

TEACHING PORTFOLIO
BENJAMIN BAYER

*Full teaching portfolio available at www.benbayer.com/teaching.html.
 Links below direct to portions of the site.*

- STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY 1
- SUMMARY OF RECENT TEACHING EVALUATION SCORES 3
 - Loyola University New Orleans, Fall 2010–Spring 2016 3
 - Raw data..... <http://goo.gl/1VrO9i>
Older scores from Colorado College, Loyola Chicago, and the University of Illinois available upon request
- SAMPLE STUDENT EVALUATION WRITTEN COMMENTS 5
 - Complete, unfiltered comments from recent courses, Spring 2012–Spring 2016..... 5
- SELECTED SYLLABI FROM COURSES IN AREA OF SPECIALIZATION 19

Loyola University New Orleans syllabi

- Philosophy of the Human Person (Fall 2016) 19
 My updated introductory philosophy course begins the semester by showing students how contemporary cultural and political controversies (e.g. abortion and inequality) often turn on disagreements about ethics, epistemology, and even metaphysics. In the remaining semester, we then dig deeper and deeper into these branches, starting with ethics and ending with metaphysics. ***(Here I include the full syllabus, including administrative policies, while subsequent syllabi are abbreviated.)***
- Free Will and Determinism (Spring 2016) 32
 This is the second of the intermediate course for non-majors I developed for Loyola. Though the question of the freedom of the will often motivates itself with students, to maximize the impact of the course I've made it a historical survey. I begin with the ancient Greeks, working through early and Reformation Christianity, the scientific revolution, and culminate with twentieth century debates. I emphasize the role that differences in philosophical world view make in philosophers' analysis of the problem of freedom.
- Free Will in Action and Thought (Fall 2014) 38
 This is an upper-level course for majors I developed as a kind of sequel to my intermediate non-majors course. The course surveys 20th century analytic perspectives on free will vs. determinism. It examines in-depth the debate between compatibilists and incompatibilists, and ends with an examination of how the traditional debate about freedom of action develops when it is applied to questions about what freedom we have in the formation of our beliefs.
- Philosophy of Knowledge (Fall 2015) 41
 I developed this course as an intermediate-level course for non-majors. To give it the broadest possible appeal, I used the example of the conflict between Galileo and the Catholic church to illustrate a variety of topics in epistemology, philosophy of science, and philosophy of religion.
- Epistemology (Fall 2013) 46
 This is an upper-level class for majors that covers standard topics in twentieth century analytic epistemology: skepticism, the analysis of knowledge, foundationalism vs. anti-foundationalism, internalism vs. externalism, and debates about naturalized epistemology. One addition of interest here is the inclusion of several of my own **published papers on these topics. I treat this as something of an “advocacy” course. I find that at least on this topic, students appreciate the fact that they see that I am actively involved in debates over the fairly abstract topics they are learning about.**

- Introduction to Analytic Philosophy (Spring 2011) 51
This is a version of a course originally developed at Colorado College and then taught again at Loyola New Orleans. It surveys the history of analytic philosophy by first contrasting the Anglo-American from the continental approach, describing the origins of the analytic approach on the continent, and then examining major movements (early analysis, logical positivism, ordinary language, naturalism, and the new metaphysics).

- LINKS TO OTHER SYLLABI.....

Loyola University New Orleans syllabi

- Making Moral Decisions (Spring 2015) <http://goo.gl/kmGOqt>
MMD fulfills the requirement non-majors have at Loyola for an intermediate-level philosophy course. I decided that the course would begin with a discussion of moral paradigm cases—murder, slavery, honesty and generosity—the evaluation of which is uncontroversial. I then used these cases as a kind of data by which to test four classical ethical theories. We would then apply these theories to contemporary controversies (abortion, war and peace, hunger and social responsibility, the environment). My overall aim is to indicate to students how controversies might be settled by appealing to analogies to the uncontroversial.
- Ethics and Social Justice (Summer 2015) <http://goo.gl/4h62Mw>
I developed this course for the first time in the Summer of 2014 as an online course for students in Loyola's nursing doctoral program. It surveys major theories of justice using Michael Sandel's book on the topic, but invites students to apply these theories systematically to a variety of controversies in biomedical ethics.
- Practical Logic (Spring 2015) <http://goo.gl/wBzN6P>
This is a version of a course I've been teaching since I was at the University of Illinois, and for which I have authored my own introductory textbook. It features an in-depth examination of informal fallacies, categorized according to the positive principles of reasoning they violate.
- Philosophical Themes in Ayn Rand (Spring 2016) <https://goo.gl/SgQ9yD>
This is a unique course I developed that aims to explore the ideas of a controversial but influential figure, in a way that explores major questions in metaphysics, epistemology, moral psychology, and ethics raised in an engrossing work of fiction.

Colorado College syllabi

- History of Modern Philosophy (Spring 2009) <http://goo.gl/EtcBkk>
In this intensive two-block course, I examined major early and late modern figures' approaches to theory of knowledge and the implications of their views in ethics and politics. Figures studied included Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Marx, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Kierkegaard.
- Philosophy of Language (Fall 2009) <http://goo.gl/7fBNWr>
Rather than teaching philosophy of language as synonymous with the history of analytic thought, I decided to offer students a survey of the field from the perspective of both analytic and continental traditions. I focused on the question of whether language is primarily a tool for social interaction, or a means of individual cognition.
- Philosophical Argumentation and Writing (Spring 2009) <http://goo.gl/7ygvE2>
For this course, I was challenged to combine elements of introductory logic with the analysis of philosophical problems. I decided to illustrate important methods of inference and analysis by having students read important texts in which philosophers utilize these methods. Students were given a multi-step writing project on the relationship between religious belief and morality.
- Formal Logic (Fall 2009) <http://goo.gl/ipJCyY>
I originally developed this course at Loyola of Chicago. It features all of the essentials of categorical logic, modern sentential and predicate logic, and a brief introduction to modern term logic. Students wrote homework online (multiple choice, translations, and proofs) using the Hurley iLrn Logic software suite.
- Environmental Ethics (Fall 2008) <http://goo.gl/YlktCD>
This course was conceived as an introduction to ethical theory for students already interested in environmental issues. It began by examining evolving Western views of nature in literature and popular culture, to show that

intuitions about nature are culturally idiosyncratic and in need of guidance by ethical theory. I surveyed standard ethical theories and those developed by environmental ethicists to deal with its special problems.

Loyola University Chicago syllabi

- Epistemology (Fall 2008) <http://goo.gl/Nj595y>
This course, originally taught at Loyola University Chicago, has been superseded by my Fall 2013 Epistemology and my Spring 2012 Theory of Knowledge courses, which split the historical and contemporary components of the earlier course into two separate courses. Two thirds of the course examined major early modern figures, while the last third examined 20th century analytic epistemologists. I emphasized how contemporary views of justification were foreshadowed by developments in the early modern period.

- SAMPLE POWERPOINT LECTURE SLIDES.....
- Philosophy of the Human Person, on the metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics of one side of the abortion controversy.....
..... <https://goo.gl/zpfr87>
- Making Moral Decisions, on comparing scientific and moral controversies
..... <http://goo.gl/mwLKQI>
- Making Moral Decisions, analysis of an argument against abortion
..... <https://goo.gl/n559AC>
- Free Will and Determinism lecture slides, on Pelagius vs. St. Augustine
..... <http://goo.gl/aPxNp4>
- Philosophy of Knowledge lecture slides, on **Galileo's theory of knowledge**.....
..... <http://goo.gl/qcdfBW>
- Free Will in Action and Thought lecture slides, on **Strawson's and reactive attitudes**.....
..... <http://goo.gl/YjSXbi>
- **Epistemology, on Moore's common sense response to skepticism**
..... <http://goo.gl/XpxTlx>

STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Benjamin Bayer

More than anything else, my approach to teaching reflects an ongoing commitment to communicate the relevance of abstract philosophy to life in the real world. This shows up in my theoretically-oriented classes, where I strive to find connections between philosophy and cultural controversies, and in applied classes, where I take every opportunity to be a salesman for philosophic theory.

As an example of the first half of this commitment, let me describe a course I developed first for Loyola, an intermediate-level course for non-majors called Philosophy of Knowledge. The epistemologist has a set of standard theoretical topics to teach in introductory epistemology courses, but I decided that these would not meet the needs of my students. Instead I decided to feature a mix of issues in epistemology, the philosophy of science, and the philosophy of religion unified by a running case study: the controversy between Galileo and the Catholic Church. The example is effective in dramatizing the origin of early modern epistemology in the scientific revolution and in illustrating the relevance of various theoretical questions to the ongoing controversy over cultural relativism. In the latest version of my Introduction to Philosophy class (Philosophy of the Human Person), I also begin the semester by showing students how contemporary cultural and political controversies (e.g. abortion and inequality) often turn on disagreements about ethics, epistemology, and even metaphysics. In the remaining semester, we then dig deeper and deeper into these branches, starting with ethics and ending with metaphysics.

I could say more about how I have pursued the same strategy in other courses, but for now I invite you to examine my syllabi for Introduction to Philosophy, History of Modern Philosophy, and Free Will and Determinism courses, all of which manifest a similar approach. On the flip side, I've also made an effort to draw attention to theoretical questions in "applied" courses such as Practical Logic and most recently in my ethics courses, Making Moral Decisions, and Ethics and Social Justice (which I teach to students in Loyola's nursing doctoral program).

Many philosophers enjoy the challenge of motivating students to rethink parochial opinions they have absorbed while growing up. I do sympathize. Oddly, however, students in many colleges are especially uncritical in their acceptance of a crude form of relativism, to the point where it is the new parochial conventionalism. A second hallmark of my teaching, as it happens, is an increasing insistence on encouraging students to overcome this complacency, to see how philosophy is a serious discipline that offers not only interesting questions but sometimes, at least, the prospect of answers.

Students who think that philosophy is nothing but a succession of exploded theories will never be convinced that our field has anything relevant to say to the world. They will agree with politicians who say we need more welders and fewer philosophers. Of course it is true that philosophic consensus is often fleeting. But in my courses I try to emphasize what progress philosophers have made, if only in their refinement of philosophic questions. I stress what makes philosophers think that it is at least possible in principle to answer their questions. I stress analogies between our field and the sciences (without reducing the former to the latter). I emphasize this particularly in my ethics class, Making Moral Decisions. I begin this class not by discussing ethical theory or controversies but paradigm cases of moral virtues and vices that most people agree about, with the aim of collecting data by reference to which ethical theories can then be tested before controversies are discussed.

The above is my teaching strategy. Now for a quick word on tactics. I devote significant time to finding ways to present philosophy in an inviting way. I use a wide array of technology to make course material accessible and to facilitate my interaction with students both in and out of the classroom. This includes the use of Powerpoint presentations, iClickers, online discussion groups, AdobeConnect recordings of lectures and slide presentations, and regular Excel-facilitated grade reports during the course of the semester that let students know their current average. I use Doodle surveys to encourage students to meet to discuss paper drafts before their deadline. This past fall I convinced over 60% of my students to show me drafts or outlines. In the classroom, students complement me on my engaging lecture style and interactive classroom presence. Some say I am funny.

I have some evidence of the modest success of my approach. My average rating as an instructor from student course evaluations since the fall of 2010 is about 4.05 out of 5. **I don't** necessarily put stock in student ratings, but I do find it interesting that these ratings have held in spite of **the fact that I give out very few "A" grades**. Typically about one tenth of my students in a given semester are taking a second classes from me (Fall 2014: 12/100; Spring 2015: 12/100; Fall 2015: 6/60; Spring 2016: 7/59; this semester it is low because I am teaching a lot of freshman). I find that the more I communicate my expectations to students (especially by sending regular grade reports), the better students get at seeing how they get the grade they earn.

If I only loved thinking about philosophy, I would simply **pursue it as a hobby**. **So it's** mainly because I also enjoy selling people on the relevance of the field that I want to pursue philosophy professionally. Pursuing it professionally, for me, means using all of the tools and techniques at my disposal to open channels of communication between me and my students. I hope you get the chance to see me do it in person.

SUMMARY OF STUDENT EVALUATION SCORES
 Benjamin Bayer
 Loyola University New Orleans, Fall 2010-Spring 2016

*Scores are in response to prompt,
 "I would recommend this instructor to other students."
 (Raw data available upon request or at <http://goo.gl/1VrO9i>)*

5=Strongly agree; 4=Agree; 3=Neutral; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly disagree

*In the Fall of 2014, Loyola adopted a new online survey system that compelled students to fill out surveys before they could access Blackboard at the end of the semester. In subsequent semesters, it stopped being a requirement and the number of responses dropped.

Spring 2016

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 252--Making Moral Decisions--001		1	4				5	10	4.20	.45
Phil 252--Making Moral Decisions--001		8	2	1		2	13	23	4.08	1.50
Phil 294--Phil Themes in Ayn Rand--001		6	2	1		1	10	17	4.20	1.32
Phil 294--Phil Themes in Ayn Rand--001		1	2				3	7	4.33	.58
Phil 206--Intro to Symbolic Logic--002		2	2			1	5	8	3.80	1.64

Fall 2015

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 272--Philosophy of Knowledge--001		1	2				3	12	4.33	.58
Phil 272--Philosophy of Knowledge--002		3	1	1			5	16	4.40	.89
Phil 282--Free Will and Determinism--001		5	1	1			7	14	4.57	.79
Phil 282--Free Will and Determinism--002		3	3		1		7	14	4.14	1.07

*Spring 2015**

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 252--Making Moral Decisions--02/51		13	17	6	3	5	44	57	3.68	1.29
Phil 201--Practical Logic--01/02		7	13	7	2	5	34	43	3.44	1.31

*Fall 2014**

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 282--Free Will and Determinism		7	11	4	5	1	28	39	3.64	1.16
Phil 294/5--Free Will in Thought/Action**		7	2	1			10	13	4.2/5	.84/0.0
Phil 201--Practical Logic--01		6	6		3	1	16	17	3.81	1.33
Phil 201--Practical Logic--02		4	9	4	3	3	23	23	3.35	1.30

**This divided into an honors and non-honors sections

Spring 2014

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 252--Making Moral Decisions--02		12	6	4	2	1	25	33	4.0	1.2
Phil 252--Making Moral Decisions--51		10	5	2	1		18	29	4.3	.9
Phil 201--Practical Logic--01		7	5	5		1	18	20	3.9	1.1
Phil 201--Practical Logic--02		6	4		3	2	15	19	3.6	1.5

Fall 2013

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 252--Making Moral Decisions--52		4	9	4	3	3	23	27	3.3	1.3
Phil 252--Making Moral Decisions--53		13	5	1	1	2	22	28	4.2	1.3
Phil 252--Making Moral Decisions--54		9	5	1	1	2	21	31	3.9	1.4
Phil 220--Epistemology--001		3	3	2	1		9	14	3.9	1.1

Spring 2013

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 294--Free Will and Determinism--01		11	2	2	2	1	18	30	4.1	1.3
Phil 294--Free Will and Determinism--51		6	9	6	3	2	26	30	3.5	1.2
Phil 201--Practical Logic--01		2	7	5	3		17	21	3.5	0.9
Phil 201--Practical Logic--02		12	5	1			18	20	4.6	0.6

Fall 2012

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 294--Free Will and Determinism--51		9	5	1	1	1	17	29	4.2	1.2
Phil 294--Free Will and Determinism--52		5	6	3			14	26	4.1	0.8
Phil 201--Practical Logic--01		11	2		2	1	16	20	4.3	1.3
Phil 201--Practical Logic--02		13	5	3			21	22	4.5	0.8

Spring 2012

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 270--Philosophy of Knowledge--01		8	2	4	1		15	28	4.1	1.1
Phil 270--Philosophy of Knowledge--02		14	2	3		1	20	28	4.4	1.1
Phil 201--Practical Logic--01		6	4	4	2	1	17	21	3.7	1.3
Phil 201--Practical Logic--02		9	7	3	2	1	22	21	4.2	0.9

Fall 2011

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 270--Philosophy of Knowledge--01		6	8	4	1	3	22	29	3.6	1.3
Phil 270--Philosophy of Knowledge--02		12	3	6	2		23	31	4.1	1.1
Phil 201--Practical Logic--01		12	4	1	2		19	20	4.4	1
Phil 201--Practical Logic--02		9	3	1	1	2	16	23	4	1.5

Spring 2011

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 122--Intro to Philosophy--03		5	9	2	1	1	18	30	3.9	1.1
Phil 122--Intro to Philosophy--06		7	7	4	2		20	26	4	1
Phil 122--Intro to Philosophy--07		8	5	5	1	1	20	30	3.9	1.2
Phil 465--Intro to Analytic Philosophy--1		6	3				9	18	4.7	0.5

Fall 2010

Course	Rating	5	4	3	2	1	# Surveyed	Enrolled	Avg	SD
Phil 122--Intro to Philosophy--02		6	7	2	2	1	18	30	3.8	1.2
Phil 122--Intro to Philosophy--07		10	4	5	2		21	29	4	1.1
Phil 201--Practical Logic--001		10	4	2			16	21	4.5	0.7
Phil 201--Practical Logic--002		8	5	2	1		16	21	4.3	0.09

SAMPLES OF STUDENT EVALUATION WRITTEN COMMENTS

Benjamin Bayer

The following are the complete, unfiltered written comments from students in all sections of my classes listed at Loyola University New Orleans, since the spring of 2012.* In the interests of full disclosure, a section of complete, unfiltered negative comments follows the positives.

*In the Fall of 2014, Loyola adopted a new online course evaluation system which compelled students to fill out evaluations before accessing Blackboard at the end of the semester. In subsequent semesters it stopped being a requirement and so the number of responses dropped off.

STRENGTHS

Making Moral Decisions, Spring 2016

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
it was very philosophical	He is very smart and cool
interesting	very flexible
	The instructor gives recordings of the lecture
	I enjoyed the class.
Interesting, challenging	Thorough, informative
We always knew what was going on and what was coming up	Presentations were decent
Fantastic instructor, fantastic course material	Excellent notes, organized lectures, easy to follow along. Best philosophy professor I've had at Loyola!
	Best instructor I have had at Loyola so far.
	Extremely engaging, I could not ask for a better instructor. Admittedly, Professor Bayer's teaching style may not be as beneficial to everyone, but his very decisiveness and questioning makes this course very fun.
	Very passionate and master of his field. Cares about his students

Philosophical Themes in Ayn Rand, Spring 2016

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Most interesting class I have taken yet	Clear expectations and communication skills.
Class discussion worked well	Fostered discussion; provided ample opportunities to discuss papers and assignments
Forces you to think critically about philosophy and ethics.	Philosophically, the instructor strongly encourages you to think, and also challenges your ways of thinking. Insightful and passionate about the subject material and goals of the course.
We read over one thousand pages of dense, philosophical fiction in a Spring semester. We broke the piece down into smaller parts and analyzed philosophy in a new and thrilling way. Need I say more?	I have encountered none but amazing Philosophy, Religion, and Ethics teachers during my time at Loyola. Dr. Bayer was no exception. Maybe it is something about the Bobet building, but he exceeded my expectations of the Philosophy professor. He was so passionate, attentive, organized, thoughtful, motivating, and genuinely interested in the students and how we were taking in the information he was delivering. He started class on time (to the second!) and from the second we started to the second we ended, he had slides, secondary readings and notes for us to critically follow along with. All of his information was posted on Blackboard. He even audio recorded class, in case one of us had to miss. So that we could actually re-live the classes we were absent for! He never wasted my time, and it encouraged me to not waste his or my classmates.
One of the most in-depth and exhilarating courses in philosophy I have ever taken. The book that was used as the text book was impossible to put down, and what made it even greater was that there was an entire philosophy within the story. The course dove into this philosophy with great accuracy and was a ton of fun to learn.	Dr. Bayer is extremely knowledgeable on the philosophy of the book as well as the other philosophers we discussed alongside the book. He is a very energetic teacher and engages every student with the complexity of the philosophy. He is very helpful with writing papers. He allowed us to submit outlines and meet with him several times before the final submission to ensure the paper was of high quality and that we understood the material. Would highly recommend this professor.
Having the students read some philosophical works alongside Rand's to identify the clash of ideas between the two was well handled.	Clearly understood the book well and well enough to convey that knowledge to the class when needed, though instead promoted discussion so that the students could gain their knowledge on their own.
This course made me appreciate my other classes.	
Not only introduced Ayn Rand's philosophy, but connected the philosophy of other major philosophers to her beliefs. Gave real-world situations to apply the philosophy, making it much easier to understand. Treating it as a combination of a philosophy class and an analysis of a mystery novel kept students excited and engaged. It also did really well at promoting discussion, since the lectures	Dr. Bayer was incredibly enthusiastic about this book and about Ayn Rand in general, and it was contagious. Again, he did really well at making us think for ourselves using some of the information he has helped us see, which really make us feel like we were learning and accomplishing something. He was really good at promoting thinking even on online discussions and paper proposals. He really wanted to

were created in a step by step process. We were allowed to come to conclusions on our own through our own arguments, rather than just being told what Rand believes.	discuss our papers to make sure we were proud of what we learned, not just trying to get a grade.
course material was engaging, utilized it outside of the classroom	very knowledgeable about the subject, great lecture material

Intro to Symbolic Logic, Spring 2016

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
No comment due to the circumstances	Dr. Bayer was placed into a difficult situation and handled it admirably and deserves a good deal of credit and appreciation for his teaching of the class. He certainly has my thanks.
I now appreciate how amazing logic is and hope to learn more in the future.	I respect Dr. Bayer for stepping in after the tragedy and I strongly believe that he performed well as our instructor.
This course allows students to learn a completely new topic, and it allows them to think in a whole new way.	Dr. Bayer was able to come into a class that was broken over the loss of their professor and help us finish the semester. He came in a little strong, but he was able to accomodate us, and I personally, really appreciated it. I was skeptic about Dr. Bayer at the beginning since he had not taught this class in so long, but I was pleasantly surprised.
very informative	The PowerPoints were a good idea
	very clear

Philosophy of Knowledge, Fall 2015

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
	very clear about what he requires of students
Very clear subject matter	Very engaging
this course made me think on a different level than I have in the past.	Dr. Bayer is a great professor. I am not the best in philosophy and he made sure I always knew the material and felt comfortable with it.
Fun, enjoyable	Passionate, loves his work.

Free Will and Determinism, Fall 2015

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
It was interesting and helped us learn.	Knows a lot about the subject matter.
Encouraged open-mindedness and individual thought	Professor's Bayer's slides were very fluent and helpful.
All I'll say is that the smart students clearly succeed in this class and the stupid ones fail. This class is hard	Great at communicating challenging subject matter in an accessible way
Grades came back very quickly. Powerpoints and lecture expanded on and created more understanding of material without being repetitive.	
Enough to talk about in class to have notes on lecture	Attentive and enthusiastic about material
challenged me to really think critically about the material. it was so interesting or challenging that i had to discuss it outside of class to family members and friends. It kept everyone involved.	the teacher was able to teach a difficult and sometimes uninteresting topic in a way that made it interesting. He related it to real life scenarios and took his time and had interest in making sure the material was easily understandable to everyone.
	super enthusiastic about the topic

Making Moral Decisions, Spring 2015

<i>Of the course**</i>	<i>Of the instructor**</i>
Very interesting viewpoints on different moralities	Seems passionate, exceptionally knowledgeable about what he teaches; never not interesting; stimulates critical thinking by constantly being devil's advocate
Highlighted issues of agreement before diving into the controversial topics; each topic was covered succinctly and was always reviewed before moving onto the next topic; straightforward assignments, especially with papers; group discussions worked nicely with topic of morality	Professor Bayer was very dedicated to making sure that each class students walked away understanding something new. Each class held my full attention through class discussion.
I was opened to many perspectives of opinions that were previously unfamiliar. Stimulating class discussion lead by Professor Bayer was always insightful and challenging.	Neutral in the debates and does not judge student for their opinion
Gives students opinion on certain topics a chance to be heard	Knowledgeable, patient, and passionate.
Manageable reading and interesting material inspire worthwhile discussion.	Impressive explanations and real-world examples, stimulated deep thought and discussion
great discussion, critical thought	Makes helpful comments on written assignments
challenging and thought provoking	Knowledgeable and tolerant of differing opinions
It was awesome	He was awesome
Makes you think critically	Enjoys what he teaches

Critical thinking and self applications from the materials studied organized	Organized and must have put lots of effort to keep it organized knows his s***
Extremely analytical and promoted a new way to think of moral controversies. I feel like I learned more in this class than many Philosophy classes I have taken thus far.	He communicates the material extremely effectively without bias. He is very knowledgeable on the material and confident in his teaching style.

***Post-Fall 2014, "of the course" and "of the instructor" comments that appear on the same row are not necessarily from the same student. The new system does not make this clear. Pre-Fall 2014, comments were copied from handwritten surveys.*

Practical Logic, Spring 2015

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
straightforward, tests reflect classwork	professional, smart, communicates
Learn the basics of logic	Extensive understanding of material.
really encourages critical and analytical thinking	passionate about the subject
Easy content	Enthusiastic and knows information
Due dates for assignments were made very clear.	Was easy to contact for questions.
learn how to build an argument	detailed lectures
This course was challenging, but not overly so. I felt I was given an appropriate amount of work.	Dr. Bayer is particularly skilled at explaining these complex logical concepts in ways that are understandable to us logic newbies.
extremely organized, all resources needed for an A were provided. Many opportunities to raise grade.	very organized & thorough
great elective class to take if not a required class. learned a lot about reasoning and fallacies.	very prompt
He was clear on grading and procedures and was fair in grading, other than that, none. This course did not encourage me to think critically...the opinion of the Professor was the only opinion that mattered	Professor is really on point and makes sure that his students grasp as much of his knowledge as possible. It is difficult for someone who is not a philosophy major yet the professor's passion is duly noted.
	wish i would have taken a class from Professor Bayer sooner. Is great at communicating material to students in an efficient way. Gives good examples to help support material.
	communicates promptly.
	I wish I could say something, but I suppose he did have an excitement to teach the content. His enthusiasm was appreciated but he tried too hard-he could of instead tried to form a relationship with the class and encourage class discussion instead of relying on a power point.

Free Will and Determinism, Fall 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Extremely interesting and pertinent subject matter, pretty straightforward lecture class style, interesting powerpoint slides	Knowledgeable, punctual with starting class, explicitly clear with class policies, makes detailed suggestions/corrections for tests and papers
Covers a lot of information and varies yet still ties things together to be understood better	Very knowledgeable and challenges you to do your best and think critically
Lots of discussion. Lectures and slides are well done, which really helps when studying for exams and writing papers.	He's very knowledgeable on this subject
very intellectually challenging	Great lecturer. Allows for independent thinking while trying to get you to think long and hard about what you're saying.
This was my favorite philosophy class I have taken. I am not a big fan of philosophy but this class was so engaging and well explained, if I had any room I would take your morality and ethics class next semester.	very clear
professor	Conveys material well, obviously has knowledge
The structure of reading quiz in the beginning and end helped to promote reading the materials while also helping students comprehend the materials before asking the harder questions.	
interesting material	

Free Will in Thought and Action, Fall 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
very intellectually challenging	very intelligent, well versed and knowledgeable on the topics covered. critical thinker.
It was very interesting and made way for critical thinking.	Very helpful, organized, and taught really well.
The easy accessibility to the notes	His willingness to help each & every student
It is a challenging and stimulating course. Extremely interesting subject matter, I would recommend it to anyone who enjoys philosophy.	Prof. Bayer is a great teacher. You can tell he is very passionate about the subject matter and that it is fun for him to teach, which makes it enjoyable to learn.
Passion which Bayer had for the material	Knowledge.

Interesting Material	Very Clear Lectures
I liked the setup of the course. The online discussion board is a wonderful addition to what is happening in class.	He was interested and excited about the topic, so he was able to clearly and effectively communicate the ideas to his students. His energy made the class exciting.
It was well-organized, the slides were clear, and it was mentally stimulating.	He understood the capabilities of the students and challenged us the right amount.

Practical Logic, Fall 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Class is more than fair. If you attend class regularly, a good grade is a given on homeworks and exams.	Class is very well taught and it really helped that instructor uploaded powerpoint to blackboard, allowing me to pay more attention in class instead of just trying to vigorously type up notes.
encourages rational thinking, helps train people to use logic and see through fallacies	Bayer really puts a lot of effort into teaching this course and it definitely shows.
The PowerPoints were very helpful when it came to studying the material homework, slideshow presentation, and clicker questions	uses real world examples, energetic organized
	In class, he was able to give many examples that further clarified the point he was trying to make. He made the material easy to understand.
	made it very easy to understand material and very helpful with explaining/answering any questions
exams are all written so in order to do well, you really need to know the information	he is on top of his students, stays in contact, grades quickly
alot of assignments	Tries to make topics interesting.
Everything was according to syllabus.	Very knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the subject.
Consistency of homework, reading chapters and lecture slides	Well organized and punctual
For business students, it's interesting to see how classical arguments are formed, and how to apply them in the real world. Business is extremely strategic, so it's understandable why this class is a requirement for business students.	effectively communicates material
powerpoints were thorough and clear, the online discussions were cool, absence policy was cool, engaging the students with the clickers was cool as well	Very discriptive about course.
Teaches you how horribly stupid the world is and how we base our teachings and basic ideas of reasoning on something as silly as practical logic	Smart man with a strong grading procedure
	Stays on task and focused when lecturing
	He is extremely passionate about the subject.
	Really made the subject matter interesting. Loved all the examples, especially the scientific ones. Dr. Bayer is a wonderful professor--you can really tell that he loves teaching the course and he puts a lot of effort into making sure everyone understands the material. Has a very encouraging attitude.
	seems very invested in material and students, sometimes provides good examples
	Really s mart, well composed organized, tries to get students engaged but no one really cares about the subject so it gets really annoying when he tries to make you participate in stead of just relaxin, realizing no one really cares and finishing the lecture

Making Moral Decisions, Spring 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
	Although the amount of time and effort that was necessary for writing papers in this class was abundant, I think more professors should put as much work into feedback as Dr. Bayer did.
	Very organized. Appreciated timely grading. Made course way more interesting than it actually is. Best professor I've had at Loyola. Keep up the good work (I'm a senior BTW)
	Outstanding instructor. I'm probably one of the students with the lowest grade because of myself, but honestly great instructor.
Very well organized.	Very detailed and thorough grading.
Very interesting, I learned a lot.	Makes a typically dull subject exciting. Very good teacher. I recommend him to everyone.
Challenged students to justify moral beliefs in logic.	Called out students on stuff they said that didn't make any sense.
	The instructor conducts the course in an organized manner. Very understanding to athletic obligations.
Clicker surveys. Discussion board.	Very available to help, interested in lectures which comes across in class.

Very mentally challenging. I always questioned my morals and ideas throughout.	[Illegible.] Interesting lecture.
	Very on top of email and responding to questions.
	The content was made interesting by this instructor and course work was enjoyable.
Really enjoyed it!	
Intellectually stimulating.	Intellectually stimulating.
Challenging but fun.	Great!
Very interesting! Learned a lot. My views were challenged and I was exposed to other views that helped me better understand other topics.	Great and energetic! Does an excellent job of teaching material! Very passionate and cares about students.
Great class, well presented.	I really appreciate your teaching style. One of my more entertaining classes in the past four years.
Online discussion was engaging and informative (if slightly [illegible])	Very knowledgeable, professional and engaging.

Practical Logic, Spring 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Good power points.	
	Very knowledgeable.
Great all-around.	Great all-around. Best instructor all year long.
I feel as though I actually learned new material that I had not been exposed to as a second semester senior. I enjoyed coming to class because it involved critical thinking/discussion.	Very organized. Effective communicator. Gave many opportunities to learn and participate. I enjoyed using the clicker for this course.
Interesting.	Seems to care for his subject.
	Good intentions, probably intended to make sure those struggling most could keep up. I prefer a faster paced, more rigorous class.
	Breaks down the material well.
Very challenging.	
Learning new ways to interpret /look at an argument.	Knows what he is teaching and seems enthusiastic about the subject.
	The man.
Great use of technology.	Good at explaining subject matter to people without a background in philosophy.
Topic understanding is very applicable to real life.	Organized, makes expectations clear and gives good feedback.
Very structured, followed syllabus to the "L." I liked the iClicker quizzes and online discussion group.	Gives a lot of time and care to the class and frequently communicates with students. Easily accessible. Replies to email promptly.

Making Moral Decisions, Fall 2013

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Did a thorough job on classic philosophers as well as contemporary. Slides were very helpful and effective. I really enjoyed answering the iClicker questions.	Taught subject effectively. Although he would often play devil's advocate when discussing with students, this helped me understand the subject better.
Interesting class. Broken up so that what was expected was very clear and attainable.	Very passionate about subject. Very knowledgeable. If he was available for a course I needed in Spring I would take professor again.
	Asking good and intellectually stimulating questions.
	Had a sound understanding of all the material and was able to communicate it very effectively.
Extensions policies are very fair. Discussion based class. Responds quickly to emails. In depth grading.	
	Loved the iClicker integration into class.
Made me think critically.	I like the way you taught the class. Slides were helpful. Thanks.
	Knowledgeable and stimulating discussion.
Great class, but I wish that I would've spoken more (afraid of getting shot down).	Clear. Understanding.
	Gives a good overview of materials and explains in great detail.
Great notes!	So helpful with explaining everything and answering questions. Encouraged participation.
Very interesting. Loved this course. Made me think very intellectually.	Funny, explain material very well.
Really helps you find your opinion on popular moral theories.	Very enthusiastic about what he teaches. Not boring! The use of clickers keeps everyone involved.
	Knows what he is talking about.
We knew what we had to do.	Cared about subject. Very easy to reach.
Diverse subject matter.	Intelligent. Good presentation.
Its required.	Knows philosophy.
Challenging and interesting subject matter.	Proposed questions that made me think. Effective teaching style, material.
Good topics. Good debates.	
Challenges us as a whole.	
	Thoughtful and organized.
	Powerpoints were very helpful in keeping up with the material. I really enjoyed the class overall.

Liked Ayn Rand. Variety of theories that could apply to controversies.	Excited about course.
	Good at making people think, and tried to create as much class participation as possible.
	Very serious and strict but outlined his policies clearly beforehand so hard to object to anything.

Epistemology, Fall 2013

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
One of the most stimulating classes I've taken.	Probably smartest person I've ever learned from. Super into his class.
Very interesting and stimulating content.	Very knowledgeable of course content.
Organization helps sort through lots of subject material.	
	Good with email. Good with Blackboard.
Focused and systematic survey of epistemology.	
Good job of allowing me to grasp difficult material.	Did a good job at presenting the material.

Free Will and Determinism, Spring 2013

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
As far as Philosophy courses, Free Will and Determinism is the most practical of the courses I took	Dr. Bayer is a great lecturer. His method of class is good for learning since it follows a good "programme."
Great speaker. Great discussion. Fun.	
This course and instructor challenged me to explore the deepest aspects of human meaning. Dr. Bayer and this course epitomizes the ideals of a holistic Jesuit education.	
Interesting and important material.	Makes class fun and interesting. Clear speaker. Helpful. Sticks to syllabus.
	Very intelligent.
Great format, please encourage other philosophy professors to do the same.	
	Nice guy, easy to listen to.
	Gives good feedback and is very clear in his presentations.
Very interesting.	
	Organized.
Very well organized, great textbook.	Very good at his job. Enthusiastic and smart. I loved this course!
Electronic format for submission was great.	Well organized.
I enjoyed the powerpoint slides to teach; also quiz/class instead of attendance policy.	Incredible instructor, funny, genuinely interesting.
Incredibly organized, relevant, and consistent.	

Practical Logic, Spring 2013

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
	Displayed great knowledge of material and conveyed it well—used helpful lecture slides and kept class active with clicker Q's.
	Great professor! Really challenged me in a lot of ways.
Provides course materials on BB.	
Everything was very well explained and if I had trouble with the definition there were excellent examples to back it up.	
	Obviously put effort into class participation.
	Outstanding professor. Second time I take him.
Intellectually stimulating.	Very engaging, good lecturer, approachable.

Free Will and Determinism, Fall 2012

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Best class I've taken this semester. Observable progressions. Policies incredibly straightforward. Poll questions.	Engaged critical thinking. Adorably awkward and nerdy. Argued against us.
	Presented the material in a good way, making it easier to learn.
	Always prepared. Knows his stuff. Probably spends a lot of time on reddit.com.
While taking this course was required, it definitely raises interesting questions, and stimulates thinking much more than most required classes.	I find Bayer to be very interested/engaged with his subject, and he communicates it very well—he teaches by asking students questions to get them to think critically about the material, rather than spoonfeeding answers.
Incredibly course, very intellectually stimulating, promotes a well informed formulation of opinions about the subject.	Dr. Bayer is thorough and helpful. He was lenient and understanding about extensions. Unbiased about subject matter. Gave more than sufficient resources to succeed.
	The instructor delivered the course material very effectively. I believe he has a strong presence and is very vocal and has the ability to express himself really clearly and effectively.

In depth investigation on a particularly discussion in philosophy. as stimulating and framed class well.	Enthusiastic and knowledgeable about subject material.
This class will change your life if you take it seriously, because the material directly applies to all aspects of your life. I really enjoyed learning all the material and found that I would often talk about it outside of class.	Professor Bayer always puts effort into his slides and how he can explain things to us in a manner that we can understand. He really enjoys teaching the subject and it makes the class a much more enjoyable experience.
Interesting, intellectual.	Explained things so that it was easier to understand. Threw in comical references.
	Best teacher I've had so far.
This course is very challenging, yet fun course. I really enjoyed being part of the class discussions and trying to understand free will and determinism.	He's one of the best and most dedicated teachers I have had. I would definitely recommend Ben Bayer to any student needing to take a philosophy class. He makes a huge effort in trying to catch our attention to the subject and makes it very dynamic.
Challenging, but stimulating once given the proper thought.	Bayer is a nice guy, and an excellent professor. He is very fair and unmatched in the clarity of his test questions, essay assignments, and in-class line of thinking/discussion. I have very much enjoyed his class.
	Ability to effectively communicate difficult materials.
Great class. Fascinating material. Wide range of philosophers and views covered.	Very clear, excellent Powerpoint presentations. Very professional, yet accessible and interesting during lectures.
Very challenging. Interesting content. If you keep up with the readings.	Passionate, sticks to word, does not merely reiterate the content, but translates it into concepts that help the student understand more thoroughly.
Challenging. Extends into the philosophy of the minds, whether our mind brain and body are separate.	
Great class, very interesting.	Professor very thorough but fair. Always available for students. Would recommend to others.
I got my requirement done.	Smart guy.
Very challenging.	Very helpful.
	Dr. Bayer is great. A great teacher in that he always wants students to understand as best as possible. Powerpoints are great as well! I would recommend Dr. Bayer, but probably not this class because it found it very difficult! So great teacher, just not great material.

Practical Logic, Fall 2012

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
The material from this class is useful in my everyday life and helps me in other classes (to articulate)	Taught the subject very well. Made the class interesting.
Gives students different views on how to argue.	Awesome and funny professor. [Inappropriate comment cut.]
Present well. Concise, to the point.	Funny man. Clear instructor.
Great course. Open discussion.	Great teacher. Very passionate, very fair, understanding, explain topics perfectly.
The course and was interesting and your slides and examples made it easy to understand.	
The goals were very well outlined. Knowledge obtained from course is useful.	Nice guy. Fair grading procedures. Thoughtful and helpful critiques on homeworks and test.
	Correction comments were sort of helpful.
	Extremely clear grading procedure. Use of Powerpoints very helpful. Excellent at explaining difficult concepts. Extremely fast turnaround on tests and homework. Very helpful comments.
Really great course. The information I learned and skills I acquired are invaluable for law school if I decide to go there. There should be a Practical Logic 2 in which we apply these concepts more seriously.	Impeccably clear. Really impressed with consistent clarity, energy level, and high level of engagement. If Practical Logic 2 is ever offered, you should teach it!
Very interesting!	Very passionate about subject and is concerned about students! Very nice and funny.
Very easy to follow.	Very prepared, enthused about subject.
	Knew subject matter well. Kept class interesting. Made philosophy a good class. Would recommend.
	Bayer is wonderful. He teaches Practical Logic well and presents course material well. He is a true asset to this college.
Awesome Powerpoints. Awesome presentation. Awesome examples. Extremely good to understand. Clickers were insightful.	Quite possibly the best instructor this semester. Passionate, patient, smart, friendly, approachable and more. Made Practical Logic fun! Tech man! I have no complaints. You rule.
	You knew the material and did a great job of explaining it using examples.
Polices are made clear and abided to at all times.	The professor not only had a clear purpose to this class, but he also followed it closely. The teaching materials were helpful and well-done, and the exams and homework reflective of class content. He was very fair and treated all students respectfully. Very enthusiastic and dedicated.
Very challenging. My arguments are now stronger.	Truly knows the material and therefore can speak confidently about the topic.

I really liked this class. Generally, philosophy not my favorite subject, but this class was interesting and informational. I really feel like I learned a lot, and this was one of my favorite classes of the semester. I liked the online posts as well. It was fun to have ongoing discussions about topics throughout the semester, and by doing the posts, I feel like I learned to use the subjects taught better.	Professor Bayer was very knowledgeable about the subject matter and was happy to teach it to us. His examples made the information easy to remember, and he made the class fun.
	Powerpoints were very helpful. Clickers made it more interesting. You explain everything perfectly, unlike my Intro Philosophy class. I am not really as confused.
	Very helpful.
Interesting and challenging material.	Descriptive. Punctual
Clear grading method.	
	It is extremely obvious that this professor is passionate about his job and loves to educate students. He is always timely in returning assignments and gives adequate time to complete things.
	Enthusiastic, good job overall.
Well organized and outlined. Very beneficial.	Always well prepared and organized. Good job!

Philosophy of Knowledge, Spring 2012

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Favorite Philosophy course I've taken at Loyola.	
	Awesome! Great teacher!!
Very difficult but very rewarding class.	Bayer is very knowledgeable. Fun, encouraging teacher.
This was an amazing course.	The instructor brought further insight to a subject that isn't necessarily my favorite.
Well-organized. Concise & [illegible]	Very motivated. Passionate. Articulate. I very much enjoyed learning from Dr. Bayer.
Ben Bayer.	He is Ben Bayer, the best professor on campus.
	Very polite! Easy going.
	Loved your lectures and attitude
	Very well structured. -Prompt-
	Very organized, Knowledgeable.
	Excellent teaching.
Definitely not for the faint of heart, but comprehensive PowerPoint slides help.	Professor Bayer made himself readily available for students, if they had questions. I should've taken advantage of that.
Enjoyed it greatly.	Communicated material very passionately. Kept my interest.

WEAKNESSES

Making Moral Decisions, Spring 2016

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Sometimes philosophy can be hard	none
lots of material	condescending
The only thing is that it was an early morning class and sometimes hard to be completely awake for it.	
The online discussions were not helpful at all and neither were the quizzes	Worded things oddly, slightly abrasive, showed clear favoritism towards ideas and students; incredibly judgmental of, bias towards, and immensely ignorant about the city of New Orleans

Philosophical Themes in Ayn Rand, Spring 2016

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Too heavy of a workload	Sometimes looks for a very specific answer, and it can lead to a halt in class discussion as everyone tries to figure out what he's looking for
It's a lengthy book which doesn't leave room for other discussions during class.	
Online discussions often seem forced	
The course is rigorous and challenging to do well in. This is indeed not a weakness, however, it is more difficult than the majority of classes I have taken at Loyola.	This is philosophy, where there is no concrete answer for a theory, and you do not have all of the answers, regardless of your feelings on Rand and how much you have looked into her teaching. You are the teacher and the student.
The course seemed like it would be overwhelming - work wise. In the end, it was not. The course was more than manageable. I personally can't stand forced "discussion board" kind of things, and it is not because I don't love a good discussion. But instead because I don't want to talk at a bunch of people who don't care about the class and I feel that most people don't or they want to talk about	

things that I don't care about. I talk to strangers about the weather and local news (maybe), but I don't want to talk to a random so and so about philosophy and what I think I believe. I do much better with voicing my opinion to humans who care about those things too, and that unfortunately is not made clear until the course goes on and you learn who your friends are. If the discussion board idea was kept in the mix, maybe Dr. Bayer could post three questions for us to answer and go from there. requiring an answer to one of the questions and then a response to someone else's answer. That might work a little better.	
It required a lot of reading, but the book was hard to put down so it was not always a difficult thing to do.	
Having the philosophic texts be optional was likely a poor choice. I definitely understand not wanting to overload the student with work, but I feel that it being optional the student would likely not read it, thus missing some crucial learning about the other philosophies Rand counters.	
The online discussion board is a terrible concept. Do away with it. In class discussion is enough. It provides for a more connected forum. Get rid of the online discussion groups.	
could get dry at times	
Time slots. Class depends on group discussion. Less people take later classes.	

Intro to Symbolic Logic, Spring 2016

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Dr. Altschul taught the material more effectively. If I started with Dr. Bayer I would have dropped the class.	
the textbook	Dr. Bayer was sometimes confusing in explaining problems, but he tried to make things as clear as possible.
Needless to say it was difficult to get the course running again after Altschul passed.	It is obvious that he knows the material but he does not know how to convey it to his students
This course moves too fast. It could be broken into 2 semesters to be more beneficial to students.	

Philosophy of Knowledge, Fall 2015

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
	very euro-centric
that one guy in class who never shut up	

Free Will and Determinism, Fall 2015

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Gets repetative	
seemed that some kids simply weren't intellectually prepared for the complex subject matter	
Spending \$50 on a course pack filled with scanned pages that could have been uploaded to Blackboard for free.	
Textbook course pack	
at times can really be too challenging. some of the material really could lead you to question your beliefs and ways of the universe. Not so much a bad thing, but wondering if it is on the level for undergraduates.	The way you ask questions is always either super wordy and confusing or the answer is so obvious and dumb. I think the clicker quizzes that were just about opinion we unnecessary and Im so angry I spent money for the app because it did not add to the class it only made grading the quizzes easier for you. Also the second paper question was confusing and if you consistently have poeople who don't do well because they are not answering the right question then it is probably the question not all of us. Asking college seniors obvious questions is taken as condescending and will not make it participation any better. Also the discussion board is kind of redundant if we have good conversations in class. Also the set up of the powerpoints is confusing how you repeat multiple slides on each presentation.
We studied WAYYYY too many philosophers. Its impossible to keep them straight	

Making Moral Decisions, Spring 2015

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
----------------------	--------------------------

A little too much quizzes giving to quickly	He has his own way of teaching which interferes with other peoples opinion of his lectures. Seems like he does not appreciate being contradicted
Mundane lectures, hard tests (because they cover so many different authors)	homework load was intense but kept students up to date with information
Expensive book	Grades rigorously without having taught the material adequately. Provides unclear instructions regarding paper format. Begins discussion with an open mind but quickly shuts down the ideas of students.
felt rushed in the end of semester	Needlessly pedantic.
easy to doze off	I dropped this class im annoyed that i have to fill out an evaluation
	disrespectful, cuts people off who try to contribute to class discussion

Practical Logic, Spring 2015

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
HATE THE DISCUSSION BOARDS!!!!!! A waste of my time! Pointless discussion! Causes people to post just to get points, rather than to try to stimulate conversation. RUINED THE COURSE FOR ME.	sometimes comes off as abrasive toward more out-spoken students
online discussion is pointless	Does not always convey material in an easy to comprehend manner.
The economic examples. Most examples and homework questions were relatable to me and my classmates, but the economic examples were sometimes hard to follow (I've never taken any sort of economics course...).	sometimes doesn't see things from other people's point of view
limited discussion in class	Some examples used in class were debatable, but he presented them as fact.
The tests and homework assignments require more critical thinking than the professor allows. Questions and problems must be shorter.	concepts were presented in a wordy way, but explained very well
It's a poorly designed course-the structure was clear though. I didn't learn much, and I tried very hard to-the content seems irrelevant to much of anything.	As a philosopher, I would expect the professor to be able to help his students boost their grades and be flexible with grading. Unfortunately, this was not the case. I am a finance major and have no interest in taking this course, but I still had to. I put effort into it and my grades reflected it. The sad part is that only because I failed to meet all of his attendance requirements at the 9:30 am session many times because I was truly unable to, the professor downgraded my grade a whole letter. I understand that rules are rules, but I would expect him to understand that we have other courses and circumstances going on in life, that I'm putting effort even though I dislike the subject, and am not always able to make it to his class.
	I like his passion, but he is close-minded and follows his strict policies as if they were glorious. He does not know how to approach the student with absolutely no interest in the class.
	only weakness is that sometimes he can talk a little fast, but other than that he is very clear
	Makes the material overly complicated. He must understand his audience, mostly business major taking the mandatory course (not philosophy majors.)
	It's absurd that the one textbook for the class was written by the Professor teaching it-I find it highly unethical which is ironic considering he is a Professor of Philosophy. I also feel his opinion and beliefs were projected onto the class-I did not appreciate feeling I had to "play the game" for this class and just please the Professor. At Loyola our Professors should encourage us to truly learn and form our own opinions (of course with evidence to back it up though). I felt like none of our Jesuit ideals were involved or crossed over into the course. ola, we should strive to have Professors that f

Free Will and Determinism, Fall 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Not much interaction in class besides occasional questions (online discussions replace this I guess)	Sometimes seems cocky
not interesting, material was very difficult to comprehend and confusing	Very particular in grading but, if instructions are followed, you should do fine
The online discussion should be reconsidered. Maybe giving the option of verbal participation or a balance between the two.	His teaching is all over the place, Which can be confusing
The only component was really unnecessary. It was just a forced recap of may of he conversations that we had already had in class.	confusing

The course has too many components to keep up with. I think the blog post was too much to keep up with. Course matter seems a bit redundant.	The syllabus and all the time/ date constraints were confusing. In an effort to be as clear as possible, the polices were over thought and made more complex than necessary.
Online discussion was annoying	Some explanations were not thorough enough.
online google group	too much online oriented discussion, I did not sign up for an online class
The clicker questions used to illustrate points could be very obvious and somewhat condescending at times. Very easy logical leaps were drawn out step by step in an obvious manner that dragged along at times.	
Course packets are ridiculous	

Free Will in Thought and Action, Fall 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
challenging for those incapable of keeping up	gets excited and worked up easily
Bayer's not very friendly, and some of his descriptions were unclear	goes through the material almost the same way every time
Tedious work. Mundane. Unmotivating.	
Get repetitive towards the end	
Some people dropped out because they were intimidated by the course description on the first day.	

Practical Logic, Fall 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
I felt as if the Online Discussion component became a tedious task rather than something that I was able to learn from.	sometimes references are beyond normal scopes of knowledge
took place 8:30 am	hard to talk to.
online discussion	He talks in a condescending tone when arguing a point with a student. Sometimes I can see where he is coming from in that it is obvious that the student is wrongly arguing this point but instead of knocking the student down, try to understand where the person is coming from and what they believe before dismissing them
	needs to improve on how he responds to peoples opinions or answers that are wrong, can be a little harsh sometimes.
discussion posts are less than ideal	he is too on top of his students.
I do not see much value on the subject for my career.	Sometimes can seem too eager (especially so early in the morning)
if you get the answer correct and still don't give the best argument or explanation for your answer, its still wrong. some topics are hard to explain even if the student understands the subject	As a senior it was disheartening to have him as a professor. I have really cherished many of the relationships I have made with professors here at Loyola. He was SO rude and condescending. Truly the worst professor in terms of the type of person he is that I have ever had. I go out of my way to tell friends to avoid him. He takes pride in students not doing well but "tricking" them in examples.
discussion threads	hard to read his handwriting so didn't understand comments made in the test
Making Moral Decisions and Practical Logic could really be combined. MMD is basically like Practical Logic, but with a moral vs. immoral component. There's absolutely no need to have two additional philosophy classes for business students.	too fast paced
more examples on the powerpoints	Took philisopy too seriously.
sooo boring, dull, pointless, sickenigly logical; every second you ask yourself "why am I doing this"	Presupposes he is correct and openly admonishes students for wrong answers.
	Places a strange pressure on students to understand things immediately during lectures, not everyone has the same learning pace.
	For starters, Dr. Bayer is extremely condescending towards students. Although it's subtle, he makes remarks that suggest that if students don't immediately understand what is being taught, then they are not very intelligent. He also purposefully tries to create trick questions, so that students will (to his apparent enjoyment) get answers wrong, so he can teach everyone "a lesson" from it. Instead of praising students when they answer correctly, he focuses on the students who answer incorrectly, and makes them feel embarrassed that they were mistaken. In addition, using background information, that he swears is common knowledge but isn't (i.e. volcanoes, atomic numbers, movie references, etc.) can often result in a student getting a question wrong - even though they know the material that relates to the class.

	Great teacher but he can have a little passive aggressive sas sometimes that is really annoying. tries to get students involved in a subject no one cares about, i guess its not his fault but its how it is,
--	---

Making Moral Decisions, Spring 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
	Respect other people's opinion, not just your own.
	Class always runs 1-2 minutes over, an hour 15 is already a long time!
	Some leading questions in lectures didn't leave room to express decisions about morality thoroughly (iClicker q's)
	Online discussion. I do not like posting ideas about my morality on the internet/blogs.
	Sometimes the professor talked too fast to understand clearly.
Textbook.	Teaching style is condescending. Kind of a jerk. Really dread this class.
Online discussion.	
The copies in the textbook are occasionally blurred/hard to read. Quizzes use sections too specific, quoting an exact line rather than a general idea.	

Practical Logic, Spring 2014

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
	The grading procedure was a little confusing to understand on Blackboard.
Don not make this a required course, especially for Business students. Can honestly say this was the least beneficial course I have taken at Loyola. Will not and have not recommend this course/professor to anyone.	Arrogant. Condescending. Stick to teaching philosophy, not everything else you try to teach us about, when you are obviously not an expert in every field.
	Every class period we spend 5-10 minutes announcing the same thing (about upcoming assignments). This is a waste of valuable time. Also, some of the examples are too extreme, involving assassinations, aliens, etc., that I wonder how practical this logic actually is. 'All balls are red.' These kind of statements, whatever the context, turned me off completely. My interest was not held, and as a result I slacked off.
Hard to grasp some concepts.	Not very helpful for students. Does not see arguments from other views kindly.
	Gives off a cocky presence that got distracting at times.
Same thing every class, gets repetitive and boring.	Does not grade homework before tests fast enough.
Please add more multiple choice questions to exams.	
	Too arrogant. Uncomfortable classroom environment to ask questions.
I felt there was no point in buying the textbook.	

Making Moral Decisions, Fall 2013

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
I did not really learn anything that would have influenced my career nor life.	Seemed a little too cocky with his statements. Feels like his statements and opinions are the only correct things.
We don't need this many quizzes! A lot of the material was far too dense, so even when I did read, I still failed the quizzes.	This is a common curriculum elective, but it is treated like a philosophy major course. Those of us without philosophy backgrounds were truly at a loss. Awful! Very condescending. Always goes over class time. Forced students into pointless group discussions that waste class time. Very tough grader. Would never recommend!
We went in circles too often at times and lost track of topic.	
	Interrupting students when they are speaking.
	Quiz questions were often very difficult, even after reading and rereading the article.
Clicker questions confusing at times.	
Really needed a table of contents in the CP booklets.	
	Went over some material too quickly. Tried to teach too much in one class period.
The readings were a bit boring/confusing.	
The blog isn't a useful source and is too easy to forget about.	
If we had a study guide that would have been more helpful for studying for tests because there is a lot of material covered.	
Online discussion difficult to keep up with or trying not to repeat what another person said by "agreeing" or "disagreeing."	
Online discussion is the worst. More of our grade should reflect class participation.	
Moved a little fast on note slides.	

	Vain, talks down to students. Refutes every answer , condescending unclear in speech and writing instructions. We hate group work. Unrealistic. No philo majors here.
Bland material. No room for creativity. Weird vibe.	Condescending responses to student discussion. Led to force-fed drone classes.
	Presentations are boring.
Boring classes. People sit on computers. Don't pay attention. He should cover less things in class and have more personal opinion.	
	Opinionated. Pedantic.
	Did not provide definite answers to questions that were raised. Confusing comments on papers.
	Intimidating. Discussion always resulted in student being wrong.
Steep grading scale (A -> 96-100)	
Online discussion is worth too much and is not helpful. It is not always reflective of someone's intellect. Too many readings, and they were too long causing many people to skip them.	
	Condescending and made students feel as though there were never any right answers—this caused a lot of people to stop participating.
	I think that he was condescending and an unfair grader.
I feel the online discussions were, while stimulating, too weighty on the grade of the class.	

Epistemology, Fall 2013

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
A little too intense. Online discussion board was lacking.	
Too much content and too many theories.	Went very rapidly.
More active discussion; I feel like not everyone always knows what's going on.	

Free Will and Determinism, Spring 2013

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
	I strongly (strongly) disagree with the "textbook" Dr. Bayer assigned. It was a badly photocopied (and somewhat incomplete) and could have put it on Blackboard. Especially since he said "paper is passé" in regards with online papers.
The online discussion felt like a waste of time.	
	Need to dumb down material. Not all of us have philosophy doctorates.
Too many quizzes.	
Both the essays felt like busy work and didn't really do anything for me. At no point during the class did I feel like it was a valuable asset to my education, but that's the story of all my common curriculum, felt like it was there to take up space more than anything.	
	Your expectations are a bit too high, not all of us are abstract thinkers! We struggle!
Too much reliance on discussion group/board, couldn't figure out what else needed to be said.	
	Unclear.
Did not find online discussions useful.	
Challenging	Don't understand sometimes his arguments. Explain more.
Stupid course content.	Extremely full of himself.
Online discussion was not helpful. Tedious and droll.	
	I'm not going to say he's a "bad" professor but there is definitely something to say about a guy who is incapable of talking about ANYTHING outside of philosophy. I felt weird from his response to "How you doing?"
	In order to get an A, you need a 96 or better. I am a committed honors student and I did not make this mark so I stopped trying and still got an A-.
Way too many assignments. Between preparing for quizzes, online posts, papers, and exams, it's easy to become disengaged and overwhelmed.	The sing-sonly voice! Good almight, the sing-songy voice is so distracting and unsettling.

Practical Logic, Spring 2013

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
Online discussion post.	
Online component was difficult for me only because I do not do well with debates and discussions.	
Blogs!! People forgot about the blogs.	

Free Will and Determinism, Fall 2012

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
I think you could have touched on how all-encompassing this philosophical debate is. It influences almost every subject and every great thinker.	
One topic also got a bit old.	Not the best at clarifying and organizing dense concepts of philosophers.
Sometimes difficult.	
It would be better if you proposed a subject for the online discussion because I think many people went off the topic we should've been discussing.	
I don't like the online discussion.	
I would have found a subject with more conclusive possibilities somewhat more exciting.	The discussion board somewhat lackluster, though that is because of student interest, not Bayer's fault. Maybe have prompts at the end of the lecture slides for appropriate discussion posts?
	Needs to be a bit clearer for grading papers. The comments were helpful.
	I think he might be Canadian.
Sometimes tough to follow.	
There was a lot of material and I would preferred focusing on a smaller amount of philosophers so that you didn't have to push through. Easy to confuse philosophers.	
I didn't enjoy this course. I was confused a lot.	
A weakness of the class I would say is the online discussion part of the class. This may just be because I dislike the online portion. It may have been helpful for other students but I didn't feel it helped me understand the material differently.	

Practical Logic, Fall 2012

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
	I think Bayer crammed too much info into this course.
	Goes over time.
Tech problems. Online discussions can get a little stale.	
	I believe that I devoted a lot of time to this class and your grading policy hurts the student more than it helps because it is extremely hard to achieve an A even if your work is of A caliber.
The trick questions on the tests were a little harsh. We're not all logicians you know!	N/A
	The set up of homework I didn't like. The format really confused me. It was just too cluttered.
	Attendance shouldn't be so strict, some students have work/part time, children, and unfortunately some get sick a lot.
Discussion board is a nuisance in which not much is learned and too much weight is given.	

Philosophy of Knowledge, Spring 2012

<i>Of the course</i>	<i>Of the instructor</i>
No more clickers.	
Dislike Clickers in general.	
Not a fan of the iClickers.	
Too short.	He's not in my life all the time.
Google Forum is a bit intimidating.	
Definitely the least challenging philosophy class I've had in four years.	
NO CLICKERS	
I think iClickers are OK.	
Clickers.	Come to a point, then discuss—not the other way around! Google isn't streamlined for this, use a different web site.
Too specific, rigorous.	
Easier quizzes?	

PHILOSOPHY R122: PHILOSOPHY OF THE HUMAN PERSON

Loyola University of New Orleans, Fall 2016, Dr. Ben Bayer

Section 001: MWF, 9:30–10:20 pm, Bobet 216

Updated: August 27, 2016

GENERAL COURSE INFORMATION AND POLICIES

CONTACT INFORMATION

Email: bjbayer@loyno.edu

Cell phone: (719) 439-2047

Office phone: (504) 865-3945

OFFICE HOURS (BOBET HALL 435)

Mondays and Wednesdays: 10:30am–11:15am; 2:30pm–4:30pm; Fridays: 10:30am–11:15am

COURSE DESCRIPTION

What does it mean to be a human being? This is one example of a philosophical question, and one that connects to a great many cultural and political controversies. In this course, we will begin by examining two such controversies (about abortion and inequality), which to resolve we would have to answer crucial questions about the nature of humanity. After illustrating the variety of philosophical questions that intersect with these everyday disputes, we will proceed to examine some of those major questions in greater depth. These will include questions about the relationship between morality and the self, questions about freedom of the will, and questions about the relationship between views of the human person and view of a divine person.

COURSE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES

1. To cultivate student competence in philosophical inquiry through the reading of primary texts in the history of philosophy and the understanding and evaluation of philosophical argumentation.
2. To cultivate student inquiry into fundamental philosophical issues and their relation to the history of philosophy through the understanding and evaluation of philosophical argumentation and the comprehension of basic issues in metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics.

Learn more about **Loyola's learning objectives for** this course here: <http://goo.gl/dhSg5t>

GRADING

Quizzes	15%
Online participation	15%
Paper #1	20%
Paper #2	20%
Exam #1	15%
Exam #2	15%
In-class participation	Extra credit up to an extra 5%

GRADING SCALE*:

96–100: A	71–75: C+
91–95: A-	66–70: C
86–90: B+	61–65: C-
81–85: B	56–60: D+
76–80: B-	51–55: D

* your final grade is rounded *up* from your course average to the closest integer.

REQUIRED TEXTS

- All texts are public domain/royalty free readings available on Blackboard.

REQUIRED HARDWARE: ICCLICKERS OR REEF

This semester I will be using the new REEF digital polling system to facilitate in-class opinion polls, quizzes, and other forms of interaction. To use REEF in class, you must use *either* of the following options:

- The REEF application for your Iphone, Android phone, or laptop, downloadable from your app store or from here: <http://reef-education.com/download/>. To use the app you will need to purchase a subscription, which is available for any of the following intervals:
 - 6 months: \$14.99; 1 year: \$23.99
 - *You can try the subscription for free for the first two weeks*
- iClicker Classroom Response System: ~\$54 new, \$43 used, \$37/24 rental at the Loyola Bookstore. At this time if you have a physical iClicker, you do not need to purchase a REEF subscription, but **you'll still need to create a REEF account.**

You will *either* need to use your mobile device to subscribe to REEF *or* use an older iClicker remote control: either will work. Both require creation of a REEF account (with a subscription if you are using the app) at <http://app.reef-education.com/#/account/create>

Instructions for creating your account can be found here: <http://goo.gl/PGbjid>

Some tips for saving money on physical iClickers:

- You can resell your iClicker after the semester for about half price, or keep it for other classes.
- You can use an iClicker from a previous semester, and you can use it for future classes.
- **You can borrow a friend's iClicker** as long as you use the same one consistently.

At the beginning of the semester, you will have the duration of the first week to purchase your REEF option and create an account. At the end of the first week, I will begin using REEF for graded quizzes.

INTERNET ACCESS

It will be important to be able to regularly access your loyno.edu email, Blackboard, and the Google discussion group. Email will be my first line of communication: I will send out frequent email reminders about course material and about upcoming deadlines. You should check roughly email every day. All email announcements will subsequently be posted on Blackboard.

Blackboard will contain much of what you need to complete the course: recordings of live lectures you might miss, lecture slides, links to the online discussion, information about papers, and your grades on all **of these. A detailed summary of all readings, lectures, and deadlines can be found on "Course Overview"** (this contains the *essence* of everything you need to know to follow the class online). You can log in here: <http://loyno.blackboard.com>

You will also participate in a Google Groups-based online discussion group, for which you'll need to use a **Google account. I'll ask you to give me any email address you have associated with an existing Google account, or to create a Google account and let me know which address you've associated with it. You can create a Google account in association with any existing email address, including your loyno.edu account.**

ATTENDANCE POLICY

Attendance is not a required component of your grade. However, you will take in-class quizzes which you cannot make up after the fact. **There is an extra credit bonus available for active in-class participation (up to 5 percentage points toward your final course grade).**

RECORDED LECTURES

I am making recordings of the audio and slides of the class and will make these available online for students in the live class who may miss a class. You can find links to Adobe Connect recordings under “Recorded Lectures” on Blackboard; links to them will also appear under “Course Overview.”

ONLINE GRADES

You will be able to review all of your grades, including recently graded quizzes and online discussion posts, in Blackboard’s online Grade Center. Here are a few notes on interpreting what you’ll see there:

- Q1, Q2, etc., are your quiz grades. QuizAvg is your raw average. Drop1QuizAvg is your average dropping your lowest score (likewise for Drop2 and Drop3).
- D1A, D1B, D2A, D2B, etc., are your online discussion grades. If you only do one post in period 1, for example, you will only see a grade under D1A.
- Dsum is your online point total, while CurrentD% is an estimate of your online discussion average, calculated by comparing your point total to the total points possible up until that time of the semester.
- CurrentAvg is an estimate of your current overall course average, determined by an average of your current grades weighted in proportion to course requirements completed up to that point of the semester.

EMERGENCIES

I reserve the right to make exceptions to any of my policies stated below when students can provide verifiable evidence of an emergency situation that make it impossible to comply with my requirements.

NOTES ON UNIVERSITY STUDENT SERVICES

EVACUATION POLICY

At times, ordinary university operations are interrupted as a result of tropical storms, hurricanes, or other emergencies that require evacuation or suspension of on-campus activities. To prepare for such emergencies, all students will do the following during the first week of classes:

1. Practice signing on for each course through Blackboard.
2. Provide regular and alternative e-mail address and phone contact information to each instructor.

In the event of an interruption to our course due to the result of an emergency requiring an evacuation or suspension of campus activities, students will:

3. Pack textbooks, assignments, syllabi and any other needed materials for each course and bring during an evacuation/suspension.
4. Keep up with course work during the evacuation/suspension as specified on course syllabi and on-line Blackboard courses.
5. Complete any reading and/or writing assignments given by professors before emergency began.

Assuming a power source is available....

6. Log on to university Web site within 48 hours of an evacuation/suspension.
7. Monitor the main university site (www.loyno.edu) for general information.
8. Log on to each course through Blackboard or e-mail within 48 hours of an evacuation/suspension to receive further information regarding contacting course instructors for assignments, etc.
9. Complete Blackboard and/or other online assignments posted by professors (students are required to turn in assignments on time during the evacuation/suspension period and once the university campus has reopened.)

10. Contact professors during an evacuation/suspension (or as soon as classes resume on campus) to explain any emergency circumstances that may have prevented them from completing expected work.

Further information about student responsibilities in emergencies is available on the Academic Affairs web site: <http://academicaffairs.loyno.edu/students-emergency-responsibilities>

In the event that there is an interruption to our course due to the cancellation of classes by the university as a result of an emergency, we will continue our course on Blackboard within 48 hours after cancellation. I plan on conducting the course in its entirety using streaming video from <http://www.livestream.com/benbayer> in the event that the university is dismissed for an extended period of time.

DISABILITIES

If you have a disability and wish to receive accommodations, please contact Disability Services at 504-865-2990, ods@loyno.edu, or visit the Office of Disability Services in Marquette Hall 112. Please note that before any accommodations can be implemented, you must obtain an official Course Accommodation Record from Disability Services for my signature.

WRITING HELP

From WAC: "Writing is a process. Start your writing assignments well before the due date and always have another person review your work before you turn it in." Also: "Writing Across the Curriculum assists students writing in any discipline and at any stage of the writing process—from brainstorming to revising. WAC tutors do not write or edit papers, but they do help student writers improve their writing and strengthen their critical thinking skills. Tutoring is free and no appointments are necessary. Visit us in Bobet 100, call us at 865-2297, or visit us on the web at www.loyno.edu/wac "

QUIZZES

There will a quiz every day over the course of the semester. Here are some important policies about quizzes:

- Classes will usually begin with a question about the reading assigned for the day. **These quizzes are closed-book and closed-note.**
- Classes will usually end with questions about the reading that were discussed in the lecture. **These quizzes are open-book and open note.** This is to incentivize your note-taking process in class.
- Obviously, your quiz answers are your own, not copied from or taken by a neighbor.
- **There is no way to make up missed quizzes**, unless you arrange to take a quiz in advance of a class you plan to miss. You must arrange with me **24 hours in advance** of your quiz to do this. You can also make up for missed quizzes by taking the quiz in the other section of my class (see the schedule on top of the syllabus).
- **You must bring your Clicker or REEF-enabled mobile device to take the quizzes for full credit** (see below). You may take the quizzes on paper, but only for half credit (unless you brought a malfunctioning device to class and you show me that you brought it).
- At the end of the semester, I will drop your **lowest three** quiz scores.

ONLINE DISCUSSION

ABOUT YOUR ONLINE PARTICIPATION GRADE

- Online participation is worth 15% of your grade.
- I will post at least one question per biweekly grading period (and usually more) to encourage discussion, but you should feel free to post your own discussion questions as well.
- Original posts, questions, and replies to prompts or other posts can all count for points.

- I assign a score between .5 and 3 points to each of your posts. Your point total will be posted on the Blackboard Grading Center. Your grade is determined by the scale below.
- **To receive credit for your post, you must be sure it goes to the whole group**, not just to me or the author of a post. Please make sure your response goes to bayer-humanperson1-fall2016@googlegroups.com if you are posting by email.
- **I will count a maximum of two posts per biweekly grading period** towards your grade. If you post more than that, I will count the scores of your two best posts.
- **There is no required number of posts per biweekly period.** To get the desired point total of 20 you must write a quality post most grading periods, but not necessarily all.
- **You can skip a period or two and make up for it with more posts later**, but you can only do this to a limited extent because of the maximum number counted per week.
- Posts do not need to be extremely lengthy—a paragraph or two of reflection will be sufficient.
- Grading periods generally end on **Wednesday nights**.

INDIVIDUAL POST GRADES

- 1 point: either your post asks a trivial question of your own or is not responsive to questions posed by others in a discussion thread, or is not clearly written enough to express your point.
- **2 points: your post is “minimally relevant”:** either you have asked a new question that begins a new thread of discussion, or your post adds a new thought to an existing discussion thread. Minimally relevant posts should be around 100 words.
- 3 points: your post is significantly relevant: either you have asked an original and insightful question that begins an especially interesting discussion, or you contribute significantly to an existing thread. I reserve the right to assign more than 3 points for posts of exceptional quality.

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING HIGH QUALITY POSTS

High-quality posts are *philosophical* posts. Philosophical posts attempt to engage with the *arguments* of the **philosophers we’re examining and the arguments of your fellow students**. **Do they offer logical reasons for the views they advance?** Are the objections raised against them decisive or not? Here are some tips for making the conversation more philosophical. Here are some tips for writing a high-quality post:

- **Read the whole thread of conversation for a given topic before posting.** This will give you a better idea of what ideas have already been discussed, and about whether **you’re** repeating something someone has already said. The purpose of your posting is to move the discussion forward.
- **Pay attention to the questions I’m asking other posters, and try to answer them.** I usually make short responses to **others’** posts and aimed at moving the conversation to the next important issue. **They’re** not just intended for the poster, but for anyone who wants to take up the question I’m raising. Please use the material I give as a chance to make an original point of your own.
- **Be sure to read or review my lecture or book chapter before discussing the material.** If **you’re** discussing an idea with just a kind of generalized understanding picked up from the discussion group, the conversation **won’t** be as good.

KEEPING THE DISCUSSION ORGANIZED

The online discussion group is a high-volume email list with many students receiving emails. For **everyone’s benefit it is best to keep the discussion as organized as possible and the number of posts received by each student to the minimum necessary:**

- **If you are replying to posts via email, please send your posts to the @googlegroups.com address only.** Please delete all other addresses, such as those of the author you’re replying to.
- **To contribute to an existing thread of conversation, please reply to that thread.** Please don’t start a new thread with a different subject header, as a few of you have already done, unless you mean to start a conversation on a new topic.
- **Please start new threads of conversation when the specific topic is new.** To do this you can send a post with a new and distinctive subject header to the @googlegroups.com address, or by clicking the red “New Topic” button on the web version of the online group.

GRADING SCALE FOR ONLINE PARTICIPATION

Here is the scale I will use to determine your letter grade, based on a sum of the points described above at the end of the semester:

<i>Sum of points</i>	<i>Letter grade</i>	<i>Sum of points</i>	<i>Letter grade</i>
19-20	A = 1.0	7-8.99	C = .70
17-18.99	A- = .95	5-6.99	C- = .65
15-16.99	B+ = .90	3-4.99	D+ = .60
13-14.99	B = .85	1-2.99	D = .55
11-12.99	B- = .80	0-.99	F = .50
9-10.99	C+ = .75		

SCHEDULE

Here are the periods during each of which I will count no more than two of your posts:

- Mon., August 22nd–Wed., August 31st
- Thurs., September 1st–Wed., September 14th
- Thurs., September 15th–Wed., September 28th
- Thurs., September 29th–Wed., October 12th
- Thurs., October 13th–Wed., October 26th
- Thurs., October 27th–Wed., November 9th
- Thurs., November 10th–Wed., November 23rd
- Thurs., November 24th–Friday, December 9th

Please do not wait until the end of the day on the last day of each grading period to submit your posts. If you do this, it will diminish the chances that you will be engaging in an actual discussion with other students, which will increase the chances **that you'll not be writing substantive posts.**

Each of these grading periods will end at **11:59pm** at the end of the day of the last day (usually, Wednesday nights). Posts after this time will count towards the next grading period.

SOFTWARE

We will use Google Groups as our online discussion forum, rather than the discussion forum on Blackboard (which is difficult to use effectively). You will be able to access the forum here: <https://goo.gl/k3Lp64>

Here are directions for how to join the Google Group:

- **If you already have a Gmail account** or another email address associated with a Google account which you would like to use for this group, you should give me this address on the first day of class (or earlier) and I will add you directly to the group. Or, if you are already signed in to your account, you can visit the <https://goo.gl/k3Lp64> and click **“Subscribe to this group”**
- **If you do not already have a Google account, you'll need to create an account.** Here are the directions for doing so:
 1. Go to <https://goo.gl/k3Lp64>, or simply to <http://groups.google.com>, and click **“Sign in to view this group”** or the blue **“Sign in”** button on the upper right hand corner.
 2. **If you see an email address already appearing under “Choose an account,”** it means you may actually have an account already. If so, follow the directions on the list above.
 3. **If you would like to create a Google account to associate with a pre-existing non-Gmail address, click the “Add account” option.** On the next screen, click the **“Create account”** link at the bottom:
 - a. **Click “I prefer to use my current email address,”** and fill out the form to choose a password by which to log into your new Google account.
 - b. **Once you've filled out this and the remaining information, you'll get an email** from Google asking to verify that this is your email address. Click on the link in that address and the account will be created.
 - c. **Email me to let me know what email address you've used to create your Google account and I will add you to the group.** Or if you've already been added, you'll now be able to verify your membership and read posts.
 4. **If you would like to create a new Gmail address to use as your Google account,** click the **“Add account”** option. On the next screen, click the **“Create account”** link at the bottom:
 - a. Choose a Gmail username and fill out the form to choose a password by which to log into your new Google account.

- b. **Email me to let me know what email address you've used to create your Google account and I will add you to the group. Or follow the directions at the top to subscribe to the group on your own.**
5. **By default I will make your account "all email." If you would rather not receive emails every time someone posts to the group, or instead digest of a given day's posts, you should visit the URL listed above and click the grey "My membership" button, and can choose from among several options.**

To post messages to the group, either send them to bayer-humanperson1-fall2016@googlegroups.com or post directly through the web at the address <https://goo.gl/k3Lp64>

PAPER ASSIGNMENTS

You will have two papers due this semester, on September 9th and November 22nd. Assignment prompts will be distributed several weeks in advance of each deadline. At that time I will also encourage you to schedule a meeting with me (live or on the phone) to discuss a draft or outline of your paper in advance of the deadline. This is your one opportunity to rewrite in light of my feedback. **There are no rewrites after your deadline has passed.**

TURN-IN POLICIES

EXTENSIONS

I offer students extended deadlines for assignments under a variety of circumstances, but to receive one, **you must request an extension for a graded assignment in writing, 96 hours (four days) before the due date before the due date.** (See the times and dates of deadlines on the class schedule below.) All assignments turned in after an agreed-upon extension deadline fall into the category of late as of the extension deadline (with usual late policies described below applying). For the extension to apply, you must email me a request in writing, and we must agree on a new deadline. No extensions will be granted for a period of longer than four days after the original deadline.

LATE EXTENSION POLICY

Asking for and receiving an extension before the due date, but later than 96 hours prior will at first result in your assignment being downgraded by the following amounts, depending on how much time remains before the class deadline, provided that you turn the paper in by the new agreed-upon deadline:

- between 24 hours and 96 hours before the class deadline: **10 points**
- less than 24 hours before the class deadline: **20 points**

LATE ASSIGNMENT POLICY

A late assignment received without any request for an extension will be downgraded by the following amounts, depending on how late the paper is:

- immediately after the deadline (even if only one minute late)/up to 12 hours afterwards: **5 points**
- for each additional 12 hours the paper is late, up to 48 hours late: **5 additional points**
- no assignments submitted more than 48 hours late will be accepted. Students failing to turn in a paper this late without an extension will receive an automatic 0.

ELECTRONIC UPLOAD POLICY

I require all assignments to be submitted electronically through Blackboard's SafeAssign software (through the "Assignment Instructions and Upload" link in the class Blackboard account). To obtain full, on-time credit for your assignment, it must be submitted on time and in a working, readable file format. You will not receive any credit if you forget to upload the file, or if the file does not work, or if you think you uploaded the file but there was a computer glitch, unless you resubmit on time. I do not promise to remind you that you have not submitted your assignment successfully. It is your responsibility. Some notes on your file format:

- please save and upload your work as .doc, .docx, or .pdf

- please do *not* submit in the .pages format.

Please double check that you successfully uploaded your file. To do so, attempt your upload and then **revisit the link to the assignment under the “Assignments” section of Blackboard. If your upload was successful, you will be able to click on and view the file you uploaded.** To further ensure that you have **submitted a gradable assignment, consider submitting the text of your paper through the “Comments” text box on the assignment page in addition to attaching a file.** That way, even if your file is corrupted, I’ll know that you’ve written a paper. **If you are having trouble uploading an assignment even after double checking, you can always email it to me at bjbayer@loyno.edu.** (To ensure that I receive your answers, **don’t just attach the assignment, but include its text in the text of the message.**)

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Both I and the Department of Philosophy treat violations of academic integrity seriously. It should go without saying that students are expected to avoid plagiarism in their written work, and otherwise uphold the principles of academic integrity. Please be aware of this, as I have a long, unfortunate track-record of identifying plagiarists.

According to the Undergraduate Bulletin, plagiarism is primarily “the false assumption of authorship: the wrongful act of taking the product of another person’s mind, and presenting it as one’s own.” Other variations include “repeating another’s sentences as your own, adopting a particularly apt phrase as your own, paraphrasing someone else’s argument as your own, or even presenting someone else’s line of thinking in the development of a thesis as though it were your own.” Please review Loyola’s definitions of plagiarism in the University Undergraduate Bulletin: <http://goo.gl/nuyr0b> . Loyola establishes strict penalties for plagiarism.

University policy is that a student engaging in plagiarism or other violations of academic integrity may receive a failing grade for the course, and a second offense is grounds for dismissal. It is the policy of the Philosophy Department (<http://goo.gl/iQAHPk>) that students found to have engaged in plagiarism will be reported to the Department Chair and Associate Dean, and will receive a zero on the assignment, and a failing grade in the course.

Be advised that I will require you to submit your assignments through software (“SafeAssign”) that automatically checks it against the internet and a database of other papers. It will automatically flag plagiarized assignments and identify their sources. I will then review flagged submissions using my own methods.

NOTES ON THE PROPER USE OF REFERENCES

Here are some reminders about principles of academic integrity that you already know as a college student:

- **Unless otherwise specified, you should not consult any sources other than the assigned course texts.** Philosophy papers are exercises in your own personal reflection on a text and the ideas discussed therein. If you are having trouble understanding the texts or the ideas, you should come to me or post questions to the online discussion group. Both I and the group exist to help clarify your understanding. You should only need to consult external sources in case you need to verify a specific matter of fact that is not common knowledge.
- **Cite any and all sources you do consult.** Whether you consult a source to quote it directly or merely to enrich your understanding of some topic, you must cite it both in the portion of the text where you draw on this material (**using parenthetical documentation including page numbers from the original source**) and in your bibliography at the end. Failing to cite sources you do consult is a violation of academic integrity.
- **Cite only reliable sources.** To cite specific matters of fact that are not common knowledge, please do not cite Wikipedia but a primary source, such as a newspaper, magazine, or scholarly journal.
- **Use quotation marks for passages copied directly.** This applies whether you are citing an external source or even the course text. If you copy text from a source by an author other than yourself directly into your paper, you must use quotation marks and list the page number or other

- locator for the text. This also applies to taglines or headers from my Powerpoint slides: they should be cited and quoted as well (though I discourage direct quotation of the slides). Failing to indicate that the text is not yours is plagiarism.
- **You should not need to copy many if any passages directly.** Most of the paper should be in your own words, not quoted from another source. Most of the time you can summarize an idea or fact from another person in your own words. In such case, you should still of course cite the **source you are summarizing, but you won't need** quotation marks because the words are your own. You only need to quote directly when the very form of the words is the object of your commentary, and for a paper like this, this will be rare.
 - **Copying text from another source and simply changing the wording slightly is still plagiarism. Don't think that you are putting ideas in your own words if you take another's text** and simply substitute their words with synonyms. If you are still relying on the overall structure of their sentence, but tweaking it slightly, you are not the one doing the writing: your source and your **thesaurus are. This is true even when you cite the source. Passing off another's writing as if it is** your own simply by changing a few words here and there is still plagiarism. To avoid the temptation to make this mistake, resolve never to use the copy and paste function in your note taking process unless you immediately surround the pasted text with quotation marks. It is better if all other notes are done in condensed shorthand so it is not **even possible to use another's words unintentionally when one is writing from one's notes.**

EXAMS

You will have two exams, on October 12th, and December 14th. Each of these will occur during class. These exams will be administered electronically. **This exam will be closed book and closed notes.**

CONFLICT/ACCOMMODATION EXAMS

You must request a conflict session for your exam **72 hours in advance** of your regularly scheduled test date and time. If you need to take an accommodation exam, please also inform me 72 hours before the test.

LECTURE AND READING SCHEDULE

NOTE: All materials on Blackboard are either public domain and no longer under copyright protection, freely offered by their copyright holders on the public internet, or reproduced and stored on Blackboard with the permission of the copyright holders. When stored on Blackboard, their status is indicated under the title and source of the piece. I do not use or link to any materials that have been placed on the internet without the permission of the copyright holder. This is important to maintain moral and academic integrity.

Introduction: the value of philosophy

Monday, August 22nd

Introduction

Wednesday, August 24th

The practical value of philosophy

- (1) Ayn Rand, "Philosophy: Who Needs It" (Blackboard)

Friday, August 26th

The practical value of philosophy

- (1) Ayn Rand, "Philosophy: Who Needs It" (continued)

The impractical value of philosophy

- (2) Bertrand Russell, "The Value of Philosophy," from *The Problems of Philosophy* (Blackboard)

Monday, August 29th

The impractical value of philosophy

- (2) Bertrand Russell, "The Value of Philosophy" (continued)

Cultural controversies with a philosophical dimension

Wednesday, August 31st

Abortion rights: Anti

- (3) Pope John Paul II, "The Unspeakable Crime of Abortion," from the papal encyclical, *Evangelium Vitae* (Blackboard)

Friday, September 1st

Abortion rights: Pro

- (4) Leonard Peikoff, "Abortion Rights are Pro-Life." Read online: <http://goo.gl/XxngrS>

Monday, September 5th—LABOR DAY HOLIDAY—NO CLASS

Wednesday, September 7th

Inequality: Not a problem

- (5) Don Watkins, "Economic Inequality Complaints Are Just A Cover For Anti-Rich Prejudice." Read online: <http://goo.gl/Yeo0LN>

Friday, September 9th

Inequality: A problem

- (6) Elbert Ventura, "Self-Made in America." Read online: <http://goo.gl/tKtSrW>

PAPER #1 DUE: 11:59pm (just before midnight)

Philosophical questions about morality

Monday, September 12th

The soul and ideal goodness

- (7) Plato, "The Good and Practicing for Death," from *The Phaedo* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, September 14th

- (8) Plato, "The Soul's Pursuit of Perfection," from *The Republic* and *The Symposium* (Blackboard)

Friday, September 16th

Human nature and the human good

- (9) Aristotle, "The Ultimate Human Good," from *Nicomachean Ethics* (Blackboard)

Monday, September 19th

The nature of the human self

- (10) Aristotle, "Self-Love and Intellectual Contemplation," from *Nicomachean Ethics* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, September 21st

Moral rightness vs. self-interest

- (11) Immanuel Kant, "The Morality of Rational Universalizability," from *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (Blackboard)

Friday, September 23rd

Moral rightness vs. self-interest

- (11) Immanuel Kant, "The Morality of Rational Universalizability" (continued)

The nature of the human self and its evil

- (12) Immanuel Kant, "Rational Freedom Thwarts the Evil of Human Nature," from *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone* and *The Critique of Practical Reason* (Blackboard)

Monday, September 26th

The morality of self-interest

- (13) Ayn Rand, "The Morality of Rational Self-Interest," from *The Virtue of Selfishness* and *The Ayn Rand Letter* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, September 28th

The morality of self-interest

- (13) Ayn Rand, "The Morality of Rational Self-Interest" (continued)

Friday, September 30th

The ethics of care

- (14) Virginia Held, "The Ethics of Care: Beyond Self and Others," from *Feminist Transformations of Moral Theory* (Blackboard)

Monday, October 3rd

The ethics of care

- (14) Virginia Held (continued)

Philosophical questions about free will

Wednesday, October 5th

Rational selfishness as universal

- (15) Nikolai Chernyshevsky, "We are All Motivated by Self-Interest," from *The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy* (Blackboard)

Friday, October 7th

Irrationality self-destruction as real

- (16) Fyodor Dostoevsky, "We are Free to Be Irrational," from *Notes From Underground* (Blackboard)

Monday, October 10th—FALL BREAK HOLIDAY—NO CLASS

Wednesday, October 12th

MIDTERM EXAM: 11:59pm (just before midnight)

Friday, October 14th

Materialistic determinism

- (17) Baron d'Holbach, "We are Not Free Agents," from *System of Nature* (Blackboard)

Monday, October 17th

Materialistic determinism

- (17) Baron d'Holbach (continued)

Wednesday, October 19th

The compatibility of free will and determinism

- (18) David Hume, "We Are Free to Act," from *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (Blackboard)

Friday, October 21st

The compatibility of free will and determinism

- (18) David Hume (continued)

Monday, October 24th

The incompatibility of free will and determinism

- (19) Thomas Reid, "We Determine Our Own Will," from *Essays on the Active Powers of Man* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, October 26th

The incompatibility of free will and determinism

- (19) Thomas Reid (continued)

Friday, October 28th

The choice to think or not to think

- (20) Harry Binswanger on Ayn Rand, "Volition as Cognitive Self-Regulation" (Blackboard)

Monday October 31st

The choice to think or not to think

- (20) Harry Binswanger on Ayn Rand (continued)

Philosophical questions about God

Can we have free will if there is a God?

Wednesday, November 2nd

God-given free will

- (21) St. Augustine, "Divine Foreknowledge and Human Free Will are Compatible," from *City of God* (Blackboard)

Friday, November 4th

God as the only source of salvation

- (22) St. Augustine, "Against the Pelagians," from *On Grace and Free Will* (Blackboard)

Monday, November 7th

God vs. free will

- (23) Martin Luther, "Our Salvation is Predestined," from *Bondage of the Will* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, November 9th

God vs. free will

- (23) Martin Luther (continued)

Can there be moral obligations if there is no God?

Friday, November 11th

Divine command theory

- (24) William Lane Craig, "Can We Be Good Without God?" Read online: <http://is.gd/jZDZ9n>

Monday, November 14th

The practice of divine command theory

- (25) "Divine Commands," from *Genesis* and *Exodus* (Blackboard)
- (26) Thomas Aquinas, "On the Dispensability of the Decalogue," from *Summa Theologica* (Blackboard)
- (27) The Bible: *The Gospel of Matthew, John's First Epistle, Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians*, (Blackboard)

Wednesday, November 16th

The practice of divine command theory

- (27) The Bible (continued)

Friday, November 18th

A critique of divine command theory

- (28) TO BE ANNOUNCED

Monday, November 21st

A critique of divine command theory

- (28) TO BE ANNOUNCED

Tuesday, November 22nd

PAPER #1 DUE: 11:59pm (just before midnight)

Wednesday, November 23rd to Friday, November 25th—THANKSGIVING HOLIDAYS—NO CLASSES

Is there a God?

Monday, November 28th

Religious testimony

- (29) William Paley, from *Evidences of Christianity* (Blackboard)
- (30) John Locke, from *The Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, November 30th

Religious testimony as self-undermining

- (31) David Hume, from *The Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (Blackboard)

Friday, December 1st

An argument for **God's existence from causes**

- (32) St. Thomas Aquinas, "**Cosmological Arguments,**" from *Summa Theologica* (Blackboard)
- (33) Samuel Clarke, from *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God* (Blackboard)

Monday, December 5th

A critique of the argument for God from causes

- (34) Hume, from *Dialogues Concerning Natural religion* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, December 7th

An argument for **God's existence from design**

- (35) William Paley, from *Natural Theology* (Blackboard)

Friday, December 9th

A critique of the argument for God from design

- (36) David Hume, from *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* (Blackboard)

FINAL EXAM:

9:30am section: *Wednesday, December 14th, 9:00–11:00am*

PHIL U282: FREE WILL AND DETERMINISM
Loyola University of New Orleans, Fall 2016, Dr. Ben Bayer

GENERAL COURSE INFORMATION AND POLICIES

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Many think that human beings are distinguished by their ability to craft their own destinies, by their possession of free will, and many find it deeply disconcerting to deny this power. And yet there are facts about humanity's place in nature that suggest to some philosophers that we do not possess it. Ideas arising in both religious and scientific traditions are sometimes taken to imply that human beings lack meaningful control over their lives. This course surveys the problem of freedom vs. determinism in the broadest of terms. It examines the major schools of thought across philosophic traditions, and explores how central ideas arise, are recapitulated and refined across the course of history. We begin with the ancient Greeks, work our way through early and Reformation Christianity, pause to witness the formation of the modern debate during the scientific revolution, and culminate with a quick survey of twentieth century debates.

COURSE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES

1. **To develop students' ability to read** and interpret primary texts in the history of philosophy on a central philosophical topic.
2. **To develop students' ability to** communicate their interpretation of this topic in writing and to logically evaluate arguments studied concerning this topic.
3. **To develop students' appreciation for how major fundamental philosophical world views affect** their assessment of a central philosophical topic.
4. **To develop students' appreciation for the importance of a central philosophical topic** to their own lives, and the importance of subjecting their own views on this topic to logical evaluation.

GRADING

Quizzes	15%
Online participation	15%
Paper #1	20%
Paper #2	20%
Exam #1	15%
Exam #2	15%
In-class participation	Extra credit up to an extra 5%

REQUIRED TEXTS

Copies of each of these will be made available on reserve:

- LAD course pack, available exclusively from the Loyola Bookstore
- Derk Pereboom (editor), *Free Will*, 2nd edition, 2009, ISBN 9781603841290

Also:

- Public domain or Loyola-subscribed readings available via Blackboard

LECTURE AND READING SCHEDULE

NOTE: All materials on Blackboard are either public domain and no longer under copyright protection, freely offered by their copyright holders on the public internet, or reproduced and stored on Blackboard with the permission of the copyright holders. When stored on Blackboard, their status is indicated under the title and source of the piece. I do not use or link to any materials that have been placed on the internet without the permission of the copyright holder. This is important to maintain moral and academic integrity.

Introduction to the problem of freedom

Monday, August 22nd

Introduction

Wednesday, August 24th

Freedom and moral responsibility

- (1) Sam Harris, from *Free Will*. Read pp. 1-14 online at Google Books: <http://goo.gl/7j8QsR>

Friday, August 26th

Freedom and science

- (2) John Searle, "The Problem of Free Will" (Blackboard)

The ancient roots of the problem of freedom

Monday, August 29th

The problem of fate and divine foreknowledge

- (3) Homer, from *The Illiad* (Blackboard)
- (4) Lucian of Samosata, "Zeus Answers a Few Awkward Questions" (Blackboard)

Wednesday, August 31st

Choice, virtue, and character

- (5) Aristotle, from *Nicomachean Ethics* (Pereboom pp. 1-4)
- (6) Aristotle, from *Nicomachean Ethics* (Blackboard)

Friday, September 2nd

Choice, virtue, and character

- (5)-(6) Aristotle, from *Nicomachean Ethics* (continued)

Monday, September 5th—LABOR DAY HOLIDAY—NO CLASS

Wednesday, September 7th

The first "compatibilism": Stoics on the will

- (7) Cicero on Chrysippus, from *On Fate* (Pereboom pp. 8-10, 11-13)
- (8) Aulus Gellius on Chrysippus, from *Attic Nights* (Pereboom pp. 14-16)
- (9) Epictetus, from *The Handbook (Enchiridion)*, (Blackboard)

Friday, September 9th

The first "compatibilism": Stoics on the will (continued)

- (7)-(9) Cicero, Aulus Gellius on Chrysippus, and Epictetus (continued)

Monday, September 12th

Critics of Stoic compatibilism

- (10) Alexander of Aphrodisias, from *On Fate* (Course pack, pp. 1-4)
- (11) Epicurus, from *On Nature* (Course pack pp. 5-6)

Wednesday, September 14th

Critics of Stoic compatibilism

- (10) Alexander of Aphrodisias, from *On Fate* (Course pack, pp. 1-4)
- (11) Epicurus, from *On Nature* (Course pack pp. 5-6)

The problem of freedom in early and reformed Christianity

Friday, September 16th

God's foreknowledge and his omnipotence

- (12) St. Augustine, from *On Free Choice of the Will* (Pereboom pp. 25–33)
[Begin at the **first line** from Evodius “Therefore, when the will...”]

Monday, September 19th

God's foreknowledge and his omnipotence

- (12) St. Augustine, from *On Free Choice of the Will* (continued)
- Freedom and original sin
- (13) Pelagius, Letter to Demetrias (Course pack 7-12: §1–2.0 [not 2.1], 3.1–3.3, 7.0–9.3)
 - (14) St. Augustine, from *On Grace and Free Will* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, September 21st

Freedom and original sin

- (13)-(14) Pelagius and St. Augustine (continued)

Friday, September 23rd

Freedom in the Reformation

- (15) Martin Luther, from *Bondage of the Will* (Blackboard)

Monday, September 26th

Freedom in the Reformation

- (15) Martin Luther (continued)

Wednesday, September 28th

Using God's “middle knowledge” to reconcile divine foreknowledge and human freedom

- (16) Luis de Molina, from *Concordia* (Course pack pp. 13-14)
- (17) William Lane Craig, Commentary on Molina (Course pack pp. 14-20)

Friday, September 30th

Using God's “middle knowledge” to reconcile divine foreknowledge and human freedom

- (16)-(17) Molina and Craig (continued)

- **PAPER #1 DUE**

The problem of freedom in the Age of Reason and the Scientific Revolution

Monday, October 3rd

Materialistic determinism

- (18) d'Holbach, from *System of Nature* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, October 5th

Materialistic determinism

- (18) d'Holbach (continued)

Friday, October 7th

Classical compatibilism: freedom as absence of compulsion

- (19) David Hume, from *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (Pereboom pp. 87–104)

Monday, October 10th—FALL BREAK HOLIDAY—NO CLASS

Wednesday, October 12th

Classical compatibilism: freedom as absence of compulsion

- (19) Hume (continued)

Reconceptualizing causality: the agency theory

- (20) Thomas Reid, from *Essays on the Active Powers of Man* (Pereboom pp. 130–38)

Friday, October 14th

Reconceptualizing causality: the agency theory

- (20) Reid (continued)

Monday, October 17th

Metaphysically dualistic compatibilism: freedom from beyond the physical world

- (21) Immanuel Kant, from “Review of Schultz” (Course pack pp. 21-22)
- (22) Immanuel Kant, from *Critique of Practical Reason* (Pereboom pp. 105–19, or for a shortened read:
105-106; 108 [from section labeled “Possibility of Causality through Freedom...”]-110 (until section labeled “Elucidation of the Cosmological idea...”); 111 [from paragraph beginning “But if effects are appearances, is it indeed...”]-114 [until paragraph beginning “Let us now remain with this point”];
115 [from paragraph beginning “Now supposing one could say...”]-118 [until paragraph beginning “It must be noted carefully...”])

Wednesday, October 19th

Metaphysically dualistic compatibilism: freedom from beyond the physical world

- (21)-(22) Kant (continued)

Friday, October 21st

Hard determinism

- (23) Arthur Schopenhauer, from *Prize Essay on the Freedom of the Will* (Course pack pp. 23-34)

Monday, October 24th

Hard determinism

- (23) Schopenhauer (continued)

Wednesday, October 26th

EXAM #1

Social and psychological perspectives on freedom in the 19th century and beyond

Friday, October 28th

Materialist psychological egoism

- (24) Nicolai Chernyshevsky, from *The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy* (Blackboard)

Monday October 31st

Materialist psychological egoism

- (24) Chernyshevsky (continued)

The proto-existentialist rebellion against determinism

- (25) Fyodor Dostoevsky, from *Notes from Underground* (Blackboard)

Wednesday, November 2nd

The proto-existentialist rebellion against determinism

- (25) Dostoevsky (continued)

Friday, November 4th

Determinism via the psychology of the unconscious

- (26) Sigmund Freud, from *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (Blackboard)

Monday, November 7th

Determinism via the psychology of the unconscious

- (26) Freud (continued)

Psychological indeterminism

- (27) William James, from "The Dilemma of Determinism" (Blackboard)

Wednesday, November 9th

Psychological indeterminism

- (27) James (continued)

Contemporary perspectives on freedom

Friday, November 11th

Radical existentialist indeterminism

- (28) Jean-Paul Sartre, from "Existentialism and Humanism" (Course pack pp. 35-38)

PAPER #2 DUE

Monday, November 14th

Radical existentialist indeterminism

- (28) Sartre (continued)

Wednesday, November 16th

Neocompatibilism: Reevaluating the principle of alternative possibilities

- (29) Harry Frankfurt, "Alternative Possibilities and Moral Responsibility" (Pereboom pp. 185-95)

Friday, November 18th

Reevaluating the principle of alternative possibilities

- (29) Harry Frankfurt (continued)

Monday, November 21st

Neocompatibilism: The asymmetry of praise and blame

- (30) Susan Wolf, "Asymmetrical Freedom" (Pereboom, pp. 228-242)

Wednesday, November 23rd to Friday, November 25th—THANKSGIVING HOLIDAYS—NO CLASSES

Monday, November 28th

Neocompatibilism: The asymmetry of praise and blame

- (30) Susan Wolf (continued)

Wednesday, November 30th

Determinism as self-undermining

- (31) James Jordan, "Determinism's Dilemma" (CP 101–104)

Friday, December 1st

Determinism as self-undermining

- (31) James Jordan (continued)

Monday, December 5th

Freedom as the fundamental alternative to think or not

- (32) Binswanger on Ayn Rand, "Volition as Cognitive Self-Regulation" (Blackboard)

Wednesday, December 7th

Freedom as the fundamental alternative to think or not

- (32) Binswanger on Ayn Rand (continued)

Friday, December 9th

Freedom and neurobiology, revisited

- (33) Searle, "Free Will as a Problem in Neurobiology" (Blackboard)

Philosophy A294-001/H295-035: Free Will in Action and Thought

Loyola University of New Orleans

Ben Bayer

Fall 2014

Course description

Whether free will exists or could exist in a deterministic universe is a question that is hotly debated by philosophers today, as it was in the ancient world. Although this course will briefly review early modern figures who helped shape the debate about free will, it will focus primarily on surveying the contemporary debate, mostly among Anglo-American philosophers. Special attention will be devoted to the conceptual question of whether or not free will is compatible with determinism (compatibilism vs. incompatibilism). Towards the end of the course, we will discuss whether leading accounts of freedom and responsibility can be applied not only to human *action* (a question that is important for moral and political philosophy) but to human *thought* as well (a question that is richly relevant to both metaphysics and epistemology).

Lecture and reading schedule

(CP # refers to course pack page numbers; PFW # refers to page numbers in Pereboom's anthology. Assigned readings may be shortened as the semester progresses.)

Introduction

Monday, August 25th

Introduction

Freedom and moral responsibility

- Sam Harris, from *Free Will*. Read pp. 1-14 online at Google Books: <http://is.gd/xkpBW4>

Historical background for the modern problem of free will and determinism

Wednesday, August 27th

Freedom and science

- John Searle, "Free Will as a Problem in Neurobiology" (Blackboard)

Monday, September 1st—NO CLASS—LABOR DAY HOLIDAY

Wednesday, September 3rd

Materialistic determinism

- d'Holbach, from *System of Nature* (Blackboard)

Monday, September 8th

Classical compatibilism: freedom as absence of compulsion

- Hume, from *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (PFW 87–104)

Wednesday, September 10th

Reconceptualizing causality: the agency theory

- Reid, from *Essays on the Active Powers of Man* (PFW, 130–38)

The twentieth century compatibilism-incompatibilism debate about freedom of action

Monday, September 15th

Neocompatibilism

- Ayer, "Freedom and Necessity" (PFW 139–47)

Wednesday, September 17th

Neocompatibilism

- Ayer, "Freedom and Necessity" (continued)

Critique of compatibilism; the contemporary agency theory (continued)

- Chisholm, "Human Freedom and the Self" (PFW 172–84)

Monday, September 22nd

Critique of compatibilism; the contemporary agency theory (continued)

- Chisholm, "Human Freedom and the Self" (continued)

Wednesday, September 24th

EXAM #1

Monday, September 29th

The contradiction of determinism

- James Jordan, "Determinism's Dilemma" (CP 1–10)

Revisions to compatibilism about freedom of action

Wednesday, October 1st

Reactive attitudes compatibilism

- Strawson, "Freedom and Resentment" (PFW 148–171)

Monday, October 6th

Reactive attitudes compatibilism (continued)

- Strawson, "Freedom and Resentment" (continued)

Wednesday, October 8th

Reevaluating the principle of alternative possibilities

- Frankfurt, "Alternative Possibilities and Moral Responsibility" (PFW 185–95)

Monday, October 13th—NO CLASS—FALL BREAK HOLIDAYS

Wednesday, October 15th

Reevaluating the principle of alternative possibilities (continued)

- Frankfurt, "Alternative Possibilities and Moral Responsibility" (continued)

Monday, October 20th

Hierarchical compatibilism

- Frankfurt, "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person" (PFW 196–212)

Wednesday, October 22nd

Semi-compatibilism

- Fischer, "My Compatibilism" (PFW 243–267)

Friday, October 24th

PAPER #1 DUE, 11:59pm

Monday, October 27th

Semi-compatibilism (continued)

- Fischer, "My Compatibilism" (continued)

Responses to revised compatibilism about freedom of action

Wednesday, October 29th

Incompatibilism via the consequence argument

- van Inwagen, "The Incompatibility of Free Will and Determinism" (FWP 213–227)

Monday, November 3rd

Incompatibilism via the consequence argument (continued)

- van Inwagen, "The Incompatibility of Free Will and Determinism"

Wednesday, November 5th

Defending agency theory from objections

- O'Connor, "Agent-causal power" (FWP 366–388)

Monday, November 10th

Defending agency theory from objections (continued)

- O'Connor, "Agent-causal power" (continued)

Wednesday, November 12th

Freedom as cognitive self-regulation

- Binswanger, "Volition as Cognitive Self-Regulation" (CP 11–23)

Monday, November 17th

EXAM #2

The problem of freedom of belief (doxastic freedom)

Wednesday, November 19th

The incoherence of direct belief choice

- Williams, "Deciding to Believe" (CP 24–31)

Monday, November 24th

The psychological implausibility of belief choice and its epistemic consequences

- Alston, "The Deontological Conception of Epistemic Justification" (CP 32–53)

Wednesday, November 26th –Friday, November 28th—NO CLASS—THANKSGIVING HOLIDAYS

Monday, December 1st

Mental focus as the source of doxastic freedom

- Salmieri and Bayer, "How We Choose Our Beliefs" (CP 54–62)

Wednesday, December 3rd

Doxastic compatibilism

- Steup, "Doxastic freedom" (CP 63–71)

Monday, December 8th

Critique of doxastic compatibilism

- Bayer, "The Elusiveness of Doxastic Compatibilism" (Updated version is on Blackboard; please ignore version in the course pack)

Tuesday, December 9th

FINAL PAPER DUE, 11:59pm

PHIL U272: Philosophy of Knowledge
Loyola University of New Orleans, Fall 2015, Ben Bayer

Course description

This course focuses on a philosophic question that is important to every other intellectual discipline: how do we know what we know? Questions covered may include: Is knowledge something forged independently by individual inquirers, or is it inherited from a social tradition? Does it have foundations in our observations of the world, as in natural science, or in purely intellectual axioms, as in mathematics? Has our knowledge any solid "foundations" at all, or is it more like a living, organic whole? What are the implications of different answers to these questions for science, religion, and our commonsense view of the world? **In particular**, we will explore these questions using examples from the history of science, especially the controversy surrounding the discoveries of Galileo and his disagreement with the church.

Course goals learning objectives:

1. **To develop students' ability to read and interpret primary texts in the history of philosophy on a central philosophical topic.**
2. **To develop students' ability to communicate their interpretation of this topic in writing and to logically evaluate arguments studied concerning this topic.**
3. **To develop students' appreciation for how major fundamental philosophical world views affect their assessment of a central philosophical topic.**
4. **To develop students' appreciation for the importance of a central philosophical topic to their own lives, and the importance of subjecting their own views on this topic to logical evaluation.**

Grading

Quizzes	15%
Online participation	15%
Paper #1	20%
Paper #2	20%
First exam	15%
Second exam	15%

Required text

- Course pack, available exclusively at the Loyola Bookstore (\$66.25)
- *A copy will be made available on reserve.*

LECTURE AND READING SCHEDULE

(CP # refers to course pack page numbers. Assigned readings may be shortened as the semester progresses.)

Introduction

Monday, August 24th

Introduction

Wednesday, August 26th

Why there are philosophical problems about knowledge

- Bayer, "Why We Need Logic" (CP 1–9)

The scientific revolution and its critics

Friday, August 28th

Background and introduction to Galileo

- WT Jones, "Science and Scientific Method" (CP 10–20)

Monday, August 31st

Background and introduction to Galileo (continued)

- WT Jones (continued)

Galileo's case using the senses and reason to investigate the universe

- Galileo Galilei, from *Dialogue concerning the Two Chief World Systems* (Blackboard online reserves)

Wednesday, September 2nd

Galileo's case using the senses and reason to investigate the universe (continued)

- Galileo Galilei, from *Dialogue concerning the Two Chief World Systems* (continued)

Friday, September 4th

Galileo's self-defense

- Galileo Galilei, "Letter to the Grand Duchess Christina" (CP 21–25)

Wednesday, September 9th

Galileo's self-defense

- Galileo Galilei, "Letter to the Grand Duchess Christina" (continued)

Bellarmino's critique and his modern defenders

- Cardinal Bellarmine, "Letter to Foscarini" (CP 26–27)

Friday, September 11th

Bellarmino's critique and his modern defenders (continued)

- Paul Feyerabend, "Galileo and the Tyranny of Truth" (CP 28–36)

Monday, September 14th

Bellarmino's critique and his modern defenders (continued)

- Paul Feyerabend, "Galileo and the Tyranny of Truth" (continued)
- Rorty, from *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (CP 37–39)

Wednesday, September 16th

Bellarmino's critique and his modern defenders (continued)

- Rorty, from *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (continued)

Friday, September 18th

Attempts at reconciliation

- Pope John Paul, "Lessons of the Galileo Case" (CP 40–43)
- Pope Benedict XVI, from "The Crisis of Faith in Science":
<http://ncronline.org/news/ratzingers-1990-remarks-galileo>

The birth of epistemology

Monday, September 21st

The need for method in an era of scientific change

- Rene Descartes, from Part I of the *Discourse on Method* (CP 44–46)

Wednesday, September 23rd

The need for method in an era of scientific change

- Rene Descartes from *Discourse on Method* (continued)

The need for independent reflection in an era of controversy

- John Locke, "Epistle to the Reader" and "Introduction" from *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (CP 47–50)

Friday, September 25th

The need for independent reflection in an era of controversy

- John Locke, from *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (continued)

Monday, September 28th

The rejection of the need for a “theory of knowledge”

- Richard Rorty, from *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (CP 51–55)

The foundations of knowledge

Wednesday, September 30th

We need to reconstruct our knowledge from its foundations

- Rene Descartes, from Part II, *Discourse on Method* (CP 56–59)
- Rene Descartes, from Rules 1–2, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* (CP 60–61)

Friday, October 2nd

The foundation of knowledge is in non-sensory intuition

- Rene Descartes, from Second Meditation, *Meditations on First Philosophy* (CP 62–63)
- Rene Descartes, Rules 3–4, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* (CP 64–65)

Monday, October 5th

The foundation of knowledge is in non-sensory intuition (continued)

- Rene Descartes, from *Meditations on First Philosophy and Rules for the Direction of the Mind* (continued)

Avoiding reliance on others and reconstructing knowledge from foundations

- John Locke, from Book I and Book IV, *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (CP 66–72)

Wednesday, October 7th

Avoiding reliance on others and reconstructing knowledge from foundations (continued)

- John Locke, from *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (continued)

Friday, October 9th

Our knowledge is based on ideas derived from the senses

- John Locke, from Book I and Book III, *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, (CP 73–77)

Wednesday, October 14th

The search for foundations confuses causal explanation with justification, cognition

- Richard Rorty, from *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (CP 78–87)

Skepticism and its critics

Friday, October 16th

Justifying our knowledge requires methodical doubt

- Rene Descartes, from First Meditation, *Meditations on First Philosophy* (CP 88–92)

Monday, October 19th

Justifying our knowledge requires methodical doubt (continued)

- Rene Descartes, from *Meditations on First Philosophy* (continued)

Wednesday, October 21st

Justifying our knowledge requires methodical doubt (continued)

- Rene Descartes, from First Meditation, *Meditations on First Philosophy* (continued)

Doubt should not be arbitrary

- Leonard Peikoff, “Maybe You’re Wrong” (CP 93–96)

Friday, October 23rd

Doubt should not be arbitrary

- Leonard Peikoff, "Maybe You're Wrong" (continued)

Wednesday, October 28th

Observations do not determine which of our beliefs to retain or abandon

- W.V. Quine and Joseph Ullian, "Belief and Change of Belief," "Observation," from *The Web of Belief* (CP 97–104)

Friday, October 30th

Scientific theories cannot establish realistic truths by crucial experiments

- Pierre Duhem, from *To Save the Phenomena* (CP 105–109)

Monday, November 2nd

Scientific theories are not underdetermined by evidence

- Margarita Levin, "Upholding Truth: Objectivity versus Solidarity" (CP 110–116)

Wednesday, November 4th

Observational data is theory-laden, and no belief is "foundational"

- Russell Hanson, "Observation," from *Patterns of Discovery* (CP 117–130)

The nature of consciousness and the senses

Friday, November 6th

The mind and its ideas are better known than the body

- Rene Descartes, from Second Meditation, *Meditations on First Philosophy* (CP 131–133)

Monday, November 9th

The mind and its ideas are better known than the body

- Rene Descartes, from *Meditations on First Philosophy* (continued)

The mind grasps external things by their causal relationship with and resemblance to ideas

- John Locke, from Book I, *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (CP 138–141)

Wednesday, November 11th

The mind grasps external things by their causal relationship with and resemblance to ideas

- John Locke, from Book I, *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (continued)

We cannot get outside of our heads to compare ideas to things they resemble

- George Berkeley, from *Principles of Human Knowledge* (CP 129–132)

Friday, November 13th

We cannot get outside of our heads to compare ideas to things they resemble

- George Berkeley, from *Principles of Human Knowledge* (continued)

Monday, November 16th

Consciousness, sensory perception, and the form/object distinction

- Harry Binswanger, from *How We Know* (CP 142–154)

Wednesday, November 18th

Consciousness, sensory perception, and the form/object distinction (continued)

- Harry Binswanger, from *How We Know* (continued)

Evidence vs. faith

Friday, November 20th

We have an obligation to base our beliefs on evidence

- John Locke, "Of Enthusiasm," from Book IV, *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, Book IV (CP 155–159)

Monday, November 23rd

We must be unwavering in basing our beliefs on evidence

- W.K. Clifford, "The Ethics of Belief" (CP 160–163)

Monday, November 30th

We should make exceptions to the principle of basing our beliefs on evidence

- William James, "The Will to Believe" (CP 164–171)

Wednesday, December 2nd

We should make exceptions to the principle of basing our beliefs on evidence

- William James, "The Will to Believe" (continued)

It is acceptable to believe more than what is traditionally based on "evidence"

- Alvin Plantinga, "Is Belief in God Properly Basic?" (CP 172–182)

Friday, December 4th

It is acceptable to believe more than what is traditionally based on "evidence"

- Alvin Plantinga, "Is Belief in God Properly Basic?" (continued)

Relativism and its critics

Monday, December 7th

Rationality is culturally relative

- Richard Rorty, "Dismantling Truth: Solidarity versus Objectivity" (183–190)

Wednesday, December 9th

The argument from the fact that we can't get outside our head is the worst argument in the world

- James Franklin, "Stove's Discovery of the Worst Argument in the World" (CP 191–200)

Philosophy A220: Epistemology
Loyola University of New Orleans
Ben Bayer
Fall 2013

Course description

One of questions central to almost every other question in philosophy is how we know what we know. Since at least the time of Descartes, philosophers have been entertained doubts about whether knowledge of the external world is possible, or if it is, whether it extends as far as modern science has claimed that it extends. This course will survey some of the most basic questions in epistemology by first briefly examining their roots in early modern philosophy, and then examining in detail the debate about these questions in the last forty years among Anglo-American “analytic” philosophers. After we examine the statements of key epistemological questions by Descartes and Locke, we will begin our discussion of contemporary debates by looking at the debate over skepticism, the challenge by some philosophers that possibly we know nothing of the external world at all. We’ll look at a variety of contemporary responses to the problem, including metaphysical appeals to common sense and the refinement of the standards for knowledge claims. This will raise questions about the meaning of the concept of “knowledge” itself, which we will explore in connection with the infamous Gettier problem. Some have claimed that philosophers’ demand to ground knowledge claims in “foundational” forms of knowledge sets the bar for knowledge too high and thereby threatens skepticism, so we will also explore the debate between foundationalists and anti-foundationalists about epistemic justification. This will then naturally raise questions about what it means to say a belief is justified, which will occasion an examination of “internalist” vs. “externalist” answers to that question. Time permitting, we will explore alternative epistemological views that challenge traditional Anglo-American thinking about theory of knowledge, including especially Quine’s naturalized epistemology and the recent strain of virtue epistemology.

Course goals

By the end of the course, I hope that students will

1. Acquire some respect for (and when writing papers, exemplify) the clarity and logical rigor of contemporary work in epistemology.
2. Understand the basic concepts of and broad trends in contemporary epistemology, and see why epistemology is central to other philosophical questions and even relates to cultural controversies.
3. Be able to write a serious analytical paper of their own, drawing on your personal research and thinking about a topic we will have covered in the class.

Required texts

- Ernest Sosa, Jaegwon Kim, Jeremy Fantl and Matthew McGrath (Eds.), *Epistemology: An Anthology*, 2nd edition, Blackwell Publishing, 2010, ISBN 978-1405169660
- Laurence Bonjour, *Epistemology: Classic Problems and Contemporary Responses*, 2nd edition, Rowman and Littlefield, 2010, ISBN 978-0742564190
- Additional essays on Blackboard

Lecture and reading schedule (tentative)

(SKFM = page numbers from Sosa, Kim, Fantl and McGrath, *Epistemology: An Anthology*)

Introduction and early modern sources of contemporary topics

Monday, August 26th

Introduction

Wednesday, August 28th

Early rationalist theory of knowledge

- Bonjour, Ch.1& 2, pp. 1-6; 9-22
- Descartes, from *Discourse and Meditations*. Read on Blackboard: <http://is.gd/XZPhCt>

Friday, August 30th

Early rationalist theory of knowledge (continued)

- Descartes, from *Discourse and Meditations* (continued)

Monday, September 2nd—NO CLASS—LABOR DAY HOLIDAY

Wednesday, September 4th

Early moderate empiricist theory of knowledge

- Bonjour, Ch. 6, pp. 97-117
- Locke, from *Essay concerning Human Understanding*. Read on Blackboard: <http://is.gd/BBYD6i>

Friday, September 6th

Early moderate empiricist theory of knowledge (continued)

- BonJour, Ch. 7, pp. 119-148
- Locke, from *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (continued)

Skepticism

Monday, September 9th

Introduction to skepticism after Descartes

- Introduction to Part I, SKFM pp. 3-5
- Stroud, "The Problem of the External World," SKFM pp. 7-25

Wednesday, September 11th

Introduction to skepticism after Descartes (continued)

- Stroud, "The Problem of the External World" (continued)

Friday, September 13th

Metaphilosophical common sense

- BonJour, Ch. 12, pp. 237-46
- Moore, "Proof of an External World," SKFM pp. 26-38
- Moore, "Four Forms of Skepticism," SKFM, pp. 29-30
- Moore, "Certainty," SFKM, pp. 31-34

Monday, September 16th

Metaphilosophical common sense (continued)

- BonJour, Ch. 12, pp. 237-46 (continued)
- Moore readings (continued)

Wednesday, September 18th

Epistemic closure and relevant alternatives

- BonJour, Ch. 12, pp. 246-49
- Introduction to Part IV, SKFM, pp. 233-35
- Dretske, "Epistemic Operators," SKFM, pp. 237-45

Friday, September 20th

Evidentialist standards for epistemic possibility

- Bayer, "Epistemic Possibility for Epistemologists, à la Evidentialism." Read on Blackboard: <http://is.gd/XYhKmt>

Monday, September 23rd

Contextualist critiques of the reality of knowledge as a kind

- BonJour, Ch. 12, pp. 249-56

- Williams, "Epistemological Realism" (see email instructions for condensation)

Wednesday, September 25th

Contextualist critiques of the reality of knowledge as a kind

- BonJour, Ch. 12, pp. 249-56 (continued)
- Williams, "Epistemological Realism" (continued)

The concept of "knowledge"

Friday, September 27th

An influential challenge to a traditional definition of "knowledge"

- BonJour, Ch. 3, pp. 23-45
- Introduction to Part III, SKFM, pp. 190-91
- Gettier, "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?," SKFM pp. 192-93

Monday, September 30th

EXAM #1

Wednesday, October 2nd

Answering Gettier by redefining "justification"

- Ichikawa and Steup, "The Analysis of Knowledge" (selections). Read on Blackboard: <http://is.gd/3KOM8c>

Friday, October 4th

Gettier's problem as inherent in the traditional framework

- Zagzebski, "The Inescapability of the Gettier Problem," SKFM pp. 207-212

Monday, October 7th

"Knowledge" as an undefined primitive

- Williamson, "A State of Mind," SKFM pp. 213-229 (see email instructions for condensation)

Wednesday, October 9th

"Knowledge" as an undefined primitive

- Williamson, "A State of Mind" (continued)

The structure of justification

Friday, October 11th

Introduction to 20th century foundationalism

- BonJour, Chapter 9, pp. 177-86
- Discussion of the regress argument and Schlick's foundationalism

Wednesday, October 16th

Anti-foundationalism

- Sellars, "Does Empirical Knowledge Have a Foundation?," SKFM pp. 94-98

Monday, October 14th—NO CLASS—FALL BREAK HOLIDAYS

Friday, October 18th

Anti-foundationalism (continued)

- Sellars, "Does Empirical Knowledge Have a Foundation?" (continued)
- BonJour, "Can Empirical Knowledge Have a Foundation?," SKFM pp. 109-20

Monday, October 21st

Anti-foundationalist coherentism

- BonJour, Ch. 9, pp. 186-96
- **Davidson**, "A Coherence Theory of Truth and Knowledge," SKFM, pp. 124-132

Wednesday, October 23rd

Anti-foundationalist coherentism

- **Davidson**, "A Coherence Theory of Truth and Knowledge" (continued)

Thursday, October 24th

PAPER #1 DUE, 11:59pm

Friday, October 25th

Foundationalism renewed

- BonJour, Ch. 9, pp. 196-202
- **Bayer**, "A Role for Abstractionism in a Direct Realist Foundationalism." Read on Blackboard:
<http://is.gd/cuqXdy>

Monday, October 28th

Foundationalism renewed

- **Bayer**, "A Role for Abstractionism in a Direct Realist Foundationalism" (continued)

Justification and consciousness

Wednesday, October 30th

Reliabilist externalism

- BonJour, Ch. 10, pp. 203-10
- **Goldman**, "What is Justified Belief?," SKFM pp. 333-45

Friday, November 1st

Reliabilist externalism (continued)

- **Goldman**, "What is Justified Belief?" (continued)

Monday, November 4th

Critiques of externalism

- BonJour, Ch. 10, pp. 210-17
- **Bonjour**, "Externalist Theories of Empirical Knowledge," SKFM p. 363-76

Wednesday, November 6th

Critiques of externalism (continued)

- **BonJour**, "Externalist Theories of Empirical Knowledge" (continued)

Friday, November 8th

Mentalist internalism

- **Feldman and Conee**, "Evidentialism," SKFM pp. 310-19

Monday, November 11th

Critiques of mentalist internalism

- **Goldman**, "Internalism Exposed," SKFM pp. 379-90

Wednesday, November 13th

Critiques of mentalist internalism (continued)

- **Goldman**, "Internalism Exposed" (continued)

Friday, November 15th

Accessibilist internalism

- Bayer, "Internalism Empowered." Read on Blackboard: <http://is.gd/xesz1T>

Monday, November 18th

Accessibilist internalism (continued)

- Bayer, "Internalism Empowered" (continued)

Wednesday, November 20th

EXAM #2

Alternative approaches [tentative]

Friday, November 22nd

Replacing foundationalist epistemology with psychology

- Bonjour, Ch. 11, pp. 221-35
- Quine, "Epistemology Naturalized," SKFM pp. 528-36

Monday, November 25th

Replacing foundationalist epistemology with psychology (continued)

- Quine, "Epistemology Naturalized" (continued)
- *Optional:* Antony, "Quine as Feminist: The Radical Import of Naturalized Epistemology," SKFM pp. 552-78

Wednesday, November 27th – Friday, November 29th—NO CLASS—THANKSGIVING HOLIDAYS

Monday, December 2nd

Critiques of naturalized epistemology

- Kim, "What is 'Naturalized Epistemology'?" SKFM pp. 539-48

Wednesday, December 4th

Critiques of naturalized epistemology (continued)

- Kim, "What is 'Naturalized Epistemology'?" (continued)
- *Optional:* Bayer: "How Not to Refute Quine." Read on Blackboard: <http://is.gd/BrhWVh>

Friday, December 6th

Virtue epistemology

- Zagzebski, "Virtues of the Mind," SKFM 442-451

Saturday, December 7th

FINAL PAPER DUE, 11:59pm

Philosophy A465: Introduction to Analytic Philosophy

Loyola University of New Orleans

Ben Bayer

Spring 2011

Course description

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a handful of British and German philosophers broke with conventional approaches in their discipline and established a philosophical movement, united by a distinctive style and a set of common concerns, which would set the terms for debate in Britain and America for much of the rest of the century. Though members of the resulting “analytic” tradition would disagree on a great many issues, they were united by a respect for the authority of natural science, an insistence on clarity and logical rigor in philosophical argumentation, and (for the most part) an interest in the role of language in generating and solving philosophical problems.

In this course we will examine broad trends in the development of the analytic tradition, beginning with the originators of the approach (Moore, Frege, and Russell), moving on to the two major mid-century movements paradigmatic of the analytic approach (logical positivist and ordinary language philosophy), and concluding with the two contemporary movements that have inherited the legacy of analysis (the naturalistic pragmatism of Quine, and the new modal metaphysics of Kripke and Putnam). Some have argued that each of these movements represent the dissolution of analytic philosophy, but this course will emphasize how they represent more consistent versions of earlier approaches (Quine is more consistently empiricist than his positivist predecessors, while Kripke represents a somewhat unwitting return to the ideas of Frege).

Throughout the course, we will focus on the topics that were of central concern to each of the traditions we’ll examine—usually topics related to the nature of reference, meaning, and knowledge. Though these are usually topics classified under the heading of the philosophy of language, I will also make a case that there are often deeper questions about the nature of human *consciousness* which undergird many traditional problems in analytic philosophy.

Required texts

- James Baillie, *Contemporary Analytic Philosophy*, 2nd edition (Prentice Hall, 2003)
- Additional readings on Blackboard

Lecture and reading schedule (*tentative*)

Introduction and early figures

Monday, January 10

Introduction and background

Wednesday, January 12

Analytic vs. continental

- “Preface,” Baillie, pp. ix-xii.
- “Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?,” Edmund Gettier (Blackboard)
- “The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge,” Jean-François Lyotard (Blackboard)

Friday, January 14

Background on skepticism

- Descartes, from the *Meditations* (Blackboard)
- Kant, from the *Critique of Pure Reason* and the *Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics* (Blackboard)

Monday, January 17—NO CLASS—MLK DAY HOLIDAY

Wednesday, January 19

Moore

- “Introduction to G.E. Moore,” Baillie, pp. 56-60.
- “Proof of an External World,” Moore, pp. 61-76.

Friday, January 21

Moore (continued)

Monday, January 24

Frege

- "Introduction to Gottlob Frege," Baillic, pp. 1-7
- "Sense and Reference," Frege, pp. 8-22.

Wednesday, January 26

Frege (continued)

Friday, January 28

Frege (continued)

Monday, January 31

Russell

- "Introduction to Bertrand Russell," Baillic, pp. 24-31
- Russell, "Knowledge by Acquaintance and Knowledge by Description" (Blackboard)
- Begin "On Denoting," Russell, pp. 31-41 (but skip pp. 36-37, from "We, say, to begin with..." until "That the meaning is relevant...")

Wednesday, February 2

Russell (continued)

- Russell, "On Denoting," pp. 31-41 (but skip pp. 36-37, from "We, say, to begin with..." until "That the meaning is relevant...")

Friday, February 4

Russell (continued)

- Russell, "On Denoting" (continued)

Monday, February 7

➤ **EXAM #1**

Wednesday, February 9

Early Wittgenstein

- "Introduction to Ludwig Wittgenstein," Baillic, pp. 77-81
- Selection from the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Wittgenstein, pp. 89-109. Skip 5.15-5.42, 5.46-5.5423, 5.62-6.001, 6.2-6.24.

Friday, February 11

Early Wittgenstein (continued)

Monday, February 14

Early Wittgenstein (continued)

The climax of 20th century analysis

Wednesday, February 16

Logical empiricism

- "Introduction to Logical Empiricism," Baillic, pp. 131-140.
- "The Foundation of Knowledge," Schlick, pp. 141-154.

Friday, February 18

Logical empiricism (continued)

- Schlick (continued)

Monday, February 21

Logical empiricism (continued)

- "The Elimination of Metaphysics through Logical Analysis of Language," Carnap, pp. 155-171.

Wednesday, February 23

Logical empiricism (continued)

- Carnap (continued)

Friday, February 25

Logical empiricism (continued)

- Ayer, "The A priori" (Blackboard)

Monday, February 28

Logical empiricism (continued)

- Ayer, "Critique of Ethics and Theology" (Blackboard)

Wednesday, March 2

Later Wittgenstein against logical empiricism

- "Introduction to Ludwig Wittgenstein," Bailie, pp. 82-88.
- *Philosophical Investigations*, Wittgenstein, pp. 110-130.

Friday, March 4

NO CLASS

- **PAPER #1 DUE (just before noon, 11:59am)**

Monday, March 7–11—NO CLASS—MARDI GRAS HOLIDAYS

Monday, March 14

Later Wittgenstein against logical empiricism (continued)

Wednesday, March 16

Ordinary language philosophy

- Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, §1-23 (Blackboard)

Friday, March 18

Ordinary language philosophy (continued)

- "Introduction to Gilbert Ryle," Bailie, pp. 186-190
- "Knowing How and Knowing That," Ryle, 191-200.

Monday, March 21

Ordinary language philosophy (continued)

- "Introduction to J.L. Austin," Bailie, pp. 201-206.
- "Selections from *Sense and Sensibilia*," Austin, pp. 207-225.

Wednesday, March 23

Ordinary language philosophy (continued)

- Austin (continued)

Friday, March 25

Ordinary language philosophy

- "Introduction to P.F. Strawson," Bailie, pp. 225-229.

- “On Referring,” Strawson, pp. 230-253.

Monday, March 28

Ordinary language philosophy (continued)

- Strawson (continued)

Reactions to analysis and retrenchment

Wednesday, March 30

Naturalistic pragmatism

- “Introduction to W.V. Quine,” Baillie, pp. 262-267.
- “Two Dogmas of Empiricism,” Quine, pp. 272-289.

Friday, April 1

NO CLASS

<p><u>Monday, April 4</u></p> <p>➤ EXAM #2</p>
--

Wednesday, April 6

Naturalistic pragmatism (continued)

- Quine, “Two Dogmas of Empiricism” (continued)

Friday, April 8

Naturalistic pragmatism (continued)

- “Introduction to W.V. Quine,” Baillie, pp. 267-270.
- Quine, “Epistemology Naturalized” (Blackboard)

Monday, April 11

Naturalistic pragmatism (continued)

- Quine, “Epistemology Naturalized” (continued)

Wednesday, April 13

The return to metaphysics

- “Introduction to Saul Kripke,” Baillie, pp. 381-387.
- “Identity and Necessity,” Kripke, pp. 388-407.

Friday, April 15

The return to metaphysics (continued)

- Kripke (continued)

Monday, April 18–Monday, April 25—NO CLASSES—EASTER HOLIDAY

Wednesday, April 27

The return to metaphysics (continued)

- Kripke (continued)

Friday, April 29

The return to metaphysics (continued)

- “Introduction to Externalism,” Baillie, pp. 412-418.
- “Meaning and reference,” Putnam, pp. 420-429.

Monday, May 2

The return to metaphysics (continued)

- Putnam (continued)

Wednesday, May 4

To be determined.

Friday, May 6th

- **PAPER #1 DUE (just before noon, 11:59am): Friday, May 6th, 11:00am**