Syllabus (final version updated April 28, 2019)

Dr. Michelle M. Dyke

[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)

Meets Tu/Th from 9:30 - 10:45 am at 194 Mercer Street, #201

My open office hours are 2-3:45 on Tuesdays (or also by appointment). My office (#304) is in the Philosophy department (5 Washington Place). During that time, please feel free to come by to discuss the course material or assignments.

**Course Description**

“You shouldn’t lie to your sister.”

“It is wrong to harm an innocent creature for personal gain.”

“Parents have a moral duty to take care of their children.”

Claims like these, which express moral demands, strike many of us as obviously true. Yet how do we know them? What kinds of evidence could we provide to justify our beliefs in these claims? Unlike “descriptive” claims about how the world *is*, moral claims instruct us about what to *do*. If there are facts about what morality demands of us, these facts would have to be importantly different from the many other sorts of descriptive facts with which we are familiar, such as facts about astronomy, geology, medicine, psychology, economics, and history.

Some philosophers, precisely because they find it so difficult to explain how it is that we could acquire any evidence that bears directly upon the answers to moral questions, have argued that this point undermines the “realist” idea that there are objective facts about what we are all morally obligated to do. Unlike the answers to scientific questions, the answers to moral questions cannot be observed via the senses, encountered in nature, or tested in a laboratory experiment. According to some “antirealist” views, the moral facts are not objective and mind-independent (as are facts about protons and galaxies), but are instead dependent upon us; moral claims are made true by things like our desires, values, or cultural norms. Other antirealists defend the view that there aren’t actually any facts about morality at all.

In this course, we will learn about how *epistemological* considerations regarding the ways in which we acquire and justify our moral beliefs might (or might not) help us to resolve this debate regarding the nature of the moral facts. Our readings will consist mostly of recent journal articles and book excerpts by philosophers.

**Prerequisites**

Before enrolling in this course (Topics in M&E), students should already have completed at least one of: Epistemology (Phil-UA 76) OR Metaphysics (Phil-UA 78) OR Philosophy of Science (Phil-UA 90). Prerequisite for enrollment in any of *these* courses is one introductory-level course

in philosophy. If you have not completed these courses at NYU, but believe you have comparable preparation sufficient to enable you both to contribute to and benefit from this seminar, please email me to discuss your situation. (Given this year's topic, I am inclined to welcome students who have completed coursework in ethics beyond the introductory level even if they have not completed Epistemology, Metaphysics, or Philosophy of Science.) Note that students who enroll without either completing the designated prerequisites or securing the permission of the instructor may be asked to drop the course, especially if there is a waitlist.

### **Schedule of Readings and Assignments**

All readings will be distributed in .pdf form and will be made available on our NYU Classes website. (**No textbook is required.**) Each passage listed below will be discussed in class on the dates listed above the title; please do the readings in advance and be ready to talk about them. This seminar will revolve around student discussion. \*Passages marked as "in class", do not need to be read in advance, though this material is important for the course.

"Optional" supplementary readings are also listed in turquoise. These may be useful to students who are in the process of writing their final papers, or who are simply curious to learn more about a given topic, but there is no expectation that students must do any of the optional readings. These articles will often, though not always, be more challenging reads than our initial assignments. Some of them presuppose quite a bit of background knowledge and will be most useful to students looking for a more detailed discussion of a particular issue for the final paper. (If you've started reading any of these articles and have questions, come by my office hours and let's chat!)

#### **By Week:**

##### 1. What is Moral Realism? (January 29/31)

- \*In class: Excerpts from Russ Shafer-Landau (2003, 2012), David Enoch (2011), Matti Eklund (2017)
- \*In class: Excerpts from T.M. Scanlon (2014)

\*Note that these entire chapters are now online on our NYUClasses site. We'll only be looking at short excerpts of each chapter as our assigned reading in class.

Further reading: The rest of any of these books. Note that while logged in through NYU, you can access books from Oxford University Press via "Oxford Scholarship Online."

##### 2. The Strangeness of Moral Facts (February 5/7)

- J.L. Mackie, "The Subjectivity of Values," *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong* (1977)

Some Further Reading (realist replies to epistemological and metaphysical objections):

- Scanlon 2014, Chapter 2: "Metaphysical Objections" and Chapter 4: "Epistemology and Determinateness"
- Justin Morton and Eric Sampson, "Parsimony and the Argument from Queerness" (2014)

### 3. Moral Facts and Empirical Explanations (February 12/14)

- Gilbert Harman, "Ethics and Observation," *The Nature of Morality: An Introduction to Ethics* (1977)
- Nicholas Sturgeon, "Moral Explanations" (1985)
- \*In class: Short Excerpt from Thomas Nagel's 1980 Tanner Lectures

#### Further reading:

- Harman Chapter 2
- Sturgeon, "Moral Explanations Defended," *Contemporary Debates in Moral Theory* (2006)
- Sturgeon, "Harman on Moral Explanations of Natural Facts" (1986)

#### More on Naturalist Moral Realism (beyond Sturgeon):

- Richard Boyd, "How to Be a Moral Realist" (1988)
- See also, in reply, the "Moral Twin Earth" objections

### **FIRST MINI PAPER DUE FEBRUARY 15, 5 PM**

### 4. Moral Antirealism: Error Theory & Non-cognitivism (February 19/21)

- \*In class: Excerpt from A.J. Ayer, *Language, Truth and Logic* (1936)
- Short excerpts from Allan Gibbard, *Wise Choices, Apt Feelings* (1990)
- Simon Blackburn, "Antirealist Expressivism and Quasi-Realism," *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory*, Ed. David Copp, 2005 (**focus on sections 2-4, skip the final section 5**)

#### Further reading on quasi-realism:

- Simon Blackburn, *Essays in Quasi-Realism* (1993)
- Selim Berker, "Quasi-Dependence" (2018/2019 working draft available online)

### 5. Moral Relativism & Intercultural Diversity (February 26/28)

- \*In class: Excerpt from Gilbert Harman, *Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity* (1996)
  - Short excerpt from David Wong, "Pluralism and Ambivalence," *Natural Moralities: A Defense of Pluralistic Relativism* (2006)
  - Excerpt from J. David Velleman, *Foundations for Moral Relativism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (2015)
- Ebook here: <https://www.openbookpublishers.com/reader/416#page/88/mode/2up>  
**Please read Chapter V, pages 75-100**

#### Further reading on relativism & problems for the view:

- Paul Boghossian, "What is Relativism?" *Truth and Relativism* (2006)

#### A defense of moral realism in light of intercultural disagreement:

- David Enoch, "How is Moral Disagreement a Problem for Realism?" (2008)

#### An alternative form of normative relativism:

- \*Michelle Dyke, "Group Agency Meets Meta-Ethics: How to Craft a More Compelling Form of Normative Relativism"

### **SECOND MINI PAPER DUE MARCH 1, 5 PM**

6. The Epistemology of Moral Disagreement (March 5/7)

- Alison Hills, "Faultless Moral Disagreement" (2013)

Further reading on the epistemology of moral disagreement:

- Katia Vavova, "Moral Disagreement and Moral Skepticism" (2014)
- Sarah McGrath, "Moral Realism without Convergence" (2010)

7. Moral Beliefs and Our Evolutionary History (March 12/14)

- Philip Kitcher, "Biology and Ethics," *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory* (2005)
- Richard Joyce, "The Evolutionary Debunking of Morality," *The Evolution of Morality* (2006)

Further reading on evolutionary debunking arguments:

- Katia Vavova, "Evolutionary Debunking of Moral Realism" *Philosophy Compass* (2015)
- Joyce, "Irrealism and the Genealogy of Morals" (2013)

**THIRD MINI-PAPER DUE MARCH 15, 5 PM**

SPRING BREAK

8. Moral Beliefs and Evolution, continued (March 26/28)

- Sharon Street, "A Darwinian Dilemma for Realist Theories of Value" (2006)

Further reading on the power of Street's argument:

- Street, "Evolution and the Normativity of Epistemic Reasons" (2009)
- Selim Berker, "Does Evolutionary Psychology Show That Normativity is Mind-Dependent?" (2014)

Another defense of Subjectivism about normative reasons:

- David Sobel, *From Valuing to Value* Oxford University Press 2016

Kantian (as opposed to Street's *Humean Constructivism*):

- Christine Korsgaard, *The Sources of Normativity* (Tanner Lectures), 1992

For an objection to this approach, see

- David Enoch, "Agency, Shmagency: Why Agency Won't Come From What Is Constitutive of Action" (2006)

- Sharon Street, "What is Constructivism in Ethics and Metaethics?" (2010)

9. Moral Beliefs and Evolution, continued 2 (April 2/4)

- David Enoch, "Epistemology," *Taking Morality Seriously: A Defense of Robust Realism* (2011)

Further reading on "third factor replies":

- Knut Skarsaune, "Darwin and moral realism: survival of the fittest" (2011)
- Erik Wielenberg, "On the Evolutionary Debunking of Morality" (2010)
- \*Michelle Dyke, "Bad Bootstrapping: The Problem with Third-Factor Replies to the Darwinian Dilemma for Moral Realism," manuscript, forthcoming in *Philosophical Studies*

## MIDTERM PAPER DUE APRIL 5, 5PM

### 10. Moral (vs. Mathematical) Knowledge & Causal Conditions (April 9/11)

- Excerpts from Paul Benacerraf, "Mathematical Truth," (1973) and Alvin Goldman, "A Causal Theory of Knowing" (1967)
- Matthew Bedke, "Intuitive Non-Naturalism Meets Cosmic Coincidence" (2009)

### More on the "Benacerraf-Field Problem" for Mathematics:

- Excerpt from Hartry Field, "Realism, Mathematics and Modality" (1988)

### See also:

- Matthew Bedke, "No Coincidence?\*" (2014)

### 11. The "Reliability Challenge" for Beliefs about Morality, Mathematics & Logic (April 16/18)

- Joshua Schechter, "The Reliability Challenge and the Epistemology of Logic" (2010)

### Further reading:

- Justin Clarke-Doane, "Moral Epistemology: The Mathematics Analogy" (2014)
- Justin Clarke-Doane, "Morality and Mathematics: The Evolutionary Challenge" (2012)

### 12. The Source of Our Moral Intuitions (April 23/25)

- Excerpts on Robert Audi's Moral "Intuitionism" from *Reasons, Rights, and Values* (2015)

### Further reading, another proponent of ethical intuitionism:

- Michael Huemer, *Ethical Intuitionism* (2005) - a very short excerpt is up on Classes

## FOURTH MINI PAPER DUE APRIL 26, 5 PM

### 13. The Source of Moral Intuitions, continued (April 30/May 2)

- Excerpts from Peter Railton, "The Affective Dog and Its Rational Tale: Intuition and Attunement" (2014)

### Further reading. Railton's version of moral realism:

- Peter Railton, "Moral Realism" (1986)

### 14. The Epistemology of Moral Testimony and the Possibility of Moral Experts (May 7/9)

- Sarah McGrath, "Skepticism about Moral Expertise as a Puzzle for Moral Realism" (2011)

**Optional rough draft or outline of the final paper is due by May 7, please**

**My last regularly scheduled office hours are on May 7. I'll also take appointments to discuss the final paper on May 9 (Thursday) and May 10 (Friday).**

**FINAL PAPER DUE MAY 17, 5PM (firm deadline – term grades to be calculated shortly thereafter)**

## Course Requirements

The requirements for the course include the completion of **four mini writing assignments** (2 double-spaced pages each), a **short midterm paper** (4-5 double-spaced pages) and a **final paper** (8-12 double-spaced pages) with **optional outline/rough draft** submitted in advance for comments without a grade. There is no final exam. Seminar participation will also count towards the term grade. For the midterm and final paper, I will suggest possible topics as a starting point, though students are also welcome to pursue their own projects.

The four mini papers will be responses to the current or previous week's assigned reading. **There is no requirement that the final paper and midterm papers must be on separate topics.** Content for each of these papers (along with the mini papers) may overlap as students continue to think through related material over the course of the term. Yet the longer papers should include substantial additions to (or modifications of) the thoughts expressed in the student's shorter papers.

### **Grades will be calculated as follows:**

5% for each mini paper (x4 = 20%)

25% midterm paper

40% final paper

15% participation in class

### **Mini-papers will be graded as follows:**

**A:** Demonstrates that the student read and engaged with the reading. The student raises one or two thoughtful points or questions. (I expect most mini-papers will earn this grade.)

**B:** The assignment is complete, but substantially lacking, e.g. the paper demonstrates a major misunderstanding of a core theme from the reading, or suggests the student didn't actually read the relevant article.

**C:** A totally inadequate assignment that is totally off-topic or only a couple sentences long. (I don't expect to give any C's.)

**Late papers will receive a deduction** of  $\frac{1}{3}$  letter grade for each day they are late. For example, an A- quality paper turned in 7 hours after the deadline will receive a B+. If it's 37 hours late, it will receive a B. And so on. (No paper of passing quality will receive lower than a D for reasons of lateness. Any assignments that are still missing 72 hours after the *final* course paper deadline will receive a 0 in the calculation of the term grade; a D (>50%) is much better than 0% !)

The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation). This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students.

Please note that all assignments and deadlines for this course are listed here on the syllabus for your information at the start of term. If you are aware of any upcoming schedule conflicts or other considerations that may prevent you from completing the work as asked, please discuss your situation with me in person as soon as possible rather than waiting until a paper is about to be due, or is already late, in order to ask for an extension. Extensions are less likely to be granted closer to the due date, except in cases of emergency as noted above.

**Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic 0 for the assignment and risks failure for the course.** Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. **Again, it's an issue of fairness.**

### Other Course Policies

Note that class participation counts for 15% of your term grade. A long-standing pattern of repeated, unexcused absences will result in an F for that portion of the grade. Please come to class even if you were not able to complete the reading for that day, so as not to fall further behind. Discussion is an important part of philosophy and this is your chance to make sure you're clear on both the course content and assignments.

Please note that students who have *unexcused* absences totaling >40% of our total class time may receive an F as their final *course grade* in accordance with NYU college policy: <http://cas.nyu.edu/content/nyu-as/cas/academic-programs/bulletin/policies/academic-policies.html>

### **Moses Center**

Students who require accommodation for a disability should consult with the Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities>. If you do request accommodation regarding the course policies in light of a disability, please also notify me (via email or in person) so that I can cooperate fully with the Moses Center and plan accordingly.

# Phil-UA 1 : Central Problems in Philosophy

NYU Fall 2018

Course Syllabus as of 9/4/2018

Michelle M. Dyke

[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)

Lecture Meets Tu/Th from 9:30 - 10:45 am in Silver 101A

My open office hours are on Thursdays from 5:00-6:00 pm (or also by appointment). My office (#208) is on the second floor of the Philosophy department (5 Washington Place). During that time, please feel free to come by to discuss the course material or assignments.

There are two preceptors for the course:

Rob Long

[\[email redacted\]](#)

Section on Mondays: 12:30-1:45, 2:00-3:15

Office hours: Tuesdays 11:00-12:00\*

@ room # TBA

\*tentative – contact Rob

Alex Rigas

[\[email redacted\]](#)

Section on Fridays: 9:30-10:45, 11:00-12:15

Office hours: Wednesdays, 2:30-3:30\*

@Irving Farm coffee, Thompson & W 3rd

\*tentative – contact Alex

## Course Description

This course will provide an introduction to some of the classic and enduring problems in philosophy and to the methods that philosophers use for tackling them. Our readings, writing assignments, and class discussions will be structured around four central questions: What is knowledge? What is the relationship between the human mind and the physical body? Is our world causally determined, and does that preclude the possibility of free will? What is required for moral responsibility? We will compare historical discussions of each of these issues with work by more recent philosophers.

## Schedule of Readings and Assignments

All readings will be distributed in .pdf form and will be made available on our NYU Classes website. Each passage listed below will be discussed in lecture on the date listed to the left of the title; please do the readings in advance and be ready to talk about them in the following discussion section.

\*Passages marked as “in class” do not need to be read in advance.

### Unit I. What is Knowledge?

Tuesday, September 4

- René Descartes, *Meditations* (1641): Meditation I

Thursday, Sep. 6

- no new reading: review Meditation I

Tuesday, Sep. 11

- Descartes, Meditation II

Thursday, Sep. 13

- Edmund Gettier, “Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?” (1963)

Tuesday, Sep. 18

- Alvin Goldman, “A Causal Theory of Knowing” (1967)

(*Read pages 357-362 and 369-370 of Goldman*)

Thursday, Sep. 20 - Timothy Williamson, *Knowledge and its Limits* (2002)  
(read Introduction: Sec. 2 and Chapter 2: Secs. 1 & 4)

Please submit the first mini-paper (2 double-spaced pages) to your preceptor by 5 pm on Friday, September 21.

## Unit 2. What is the Relationship between *Mind and Body*?

Tuesday, Sep. 25 - Descartes and Princess Elisabeth, correspondence  
\*In Class: David Hume's "bundle theory" of mind

Thursday, Sep. 27 - no new reading

Tuesday, October 2 - Frank Jackson, "Epiphenomenal Qualia" (1982) (*stop before Section II*) and "What Mary Didn't Know" (1986)

Thursday, Oct. 4 - Excerpt from David Chalmers, *The Conscious Mind* (1996)

Tuesday, Oct. 9 **Legislative Monday – Our Class Will NOT Meet**

Thursday, Oct. 11 - John Heil textbook chapter on "Functionalism"

Tuesday, Oct. 16 - Hilary Putnam, "The nature of mental states" (1969), *Sec II-V*

Thursday, Oct. 18 - Sydney Shoemaker, "The Inverted Spectrum" (1982)  
(*Stop at Sec. IV on pg. 368*)

## Unit 3. If our World is *Causally Determined*, does that Preclude the Possibility of *Free Will*?

Tuesday, Oct. 23 - Peter van Inwagen, "The Incompatibility of Free Will and Determinism" (1974)  
\*In Class: LaPlace's Demon

Thursday, Oct. 25 - Short Excerpt from Cicero on the swerve of the atom  
\*In class: BBC Youtube video on Benjamin Libet's experiments

Please submit the second paper (4-5 double-spaced pages) to your preceptor by 5 pm on Friday, October 26.

Tuesday, Oct. 30 - Roderick Chisholm, "Human Freedom and the Self" (1964)

Thursday, November 1 - Excerpt from Ned Markosian, "A Compatibilist Version of the Theory of Agent Causation" (1999)

Tuesday, Nov. 6 - Harry Frankfurt, "Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility" (1969)

Thursday, Nov. 8 - no new reading, Discussion of Writing Assignments

## Unit 4. What Does it Take to be a *Morally Responsible Agent*?

Tuesday, Nov. 13 - P.F. Strawson, "Freedom and Resentment" (1962)

Thursday, Nov. 15 - Selection from David Hume's *Enquiry* (1748) on enduring character traits and moral responsibility

Tuesday, Nov. 20 - no new reading

**Wednesday, November 21 – Friday Nov. 23 Thanksgiving Break – No Classes**

Tuesday, November 27 -Heather Battaly, from *Current Controversies in Virtue Theory* (2015)  
Thursday, Nov. 29 - Short selection from Aristotle on virtues

Tuesday, December 4 - Kant, *Groundwork* (1785) (selections)  
Thursday, Dec. 6 - review Kant

**Please submit the third and final paper (6-8 double-spaced pages) to your preceptor via email by 5 pm on Friday, December 7.**

Tuesday, Dec. 11 - Susan Wolf, “Moral Saints” (1982)  
Thursday, December 13 - last class, no new reading, come with questions

**OFFICIAL FINAL EXAM: Tuesday, December 18, 8:00 am – 9:50 am**  
(in our usual lecture hall, attendance is mandatory)

### Course Requirements

The requirements for the course include **three writing assignments** of varied length (2, 4-5, or 6-8 double-spaced pages each) and a **cumulative, multiple-choice final exam**.

A choice of possible paper topics will be provided for all three writing assignments. The prompts will ask you to engage carefully with an idea or debate that we have discussed in class. For the first mini-paper, you will be asked to *summarize*, in your own words, an idea or argument from our assigned reading. For both of the subsequent papers, you will be asked to *take a stance* on a question that arose during our discussion of the readings. You will be asked to provide an argument in support of your chosen thesis. These paper prompts will ask you to explain: Are you convinced by the author(s) from our reading? Why or why not? The exam will be designed to test your recall and understanding of the philosophical views and arguments that were discussed in our required course readings and in lecture. I recommend studying for the exam by reviewing our lecture handouts.

#### **Grades will be calculated as follows:**

15% first 2-page paper  
20% second 4-5 page paper  
25% final 6-8 page paper  
25% final exam  
15% participation in discussion section

**Late papers will receive a deduction** of 1/3 letter grade for each day they are late. For example, an A-quality paper turned in 7 hours after the deadline will receive a B+. If it's 37 hours late, it will receive a B. And so on. No paper of passing quality will receive lower than a D for reasons of lateness. Any assignments that are still missing 72 hours after the *final* course paper deadline will receive a 0 in the calculation of the term grade; a grade of D (>50%) is much better than 0% !

The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation to your preceptor). This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students. Please note that all assignments and deadlines for this course are listed here on the syllabus for your information at the start of term. If you are aware of any upcoming schedule conflicts or other

considerations that may prevent you from completing the work as asked (especially the final exam), please discuss your situation with me (rather than your preceptor) in person as soon as possible rather than waiting until a paper is about to be due, or is already late, in order to ask your preceptor for an extension. (Extensions are less likely to be granted closer to the due date, except in cases of emergency as noted above.)

**Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic 0 for the assignment and risks failure for the course.** Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. **Again, it's an issue of fairness.**

### Other Course Policies

Note that participation in discussion section counts for 15% of your term grade. Your preceptor will record class **attendance**; a long-standing pattern of repeated, unexcused absences will result in an F for that portion of the grade. Please come to class even if you were not able to complete the reading for that day, so as not to fall further behind. Discussion is an important part of philosophy and this is your chance to make sure you're clear on both the course content and assignments.

Please note that students who have *unexcused* absences totaling >40% of our total class time (lecture & section) are at risk of receiving an F as their final *course grade* in accordance with NYU college policy: <http://cas.nyu.edu/content/nyu-as/cas/academic-programs/bulletin/policies/academic-policies.html>

#### **Moses Center**

Students who require accommodation for a disability should consult with the Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities>. If you do request accommodation regarding the course policies in light of a disability, please also notify me (via email or in person) so that I can cooperate fully with the Moses Center and plan accordingly.

### (No) Textbooks

All required readings will be made available in .pdf form on our NYU Classes website. No textbook purchase is required.

## Phil-UA 80 : Philosophy of Mind

NYU Summer Session I 2017

Michelle Dyke

[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)

Meets MTuWTh from 11:30 am - 1:05 pm in room 202 at 5 Washington Place  
Monday, May 22 – Thursday, June 29

My office hours are on Thursdays from 10:30-11:30 am (or also by appointment). My office (#315) is on the third floor of the Philosophy department (5 Washington Place). During that time, feel free to come by to discuss the course material or assignments.

### Course Description

This course will provide an introduction to some of the major themes and ongoing debates in the Philosophy of Mind. Our readings and class discussions will focus on questions such as the following: What is the relationship between the mind and the body (especially the brain)? Can mental states, like belief and intention, be explained wholly in physical terms? How does the mind represent information about the external world? What is the self - Am I identical to my mind? What is consciousness? Does it come in degrees, for example with humans possessing higher degrees of consciousness than lower animals like mollusks? What other sorts of things, if any, could be conscious? Previous background in philosophy is not a requirement for enrollment in this course.

### Schedule of Readings and Assignments

Readings will be distributed in .pdf form and will be made available on our NYU Classes website. Each passage listed below will be discussed in class on the date listed to the left of the title; please do the readings in advance and be ready to talk about them. Passages marked as “in class” do not need to be read in advance.

#### **Week I (Historical Introduction & Problems for Physicalism)**

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| for Monday, May 22 | - In class: Historical Introduction on Descartes’<br>Dualism & objections, other views                           |
| for Tuesday        | - Frank Jackson, “What Mary Didn’t Know” and<br>“Epiphenomenal Qualia” (both very short)                         |
| for Wednesday      | - Thomas Nagel, “What Is It Like to Be a Bat?” (short)<br>and excerpts from <i>The View from Nowhere</i>         |
| for Thursday       | - Excerpts from David Chalmers’ <i>The Conscious Mind</i><br>- In class: Excerpt from Leibniz: The Mill Argument |

#### **Week II (Mental and Physical Properties: Identity & Supervenience)**

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Monday, May 29 | MEMORIAL DAY: NO CLASS                     |
| Tuesday        | - George Bealer, “Mental Properties”       |
| Wednesday      | - Jaegwon Kim, “Concepts of Supervenience” |
| Thursday       | No new reading                             |

Please submit the first paper (4-5 double-spaced pages) to me via email by 5 pm on Saturday, June 3.

### Week III (Functionalism & Some Objections)

- Monday, June 5 - "Functionalism" from John Heil's *Philosophy of Mind*
- Tuesday - Hilary Putnam, "The nature of mental states"
- Wednesday - Excerpts from Sydney Shoemaker's "The Inverted Spectrum"
- for Thursday - John Searle: "Minds, brains, and programs"

### Week IV (Consciousness)

- Monday, June 12 - David Chalmers, "Absent Qualia, Fading Qualia, Dancing Qualia"
- Tuesday - David Rosenthal on HOT: *Analysis* 2011
- Wednesday - Excerpts from Ned Block, "On a confusion about a function of consciousness"
- Thursday - Excerpts from Daniel Dennett, "Quining Qualia" and from John Heil's *Philosophy of Mind*

**Please submit the second paper (4-5 double-spaced pages) to me via email by 5 pm on Saturday June 17.**

### Week V (Intentionality & Mental Representation)

- Monday, June 19 - Gilbert Harman, "The Intrinsic Quality of Experience"
- Tuesday - Ned Block, "Inverted Earth"
- Wednesday - review of Armstrong's *Perception and the Physical World* and Fred Dretske's "Phenomenal Externalism"
- Thursday - No new reading

### Week VI (Personal Identity & Special Topics: Mental Determination & Creativity)

- Monday, June 26 - Selection from John Locke's *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*
- Tuesday - Derek Parfit, "Personal Identity"
- Wednesday - Selections: Free Will and Libet's experiments
- Thursday - Skim Berys Gaut, "Educating for Creativity" and Alan Hajek, "Philosophical Heuristics and Philosophical Creativity"

**Please submit the third paper (4-5 double-spaced pages) to me via email by 5 pm on FRIDAY, June 30.**

### Course Requirements

The required assignments for the course are **three papers** (4-5 double-spaced pages each). A choice of possible paper topics will be provided for all three writing assignments. The prompts will ask you to engage carefully with an idea or debate that we have discussed in class. You will be asked to provide arguments (offering examples or counterexamples where appropriate) in support of your chosen

thesis. Every paper prompt, in some form or other, will ask you to explain: Do you agree or disagree with the author(s) from our reading? Why?

**Grades will be calculated as follows:**

30% (x3) each paper

10% participation (attendance, engagement in class discussions, asking questions, etc.)

**Late papers will receive a deduction** of 1/3 letter grade for each day they are late. For example, an A-quality paper turned in 7 hours after the deadline will receive a B+. If it's 37 hours late, it will receive a B. And so on. The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation). This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students.

**Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic 0 for the assignment and risks failure for the course.** Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. Again, it's an issue of fairness.

### Other Course Policies

Note that class participation counts for 10% of your term grade. I'll take attendance in class; a long-standing pattern of repeated, unexcused absences may result in an F for that portion of the grade. Please do come to class even if you were not able to complete the reading for that day in order to avoid falling further behind.

Please do bring your reading(s) to class. During the class, I'll ask you to put your cellphones and any other electronics away. We'll take a 5-minute break halfway through the session and you're welcome to access them then.

#### **Moses Center**

Students who require accommodation for a disability should consult with the Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities>. If you do request accommodation, please send me an email as well so that I can cooperate with the Moses Center and plan accordingly.

### Textbooks

All required readings will be made available in .pdf form on our NYU Classes website. No textbook purchase is required.

In case you have trouble completing the reading at home, note that there are student-access computers available in the philosophy department (e.g. on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, near the elevator).

## Phil-UA 21 : History of Modern Philosophy

NYU Summer Session II 2017

Michelle Dyke

[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)

Meets MTuWTh from 1:30 pm - 3:05 pm in room 302 at 5 Washington Place  
Monday, July 3 – Thursday, August 10

My office hours are on Wednesdays from 3:05-4:05 pm (or also by appointment). My office (#315) is right across the hall from our classroom in the Philosophy department. During that time, feel free to come by to discuss the course material or assignments.

### Course Description

This course will provide an introduction to the works of some major figures in philosophy from the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. Authors will include (but are not limited to) Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibniz, Berkeley, Hume, and Kant. We will compare their views on a variety of topics in metaphysics & epistemology including knowledge and skepticism, causation, essence and identity, the relationship between the mental and the physical, and the role of God. Students will be encouraged to engage critically with the arguments of each author.

### Schedule of Readings and Assignments

Readings with asterisks (\*) will be made available in .pdf form on our NYU Classes website. Each passage listed below will be discussed in class on the date listed to the left of the title; please do the readings in advance and be ready to talk about them. Passages marked as “in class” or “for fun” do not need to be read in advance.

#### **Week I (Descartes' *Meditations*)**

for Monday, July 3	- Meditation I
for Tuesday	NO NYU CLASSES: INDEPENDENCE DAY
for Wednesday	- Meditation II
for Thursday	- Meditation III

#### **Week II (*Meditations* cont'd and Spinoza's *Ethics*)**

Monday, July 10	- Meditations IV and VI (skip V) In class: Excerpt of Descartes' Correspondence with Princess Elisabeth*
Tuesday	- Part I of Spinoza's <i>Ethics</i> (skip the Appendix)
Wednesday	- Review Part I (and <i>do</i> read the Appendix)
Thursday	- Skim Part II (skipping pages 42, 43) Please take note of P2, P5, P6, P7, P13

**On Friday, July 14 by 5 pm, please submit a rough draft/outline of a short paper to me via email.**

### Week III (Locke's *Essay*)

Monday, July 17

Tuesday

Wednesday

Thursday

- Book I: Chapters i and ii
- Book II: Chapters i.1-5, ii, iii, v, vi, vii, viii, xii
- Book II: Ch xxiii.1-15 and Ch xxvii.1-15
- Book II: Chapter xxi Sections 1-37, 47-56

**On Friday, July 21 by 5 pm, please submit a final version of the short paper (4-5 double-space pages) to me via email.**

### Week IV (Leibniz and Berkeley)

Monday, July 24 (Leibniz)

Tuesday (Leibniz)

Wednesday (Leibniz)

Thursday (Berkeley)

- Excerpts from *Discourse on Metaphysics*\*  
In class: Letter excerpt\* (Lady Masham)
- Excerpt from *The Monadology*\*  
For fun: Short excerpt from Voltaire's *Candide*\*
- *New Essays*\*: Preface (through pg 10 only) and  
Book I: Chapters i & iii (skip ch ii)
- Excerpt from Berkeley's *Treatise*\*

### Week V (Berkeley and Hume)

Monday, July 31 (Berkeley)

Tuesday (Hume)

Wednesday (Hume)

Thursday (Hume)

- Review Berkeley's *Treatise*
- *Enquiry* Sections 2, 4 (online or paper text)
- *Enquiry* Sections 5, 9
- *Enquiry* Sections 6, 10

**On Friday, August 4 by 5 pm, please submit a draft/outline of a medium-length paper to me via email.**

**(I will distribute the study guide for the final exam.)**

### Week VI (Kant)

Monday, August 7

Tuesday

Wednesday (Review session in class)

- 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Preface to the *Critique of Pure Reason*\*
- *Prolegomena*: Sec 1-3, 14-22, 27-30\*
- Bring your study guides and plan on working  
with your classmates

**On Thursday, August 10: Final Exam in class**

**On Friday, August 11 by 5 pm, please submit a final version of the medium-length paper (6-8 double-spaced pages) to me via email.**

### Course Requirements

The required assignments for the course include **one short paper** (4-5 double-spaced pages), **one medium-length paper** (6-8 double-spaced pages) and **one in-class final exam**. A choice of possible paper topics will be provided for both assignments. **Drafts or outlines of each paper** will be due one week before the final versions. The drafts will not be graded, but comments will be provided within 2-

3 days. Submission of drafts will count towards participation. (Drafts must be submitted on time for full credit.)

Unlike the papers, the exam will be designed to test only your recall and understanding of the assigned authors' views rather than your ability to critically assess their arguments. A study guide will be distributed one week in advance. That study guide will be composed of questions of the same format as on the exam, but it will include about 3x as many questions as will appear on the final. The questions to appear on the exam will be chosen from among those on the study guide.

**Grades will be calculated as follows:**

25% short paper

30% medium paper

30% final exam

15% participation (5% x2 for submission of each paper draft, 5% for engagement in class discussions)

**Late papers will receive a deduction** of 1/3 letter grade for each day they are late. For example, an A-quality paper turned in 7 hours after the deadline will receive a B+. If it's 37 hours late, it will receive a B. And so on. The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation). Timely paper drafts will receive 5/5 points. One point will be lost for each day the draft is late. (5/5 = A, 4/5 = B+, 3/5 = B-, 2/5 = C, 1/5 = D+, 0/5 = F) This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students.

**Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic 0 for the assignment and risks failure for the course.**

Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. Again, it's an issue of fairness.

### Other Course Policies

Note that engagement in class discussions counts for 5% of your term grade. I'll take attendance in class; a pattern of repeated, unexcused absences may result in an F for that portion of the grade. Please do come to class even if you were not able to complete the reading for that day in order to avoid falling further behind.

Please do bring your book(s) or reading(s) to class. During the class, I'll ask you to put your laptops, cellphones, and any other electronics away. We'll take a 5-minute break halfway through the session and you're welcome to access them then.

### **Moses Center**

Students who require accommodation for a disability should consult with the Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at <https://www.nyu.edu/students/communities-and-groups/students-with-disabilities.html>. If you do request accommodation (regarding the administration of the final exam, for example), please do send me an email as well so that I can cooperate with the Moses Center and plan accordingly.

## Textbooks

The following three books are required texts and are available at the NYU Bookstore (as well as on Amazon.com, etc.):

**1. An Essay Concerning Human Understanding**

John Locke, ed. Nidditch  
Oxford University Press

These two are very small, inexpensive paperbacks:

**2. Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy (4<sup>th</sup> edition)**

René Descartes, trans. Cress  
Hackett Publishing Company

**3. Ethics**

Spinoza, trans. Curley  
Penguin Classics

The following text, also available at the NYU Bookstore, is *optional*:

**4. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding**

David Hume, ed. Buckle  
Cambridge University Press

Purchasing the text is optional because a free online version (carefully prepared and fully legitimate) is also available at [www.davidhume.org](http://www.davidhume.org). (The readings will be required, though purchasing a paper version of the text is not.)



***GPH-GU 1005 001 Advanced Introduction to Bioethics<sup>3</sup>***  
*(3 credits)*

---

Class Schedule: W 6:45-8:45  
Class Location: Silver 412  
Semester and Year: Fall 2019

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke  
Phone: +1 212 998 3867 (extension 83867)  
Email: [michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)

Office: Room 1226 at 719 Broadway  
Office Hours: T 4-6 or by appointment

**COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

Advanced Introduction to Bioethics - Open only to Graduate Students in Bioethics or Philosophy or by Permission of Instructor. This seminar is intended to introduce students to the central methods and concerns of contemporary bioethics. We will consider topics including the grounds for respecting human (and other) life, the concepts of well-being and autonomy, decisions about future people, and justice in distribution of scarce medical resources. Students will develop familiarity with these concepts as well as the conventions and standards of bioethical debate.

**PRE-REQUISITES:**

No Pre-requisites. Students must be enrolled in the MA in Bioethics at NYU, or have permission from the instructor to take this class.

**ASSIGNMENTS:**

***Attendance and Participation (10%)***

***Short Writing Assignments (30% of total grade at 10% each):*** Throughout the semester, you will be required to hand in three short writing assignments based on course readings.

- These written exercises should be no more than two pages in length, double-spaced.
- This means that your writing must be focused and free of unnecessary detail. **Avoid summarizing the whole article.** Instead, select some component of the article (an argument, a definition, an assumption, etc.), reconstruct it briefly, and critically evaluate it.
- For the first assignment, you will be given options for topics to write about.
  - Topics will be announced on NYU Classes one week before the deadline.
- Starting with the second assignment, you may come up with your own topics, but suggestions will also be provided.

---

<sup>3</sup> Note for Teaching Portfolio readers: This is an abridged version of the syllabus. The official version includes more detail on course learning objectives and grading standards in compliance with NYU College of Global Public Health guidelines.

- Writing assignments must discuss course material that was assigned reading for class meetings after the last writing assignment deadline. The point of these assignments is to make sure that you're keeping up with the course material.
- Generally speaking, in these short assignments, you'll want to raise and respond to at least one objection that could be raised with regard to an argument that appears in the assigned readings.
- These assignments will help you to gain experience choosing your own research topics, and will give you practice with philosophical writing.
- I will grade these assignments in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." I will provide written comments along with the grade.

**Mini-quizzes (10% of total grade at 5% each):** Two of these will be held at the start of two different classes early in the term.

- These will involve only a handful of multiple-choice questions designed to test basic comprehension of the assigned readings for that week's class meeting. You will have 15 minutes to complete them. They are closed-book, closed-note.
- These are intended to help you gauge whether you're reading and understanding the assigned articles at the level of detail and sophistication expected for the course.
- Students with an excused absence on the day of the mini-quiz will make up an alternate version by arrangement with me. Students who miss a mini-quiz due to an unexcused absence will receive a 0 for the quiz.

**Research Paper (50% total):**

**Proposal—4%**

- **Note: This assignment will be graded A (100) or F (0) for completion.**
- Write a short summary of the topic upon which you plan to write your final paper.
- This summary does not need to be more than two pages, double-spaced in length (and can, in fact, be much shorter), but it must give me an idea of both the ethical question that you plan to answer as well as the argument that you plan to use to respond to it.
- This assignment itself does not need to be an argumentative piece of philosophical writing – it is a descriptive proposal regarding the arguments you wish to pursue.
- You will be expected to take a stance on the relevant issue in your final paper—it is not sufficient to simply describe an existing bioethical debate.
- The topic is entirely up to you, so long as it engages with one of the topics or themes covered in this course. The final paper should cite, at minimum, some of the course readings.
- If your proposed topic is not appropriate to this course, you will be required to write another proposal on another topic. You will not be penalized for handing in that second proposal after the assignment deadline.
- **I encourage you to meet with me at least once during this term to talk about paper ideas.**

### **Outline—6%**

- Write a more detailed outline (2-6 pages) summarizing the key arguments and objections that you anticipate covering in your final paper.
- We will discuss the expectations for this assignment in class closer to the deadline.

### **Final Research Paper—40%**

- Write a paper based on your proposal and outline.
- Your paper must be between 15 and 18 pages in length, double-spaced, in Times New Roman font, 12-point.
- This paper must be an argumentative piece of philosophical writing. It must have a thesis statement (to appear by the end of the first page), to which the rest of the paper is dedicated to proving. You must advance and defend an argument, and raise and respond to objections.
- The paper must engage with at least some of the views advanced in assigned readings from this course.
- If you do not have much experience writing philosophy papers, I encourage you to check out Professor Jim Pryor's guide: <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/writing.html> . We will also discuss expectations in class.
- Remember to include grammatically correct and academically responsible citations of sources. This is a graduate-level course with corresponding expectations; students must engage in proper citation practices. See the below statement on Academic Integrity.

### **Policy on Late Work**

Work submitted after the deadline will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade (e.g. from what would have been a B+ to a B) for each additional 24-hour period the assignment is late. (The first deduction occurs after the deadline has passed.) This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students, all of whom have busy schedules, too. Exceptions will be granted only in cases of emergency. All deadlines are indicated here for your information at the start of term. (If you know in advance that you will be unable to meet one of these deadlines, please send me an email or see me in person to discuss your situation.)

### **NYU CLASSES:**

NYU Classes will be used extensively throughout the semester for assignments, announcements, and other communication. NYU Classes is accessible at <https://home.nyu.edu/academics>

### **TECHNOLOGY POLICY:**

Ringers of mobile devices (phones, pagers, tablets, etc.) will be turned off or, if absolutely necessary, placed on vibrate prior to class. Laptops and tablets can be used in the classroom if necessary to take notes and download/read course materials. However, laptop use is discouraged and the taking of paper notes is preferred. (Students should also close laptops whenever possible to facilitate seminar-style discussion.) Research suggests that non-academic use of the internet is associated with poorer learning outcomes. Non-academic use of the internet in class will also affect one's participation grade.

**COURSE OUTLINE:**

Note that assigned readings and deadlines are subject to modification if appropriate; I will email you well in advance if this occurs.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Readings/Materials Due</b>	<b>Assignments Due</b>
Week 1 Sep 4	Moral Theory - Utilitarianism	Come to class having read Singer (1972) & Singer (1974)	
Week 2 Sep 11	Moral Theory - Deontology	Read Hill (1984) & Darwall (1977)  <b>First Mini-Quiz</b>	<b>First 15 min. of class</b>
Week 3 Sep 18	Autonomy and Paternalism	Read Conly (2013) & Flanigan (2017) & Ackerman (1982)  <b>First Short Writing Assignment</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>
Week 4 Sep 25	Theories of Well-Being	Read Bradley (2009 book, selections) & Hawkins (2014)	
Week 5 Oct 2	Abortion	Read Thomson (1971) & Marquis (1989)  <b>Second Mini-Quiz</b>	<b>First 15 min. of class</b>
Week 6 Oct 9	The Non-Identity Problem	Read Parfit (1986) & Kumar (2003)	
Week 7 Oct 16	Defining Death (& Related Ethical Issues for Healthcare)	Read McMahan (2006) & Veatch (2004) & Collins (2010, only Sec I-II required)  <b>Second Short Writing Assignment</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>
Week 8 Oct 23	Euthanasia and Related Practices	Read Thomson (1999) & Hardwig (1997)  *Optional: Velleman (1999)	
Week 9 Oct 30	Collective Responsibility and the Environment	Read Wringe (2019) & Jamieson (2015)	
Week 10 Nov 6	Patient Rights & Informed Consent	Read Liao (2016) & Stoljar (2011) & Wells and Kaptchuk (2012)  <b>Third Short Writing Assignment</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>

Week 11 Nov 13	Enhancement, Genetic Engineering	Read DeGrazia (2000) & Bostrom and Ord (2006) & Rosemann et al. (2019)  *Optional: Watch <i>Gattaca</i> (1997)	
Week 12 Nov 20	Defining Health (and esp. Mental Health)	Read Wakefield (1992) & Kukla (2014)  <b>Research Paper Proposal</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>
<b>Thanksgiving Break: No Class on Nov 27</b>			
Week 13 Dec 4	Disability and Society	Read Barnes (2016 book, selections) & Barnes (2018) replies  <b>Research Paper Outline</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>
Week 14 Dec 11	Addiction	Read Lewis (2017) & Pickard (2017)  Background: Pickard (2018) *Optional philosophical background: Strawson (1962)  <b>Final Research Paper</b>	<b>Due 5 pm on December 16</b>

### READING/VIEWING LIST:

- Ackerman, Terrence. (1982). "Why Doctors Should Intervene," *The Hastings Center Report*, 12(4), 14-17.
- Barnes, Elizabeth. (2016). *The Minority Body: A Theory of Disability*. Oxford University Press.
- Barnes, Elizabeth. (2018). "Against impairment: replies to Aas, Howard and Francis," *Philosophical Studies*, 175, 1151-1162.
- Bostrom, Nick and Toby Ord. (2006). "The Reversal Test: Eliminating Status Quo Bias in Applied Ethics," *Ethics*, 116, 656-679.
- Bradley, Ben. (2009). "Well-Being," *Well-Being and Death*. Oxford University Press.
- Collins, Mike. (2010). "Reevaluating the Dead Donor Rule," *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 35, 154-179.

- Conly, Sarah. (2013). "Chapter 1: Why Value Autonomy?" *Against Autonomy: Justifying Coercive Paternalism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Darwall, Stephen. (1977). "Two Kinds of Respect," *Ethics*, 88, 36-49.
- DeGrazia, David. (2000). "Prozac, Enhancement, and Self-Creation," *Hastings Center Report*, 30(2), 34-40.
- Flanigan, Jessica. (2017). "Seat Belt Mandates and Paternalism," *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, 14, 291-314.
- Hardwig, John. (1997). "Is There a Duty to Die?" *The Hastings Center Report*, 27(2), 34-42.
- Hawkins, Jennifer. (2014). "Well-Being, Time, and Dementia," *Ethics*, 124, 507-542.
- Hill, Thomas. (1984). "Autonomy and Benevolent Lies," *Journal of Value Inquiry*, 18, 251-267.
- Jamieson, Dale. (2015). "Responsibility and Climate Change," *Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric*, 8(2), 23-42.
- Kukla, Rebecca. (2014). "Medicalization, 'Normal Function,' and the Definition of Health," In *The Routledge Companion to Bioethics*, Ed. John D. Arras, Elizabeth Fenton, Rebecca Kukla. 515-530.
- Kumar, Rahul. (2003). "Who Can Be Wronged?" *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 31(2), 99-118.
- Lewis, Marc. (2017). "Addiction and the Brain: Development, Not Disease," *Neuroethics*, 10, 7-18.
- Liao, S. Matthew. (2016). "Health(care) and human rights: a fundamental conditions approach," *Theoretical Medical Bioethics*, 37, 259-274.
- Marquis, Don. (1989). "Why Abortion Is Immoral," *The Journal of Philosophy*, 86(4), 183-202.
- McMahan, Jeff. (2006). "An Alternative to Brain Death," *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, Symposium: Defining the Beginning and the End of Human Life*, Spring 2006. 44-48.
- Parfit, Derek. (1986). "Chapter 16: The Non-Identity Problem," *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford University Press.
- Pickard, Hannah. (2017). "Responsibility without Blame for Addiction," *Neuroethics*, Online First 07 January 2017.
- Pickard, Hannah. (2018). "The Puzzle of Addiction," In *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy and Science of Addiction*, Ed. H. Pickard and S. Ahmed. 9-22.
- Rosemann, Achim et al. (2019). "Heritable Genome Editing in a Global Context: National and International Policy Challenges," *Hastings Center Report*, 49(3), 30-42.
- Singer, Peter. (1972). "Famine, Affluence, and Morality," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1(3), 229-243.
- Singer, Peter. (1974). "All Animals are Equal," *Philosophic Exchange*, 1(5), 103-16. Reprinted in *Bioethics: An Anthology*. Third Edition. (2016). Ed. Helga Kuhse, Udo Schüklenk, and Peter Singer. Wiley Blackwell. 530-539.
- Stoljar, Natalie. (2011). "Informed Consent and Relational Conceptions of Autonomy," *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 36, 375-384.

- Strawson, P.F. (1962). "Freedom and Resentment," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 48, 1-25. (\*optional)
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis. (1971). "A Defense of Abortion," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1(1), 47-66.
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis. (1999). "Physician-Assisted Suicide: Two Moral Arguments," *Ethics*, 109, 497-518.
- Wakefield, Jerome. (1992). "The Concept of Mental Disorder," *American Psychologist*, 47(3), 373-388.
- Veatch, Robert M. (2004). "Abandon the Dead Donor Rule or Change the Definition of Death?" *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 14(3), 261-276.
- Velleman, J. David. (1999). "A Right to Self-Termination?" *Ethics*, 109, 606-628. (\*optional)
- Wells, Rebecca Erwin and Ted J. Kaptchuck. (2012). "To Tell the Truth, the Whole Truth, May Do Patients Harm: The Problem of the Nocebo Effect for Informed Consent," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 12(3), 22-29.
- Wringer, Bill. (2019). "Global obligations, collective capacities, and 'ought implies can,'" *Philosophical Studies*, Online First 07 March 2019.
- *Gattaca*, 1997 film directed and written by Andrew Niccol (\*optional)

#### **STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:**

The NYU College of Global Public Health values both open inquiry and academic integrity. Students in the program are expected to follow standards of excellence set forth by New York University. Such standards include respect, honesty and responsibility. The CGPH does not tolerate violations to academic integrity including:

- Plagiarism
- Cheating on an exam
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Collaborating with other students for work expected to be completed individually
- Giving your work to another student to submit as his/her own
- Purchasing or using papers or work online or from a commercial firm and presenting it as your own work

#### **STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:**

Students with disabilities should contact the Moses Center for Students with Disabilities regarding the resources available to them, and to determine what classroom accommodations should be made available. More information about the Moses Center can be found here:

<https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities.html>.

Students requesting accommodation must obtain a letter from the Moses Center to provide to me as early in the semester as possible.

*Sample Course Syllabus*  
**Introductory Ethics**  
(undergraduate seminar or lecture)  
Michelle M. Dyke

**Course Description**

This course will provide an introduction to the philosophical study of Ethics. Our readings and discussions will be structured around the consideration of four central questions. What makes an action *right*? What does it take to be a moral *agent* (of the kind that can appropriately be held morally *responsible*)? What does it mean to live a *good life*? Are moral values *objective*, or do they vary across cultures? We will consider perspectives from important historical figures (such as Aristotle, Immanuel Kant and Jeremy Bentham) as well as from contemporary authors.

**Sample Reading List**

**What makes an action right?**

Discussion of Consequentialism vs. Deontology:

- Selections, Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789)
- Excerpt, Barbara Herman, “Doing Too Much,” *Journal of Ethics* (2018)
- Selections, Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785)
- Thomas Hill, “Autonomy and Benevolent Lies” (1984)
- Philippa Foot, “Morality as a System of Hypothetical Imperatives” (1972)

Ethics and the Cultivation of Virtues

- Selection from Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*
- Heather Battaly, “A Pluralist Theory of Virtue” in *Current Controversies in Virtue Theory* (2015)

**What does it take to be a moral agent?**

Moral Sentiments, Blame, and the Relevance of Free Will:

- David Hume, “Chapter 8: Of liberty and necessity” from *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748)
- P.F. Strawson, “Freedom and Resentment” (1962)

Discussion: Do our reasons for understanding *human beings* as moral agents apply to other creatures (and things) as well?

- Excerpt, Lucy A. Bates et. al. “Do Elephants Show Empathy?” *Journal of Consciousness Studies* (2008)
- Peter Singer, “All Animals Are Equal” (1974)
- Amitai Etzioni & Oren Etzioni, “Incorporating Ethics into Artificial Intelligence,” *Journal of Ethics* (2017)

### What does it mean to live a good life?

- Robert Nozick on “The Experience Machine,” pages 42-45 of *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974)
- Susan Wolf, “Happiness and Meaning: Two Aspects of the Good Life” (1997)
- Peter Railton, “Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality” (1984)
- Bernard Williams, “The Makropulos case: reflections of the tedium of immortality” from *Problems of the Self* (1973)

### Are moral values objective?

- J.L. Mackie, “The Subjectivity of Values” from *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong* (1977)
- Short selection from David Wong, *Natural Moralities: A Defense of Pluralistic Relativism* (2006)
- Short selection from Gilbert Harman (& Judith Jarvis Thomson), *Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity* (1996)
- David Enoch, “How is Moral Disagreement a Problem for Realism?” *Journal of Ethics* (2009)
- Short excerpts from Derek Parfit, *On What Matters* (2011)
- Excerpts, Carol Rovane, “Earning the Right to Realism or Relativism in Ethics” (2002)

### Course Requirements

The required assignments for the course are **three papers** (4-6 double-spaced pages each). A choice of possible paper topics will be provided for all three writing assignments. These prompts will ask students to engage carefully with an idea or debate that we have discussed in class. Every paper prompt, in some form or other, will ask students to explain: Do you agree or disagree with the author(s) from our reading? *Why?* Students will be asked to provide arguments (offering examples where appropriate) in support of their thesis statements.

We will devote some of our class time to addressing what makes for good philosophical writing.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

30% each paper

10% class participation

*Sample Course Syllabus*  
**Is There Anything We Ought to Do?**  
**Collective Responsibility and the Ethics of Group Agency**  
(intended as an advanced undergraduate or graduate seminar)  
Michelle M. Dyke

**Course Description**

We are familiar with the claims that single human beings can act intentionally, may be ethically responsible for their actions, and may be judged as rational or irrational in light of their behaviors. But what about the many social groups of which we are members, such as hobby clubs, carpools, sports teams, committees, juries, corporations, societies, and states? Can these groups act intentionally? Are they ethically responsible for their actions? Is their behavior wholly reducible to the contributing acts of their members? Is it ever right to say that the group as a whole acts and is responsible independently of the sense in which each individual member bears responsibility? As members of social groups, do we as individuals also have special duties or obligations? In this course, we will discuss some of the ethical issues that arise in connection with collective action and group agency. We will conclude by debating applications to two urgent contemporary case studies: collective responsibility for global climate change and responsibility for structural injustices towards minority groups in academia and in society at large.

**Sample Reading List**

**I. What is Collective Intention?**

- Excerpts: Gilbert, Margaret. (1989). *On Social Facts*. New York: Routledge.
- Gilbert, Margaret. (1990). "Walking Together: A Paradigmatic Social Phenomenon," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 15(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4975.1990.tb00202.x>
- Excerpts: Bratman, Michael E. (2014). *Shared Agency: A Planning Theory of Acting Together*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**II. Collective Moral Obligations**

- Wringer, Bill. (2014). "Collective Obligations: Their Existence, Their Explanatory Power, and Their Supervenience on the Obligations of Individuals," *European Journal of Philosophy*, 24(2), 472-497. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejop.12076>
- Giubilini, Alberto and Neil Levy. (2018). "What in the World Is Collective Responsibility?" *dialectica*, 72(2), 191-217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1746-8361.12228>

**III. Making Sense of Group Agency**

- Excerpts: List, Christian and Philip Pettit. (2011). *Group Agency: The Possibility, Design, and Status of Corporate Agents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- List, Christian. (2014). "Three kinds of collective attitudes," *Erkenntnis*, 79(9 Supp.), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-014-9631-z>

- Miller, Seumas and Pekka Makela. (2005). "The Collectivist Approach to Collective Moral Responsibility." *Metaphilosophy*, 36(5), 634-651.
- Hess, Kendy. (2018). "Does the Machine Need a Ghost? Corporate Agents as Nonconscious Kantian Moral Agents." *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 4(1), 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2018.10>
- Excerpts: Rovane, Carol. (1998). *The Bounds of Agency: An Essay in Revisionary Metaphysics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rovane, Carol. (2004). "Rationality and Persons." In *The Oxford Handbook of Rationality*. Ed. Alfred R. Mele and Piers Rawling. Oxford University Press.

\*Optional Further reading:

- Dyke, manuscript, "Rethinking Agency"
- List, Christian. (2018). "What is it Like to be a Group Agent?" *Noûs*, 52(2), 295-319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12162>
- Dietz, Alexander. (2018). "Are My Temporal Parts Agents?" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Early View 19 September 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12553>

#### IV. The Ethics of Group Agency

- French, Peter. (1979). "The Corporation as a Moral Person." *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 16(3), 207-215. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20009760>
- Velasquez, Manuel. (2003). "Debunking Corporate Moral Responsibility." *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 13(4), 531-562. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3857970>
- Copp, David. (2006). "On the Agency of Certain Collective Entities: An Argument from 'Normative Autonomy,'" *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 30, 194-221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4975.2006.00135.x>
- Pettit, Philip. (2007). "Responsibility Incorporated," *Ethics*, 117, 171-201.
- More excerpts, List & Pettit (2011)
- Collins, Stephanie. (2017). "Duties of Group Agents and Group Members," *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 48(1), 38-57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josp.12181>
- Björnsson, Gunnar and Kendy Hess. (2017). "Corporate Crocodile Tears? On the Reactive Attitudes of Corporate Agents," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 94(2), 273-298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12260>
- Haji, Ish. (2006). "On the Ultimate Responsibility of Collectives," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 30(1), 292-308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4975.2006.00141.x>
- Hess, Kendy. (2014). "The free will of corporations (and other collectives)," *Philosophical Studies*, 168, 241-260. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-013-0128-4>

#### V. Non-Agent Social Groups

- Ritchie, Katherine. (2018). "Social Structures and the Ontology of Social Groups," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Early View 20 September 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12555>

- Epstein, Brian. (2016). “What are social groups? Their metaphysics and how to classify them,” *Synthese*, Online First 06 April 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-017-1387-y>

## VI. Real-World Applications/Case Studies:

### Global Warming and Collective Duties to the Environment

- Wringer, Bill. (2019). “Global obligations, collective capacities, and ‘ought implies can,” *Philosophical Studies*, Online First 07 March 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-019-01272-6>
- Jamieson, Dale. (2015). “Responsibility and Climate Change,” *Global Justice: Theory, Practice, Rhetoric*, 8(2), 23-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21248/gjn.8.2.86>

### Responsibility for Structural Injustices, in Academia and in Society

- Sangiovanni, Andrea. (2018). “Structural Injustice and Individual Responsibility,” *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 49(3), 461-483. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josp.12250>
- American Philosophical Association, (2019), “The Diversity and Inclusivity Survey: Final Report,” Carolyn Dicey Jennings et al.
- Excerpts, *Advancing Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education: Key Data Highlights Focusing on Race and Ethnicity and Promising Practices*, (November 2016), report in public domain by Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Office of the Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Education

### Course Requirements

The assignments for the course include one short **mid-term paper** (5-7 pages) and one longer **final paper** (14-18 pages). A list of suggested paper topics will be provided; students may also propose their own topics. The final paper may involve either a development of the ideas from the short paper assignment or an entirely new project. Students who elect to write their final papers on a new topic are highly encouraged to submit a draft/outline (2-4 pages, including a thesis statement) for preliminary feedback at least three weeks before the end of the term.

There will also be four informal “mini-papers” (1-2 double-spaced pages) due throughout the term. Each must present students’ reactions to course readings assigned *after* the due date of the last mini-paper. They will be graded mostly for participation credit with written comments returned. These assignments are intended to ensure that students are keeping up with, and continuing to engage thoughtfully with, the assigned readings.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

25% midterm paper

45% final paper

20% mini-papers at 5% each x4

10% class participation

*Sample Course Syllabus*  
**British Empiricism & The Scientific Revolution**  
(intended as an advanced undergraduate or graduate seminar)  
Michelle M. Dyke

**Course Description**

The philosophers John Locke, David Hume, and George Berkeley are often discussed together as the three major figures of British Empiricism. The core commitment of Empiricism is the claim that all human knowledge is derived from, and therefore limited by, experience. According to Hume's "Copy Principle," for example, all of our ideas are copies of more vivid original sense "impressions" that we experience. This claim, as well as many other assumptions that characterize the work of these three philosophers, can be understood as endorsements of the kinds of empirical methods and associated beliefs about the natural world that were becoming increasingly popular in the wake of the Scientific Revolution. Despite some important commonalities, however, the views of these philosophers depart from each other in surprising ways. (In part for this reason, some philosophers protest the traditional practice of grouping these philosophers together with the oversimplifying title of "Empiricist.") For example, John Locke puts his Empiricist epistemology to work to defend the reasonableness of Christian faith, while David Hume offers arguments from similar starting points regarding the sources of our beliefs in order to cast doubt upon religious claims. George Berkeley is most famous for endorsing a form of idealism, the shocking view that perceiving minds and their ideas are all that exist. This course will examine in detail some of the views presented by the major works of Locke, Hume, and Berkeley, with special emphasis on their accounts of the possibility and origins of various kinds of human knowledge (of the natural world, of mathematics, of morality, of religion, of the self, and so on).

**Sample Reading List**

- Selection from Francis Bacon on the scientific method
- Selection from Galileo on the observable qualities of objects

**John Locke**

Selections from Locke's *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, especially regarding:

- Locke's arguments against the existence of innate ideas (Book I)
  - Locke's Empiricist account of the nature and origin of our ideas (Book II)
  - Locke's account of Knowledge (Book IV)
  - consequences of these views for the limits of our understanding of physical matter, souls, and our own identity as conscious beings
- Locke's *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (excerpt)
  - Mark Mathewson, "John Locke and the Problems of Moral Knowledge" (2006)
  - Shelley Weinberg, "Locke on Knowing Our Own Ideas (And Ourselves)" (2015)

## David Hume

Selections from Hume's *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* and *A Treatise of Human Nature*, especially regarding:

- Hume's empiricist account of the origin of our ideas
- Inductive reasoning and skepticism (in science and everyday life)
- A comparison between the minds and cognitive abilities of humans and animals
- Belief in miracles and the afterlife

- Short excerpts from John Wright's *The Sceptical Realism of David Hume* (1983), Malebranche's *Recherche de la Vérité*, and Hume's correspondence, regarding the influence of Malebranche's views on Hume's understanding of the mind and brain

- Annemarie Butler, "On Hume's Supposed Rejection of Resemblance Between Objects and Impressions" (2010)

- Louis Loeb, "Integrating Hume's Accounts of Belief and Justification" (2001)

## George Berkeley

Selections from Berkeley's *Principles of Human Knowledge* and *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, emphasizing:

- Berkeley's "idealism," the philosophical view that ideas and perceiving minds are all that exist
- Berkeley's criticism of Locke on ideas, especially ideas of primary vs. secondary qualities (of observable objects) and abstract ideas

- Margaret Atherton, "Berkeley's Anti-Abstractionism" (1987)

- Stephen H. Daniel, "Berkeley on God's Knowledge of Pain" (2018)

## Course Requirements

The assignments for the course include one short **mid-term paper** (5-7 pages) and one longer **final paper** (14-18 pages). A list of suggested paper topics will be provided; students may also propose their own topics. The final paper may involve either a development of the ideas from the short paper assignment or an entirely new project. Students who elect to write their final papers on a new topic should submit a draft/outline (2-4 pages, including a thesis statement) for preliminary feedback at least three weeks before the end of the term.

There will also be four informal "mini-papers" (1-2 double-spaced pages) due throughout the term. Each must present students' reactions to course readings assigned *after* the due date of the last mini-paper. They will be graded mostly for participation credit with written comments returned. These assignments are intended to ensure that students are keeping up with, and continuing to engage thoughtfully with, the assigned readings.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

25% midterm paper

45% final paper

20% mini-papers at 5% each x4

10% class participation

## Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

### Course Evaluation Results from NYU Students

The following pages include results from student evaluations of all past courses for which I was the sole or primary instructor, as conducted online by New York University's College of Arts & Science.

**In response to survey items, students submit scores between 1 and 5** (from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” or from “very poor” to “excellent” depending on the question).

Included are results from Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism (Spring 2019), Central Problems in Philosophy (2 courses – Fall 2018 as a lecture and Summer 2018 as a seminar), Philosophy of Mind (Summer 2017) as well as the History of Modern Philosophy (3 courses – Summers 2017, 2016 & 2015).

For the summer term 2015, the evaluation results are divided into two class sections. Regularly enrolled NYU undergraduates and visiting students enrolled in the same course under two different section numbers. These are 210001 for the regularly enrolled undergraduates and 2100060 for the visiting students.

### Teaching Reference Letter

Professor Don Garrett will be providing a reference letter specifically describing my effectiveness as an instructor of philosophy. This letter is based on his observation of a class meeting of my 2017 History of Modern Philosophy course. It is also based on confidential reports from class observations by NYU faculty of my other previous courses and on my students' course evaluations. This letter will be sent from NYU along with my other confidential letters of reference.  
(or for copies, please email Amy Moore at [akm411@nyu.edu](mailto:akm411@nyu.edu))