

Ethics (PHIL 102), Winter 2019, University of Oregon

Dr. Colin Koopman

Course Description:

This course will offer an introduction to central concepts of ethical inquiry and moral philosophy. What is of paramount importance for us as individuals and as a society? To guarantee equal rights for all? To provide better lives, or at least opportunities, for those less fortunate? To treat well those with whom we interact? And can all of these be of paramount importance at once? In this course you will develop a vocabulary for addressing these questions using the frameworks of the most influential moral theories shaping contemporary ethical and political discourse. In the first weeks of the course we will begin by studying the basic concepts of the most influential classical moral theories. Here we will read selections from Aristotle and Epicurus on virtue ethics, from Immanuel Kant on rights-focused universalist moral theory, from John Stuart Mill on outcome-centered utilitarian moral theory, and from William James on pragmatist approaches to the very project of moral philosophy. Following this background exposure to the basic organizing concepts of contemporary moral theory, you will then learn how to utilize, enrich, and critique these theories by examining some of the most pressing ethical conflicts we face today. Critical moral issues we will consider in this part of the class will include economic inequality, racial injustice, and the ethics of emerging technologies of surveillance. Here we will read, among others, selections from Ta-Nehisi Coates, Martha Nussbaum, Elizabeth Anderson, John Rawls, Peter Singer, and Helen Nissenbaum.

Instructor:

Colin Koopman, koopman@uoregon.edu (please contact me via email; messages sent to me via canvas will not receive replies)

Office Hours: Mon 3:00-4:50 in SCH (Susan Campbell Hall) 250A

Teaching Assistants (GTFs in charge of your Friday section):

Nicolas Brooks, nbrooks2@uoregon.edu; Office Hours: Tues 1:00-2:50 in Location TBD

Sterling Hall, shall11@uoregon.edu, Office Hours: Tues 1:00-2:50 in Location TBD

John Montani, jmontani@uoregon.edu, Office Hours: Tues 11:00-12:50 in SCH 221

Zeinab Nobowati, zeinabn@uoregon.edu, Office Hours: Tues 3:00-4:50 in SCH 232

Chris Shambaugh, cshambau@uoregon.edu, Office Hours: Mon & Wed 1:00-1:50 in SCH 221

Valérie Simon, vsimon3@uoregon.edu, Office Hours: Mon 12:00-1:50 in SCH 221

Class Meetings:

- Lectures on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, 2:00-2:50 in PLC 180
- Discussion Sections every Friday (prior to our 2:00 lecture); exact time and room based on the section you registered for.

Course Overview (Focal Topics [in bold] & Assigned Readings [author name(s) listed])

	Mon PM Lecture	Wed PM Lecture	<i>Fri AM (w/ your GTF)</i>	Fri PM Lecture
1	What is Ethics? (+ syllabus overview)	Ethics in a Democracy Jane Addams & William James	<i>Why Morality Matters</i>	The Moral Philosopher William James
2	Facing a Moral Problem William James	Relativism v. Morality Bernard Williams	<i>Morality v. Relativism</i>	Determinism v. Morality William James <i>+ writing: arguments</i>
3	n/a holiday	Rational Virtue Ethics Aristotle	<i>Ancient Ethics</i> (<i>rational virtue v. pleasurable life</i>)	Epicurean Virtue Ethics Epicurus
4	Utilitarianism J.S. Mill, Ch I	Utilitarianism J.S. Mill, Ch II	<i>Utilitarianism</i> (<i>the ethics of well-being</i>)	Utilitarianism J.S. Mill, Chs III/IV <i>+ writing: counter-args.</i>
5	Deontology Immanuel Kant, Preface	Deontology Immanuel Kant, §1	<i>Deontology</i> (<i>the ethics of reason</i>)	Deontology Immanuel Kant, §2 <i>+ writing: theses</i>
6	Kantian Equality John Rawls	Kantian Equality John Rawls	<i>Equality</i>	Aristotelian Equality Martha Nussbaum
7	Utilitarian Equality Peter Singer	What is Race? Paul Taylor	<i>Identity</i>	What is Racism? Ta-Nehisi Coates
8	Race: Kantianism Bernard Boxill	Race: Consequentialism Elizabeth Anderson	<i>Util v. Deont (review)</i> <i>Privacy (Group Work)</i>	Privacy: Util. v. Kant Peter Singer & Charles Fried
9	Conceptualizing Privacy Helen Nissenbaum	Engaging Privacy Ethics Privacy Case Study Packet <i>Privacy (Group Work)</i>	<i>Privacy (Group Work)</i>	Data Ethics Guest Lecture by Bonnie Sheehey
10	Technology & Virtue Shannon Vallor	Moral Psychology of Will William James	<i>Why Morality Matters</i>	Self-Transformation William James

Full Course Schedule, including Reading Schedule & Assignment Due Dates:

All assigned readings are to be completed *before* the lecture during which they will be discussed.

Date	Class Topics & Assigned Reading
	INTRODUCTION: Approaching Ethics Philosophically
1/7	<u>Introduction to the Class: What is Ethics?</u>
	UNIT I: Meta-ethics How to Approach Ethics Philosophically
1/9	<u>Why Ethics Matters for Each of Us in a Democratic Society</u> Jane Addams, "Introduction" to <i>Democracy and Social Ethics</i> William James, "The Moral Philosopher & the Moral Life," pp. 184-198 only in <i>WTB</i> (read more if you want) <i>Recommended:</i> Addams, "Political Reform," ch. 6 of <i>DSE</i>
1/11	Section Discussion of <u>Why Moral Matters Matter to You</u> with your GTF
1/11	<u>Being Philosophical about Morality: How to Reflect on Ethics</u> William James, "The Moral Philosopher and the Moral Life" in <i>WTB</i> (read the whole essay)
1/14	<u>Being Philosophical about Morality: An Example</u> William James, "The Moral Equivalent of War" (avail. on <i>Canvas</i>)
1/16	<u>Defusing Moral Skepticisms (Relativism and Subjectivism)</u> Bernard Williams, <i>Morality</i> , Chs. 1-4, pp. 3-38
1/18	Section Discussion of <u>the Very Idea of Moral Philosophy</u> with your GTF
1/18	<u>Defusing More Moral Skepticisms (Determinism)</u> William James, "The Dilemma of Determinism" in <i>WTB</i> <u><i>In-Class Workshops on Philosophical Writing:</i></u> Topic: basic concepts of argumentative writing
1/23	Assignment #1 due on Wed. of Week 3 at start of lecture
	UNIT II: Normative Ethics The Major Theories of Morality
1/21	<i>No classes today in observance of MLK Holiday</i>

1/23	<p><u>Virtue Ethics and the Rational Life:</u> Aristotle, <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i>, Book I (I.1, I.5, I.9) & Bk II (II.1, II.2, II.3) <i>Recommended:</i> Williams, <i>Morality</i>, Chs. 6 & 7 (pp. 48-62)</p>
1/25	<p>Section Discussion of <u>Aristotelian Virtue Ethics</u> with your GTF</p>
1/25	<p><u>Virtue Ethics and the Pleasurable Life:</u> Epicurus, “Letter to Menoeceus” + “The Principal Doctrines” + “Epicurean Sayings” <i>Recommended:</i> “Epicurus” entry at <i>Internet Encyc. Phil.</i> at < https://www.iep.utm.edu/epicur/></p>
1/28	<p><u>Utilitarian Ethics, Part I:</u> John Stuart Mill, <i>Utilitarianism</i>, Ch. I (pp. 1-5) + Ch. II (pp. 6-7 only) <i>Recommended:</i> Williams, <i>Morality</i>, Ch. 10 (pp. 82-98)</p>
1/30	<p><u>Utilitarian Ethics, Part II:</u> John Stuart Mill, <i>Utilitarianism</i>, Ch. II (pp. 6-26)</p>
2/1	<p>Section Discussion of <u>Mill’s Utilitarian Moral Theory</u> with your GTF</p>
2/1	<p><u>Utilitarian Ethics, Part III:</u> John Stuart Mill, <i>Utilitarianism</i>, Chs. III & IV</p> <p><i>In-Class Workshops on Philosophical Writing:</i> Topic: counter-argument and engaging the conversation Prepare: locate an objection to utilitarianism & Mill’s reply in <i>Utilitarianism</i>, Ch. II, pp. 7-26</p>
2/4	<p><u>Deontological Ethics, Part I:</u> Immanuel Kant, <i>Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals</i>, Preface (pp. 1-5) + First Section (pp. 7-13 only) <i>Recommended:</i> Williams, <i>Morality</i>, Ch. 8 (pp. 63-72)</p>
2/6	<p><u>Deontological Ethics, Part II:</u> Immanuel Kant, <i>GMM</i>, First Section (in entirety; pp. 7-17)</p>
2/8	<p>Section Discussion of <u>Kant’s Deontological Moral Theory</u> with your GTF</p>
2/8	<p><u>Deontological Ethics, Part III:</u> Immanuel Kant, <i>GMM</i>, Second Section (pp. 19-48)</p> <p><i>In-Class Workshops on Philosophical Writing:</i> Topic: focusing your argument Prepare: bring a hypothetical thesis statement (on Kant) to class Background: read handout titled ‘Writing Introductory Paragraphs’</p> <p>Midterm Assignment to be distributed today at end of class.</p>
2/11	<p>Assignment #2 (Midterm) due on Mon. of Week 6 at start of lecture.</p>

	UNIT III: Engaged Ethics Three Contemporary Ethical Problems
	UNIT III.A: The Ethics of Inequality (focusing on distributive justice)
2/11	<u>Equality by Agreement: A Procedural Rights-Based Approach</u> John Rawls, <i>Justice as Fairness</i> , §§1-9 (pp. 1-29) <i>Recommended:</i> “John Rawls” entry at <i>Stanford Encyc. Phil.</i> at < https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/ >
2/13	<u>Equality by Agreement: A Procedural Rights-Based Approach</u> John Rawls, <i>Justice as Fairness</i> , §§13-16 (pp. 42-57)
2/15	Section Discussion of <u>the Ethics of Equality</u> with your GTF
2/15	<u>Equality of Capabilities: An Aristotelian Account (w/ some Kantian elements)</u> Martha Nussbaum, <i>Creating Capabilities</i> , Ch. 2, pp. 17-45 <i>Recommended:</i> Amartya Sen, <i>Inequality Reexamined</i> , pp. 12-30
2/18	<u>Global Equality: A Utilitarian Perspective</u> Peter Singer, “Famine, Affluence, and Morality” <i>Recommended:</i> Henry Shue, “Nationality and Responsibility”
	UNIT III.B: The Ethics of Identity (focusing on racial segregation)
2/20	<u>What is Race? Why is it a Moral Matter?</u> Paul C. Taylor, <i>Race: A Philosophical Introduction</i> , pp. 3-17, 84-86, 116-118 <i>Recommended:</i> W.E.B. Du Bois, <i>The Souls of Black Folk</i> , Ch. 1 <i>Recommended:</i> M. James, “Race” at <i>Stanf. Encyc. Phil.</i> at < https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/race/ >
2/22	Section Discussion of <u>Why Race is a Moral Matter</u> with your GTF
2/22	<u>What is Racial Injustice?: Segregation & Reparations</u> Ta-Nehisi Coates, “The Case for Reparations” (pdf or online at www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/06/the-case-for-reparations/361631/) <i>Recommended:</i> Cornel West, “A Genealogy of Modern Racism”, pp. 47-65 <i>Recommended:</i> Michelle Alexander, “The New Jim Crow”, pp. 182-187, 190-200
2/25	<u>Responding to Racial Injustice: A Kantian Approach</u> Bernard Boxill, <i>Blacks & Social Justice</i> , pp. 73-88 only <i>Recommended:</i> Arnold Farr, “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?”

2/27	<u>Responding to Racial Injustice: A Consequentialist Approach</u> Elizabeth Anderson, <i>The Imperative of Integration</i> , pp. 3-7, 86-88, 112-117, 134-137 <i>Recommended:</i> Anderson, “The Future of Racial Integration”
3/1	Assignment #3 due Fri. of Week 8 at beginning of section
	UNIT III.C: The Ethics of Technology (focusing on data privacy)
2/27	<i>Extra Credit:</i> Guest Lecture by Sarah Igo (Vanderbilt Univ.) on “The Known Citizen: Privacy in America” @ 6:30pm in Knight Law 175
3/1	Section focused on <u>Problems of Data Privacy and Group Privacy Collaborations</u> with your GTF
3/1	<u>Justifying Privacy: Utilitarian and Kantian Approaches</u> Peter Singer, “Visible Man: Ethics in a World Without Secrets” Charles Fried, “Privacy” <i>Recommended:</i> Anita Allen, “An Ethical Duty to Protect One’s Own Information Privacy?” <i>Recommended:</i> Bernard Harcourt, “The Expository Society,” pp. 1-3, 13-23
3/4	<u>Putting Privacy in Context: Pragmatic Information Tech. Ethics</u> Helen Nissenbaum, “A Contextual Approach to Privacy Online” <i>Recommended:</i> Deirdre Mulligan, Colin Koopman, & Nick Doty, “Privacy Is An Essentially-Contested Concept”
3/6	<u>Putting Privacy in Context: Pragmatic Information Tech. Ethics</u> Privacy Case Studies Packet (avail. on <i>Canvas</i>)
3/8	Section focused on <u>Group Privacy Collaborations</u> with your GTF
3/8	<u>Technology Ethics: Topic TBD</u> Guest Lecture by Bonnie Sheehey Assigned reading TBD <i>Recommended:</i> Bonnie Sheehey, “Algorithmic Paranoia”
3/11	<u>Why is Technology a Moral Matter?: Virtue Ethics Approaches</u> Shannon Vallor, “Surveillance and the Examined Life: Cultivating the Technomoral Self in a Panoptic World” <i>Recommended:</i> Langdon Winner, “Citizen Virtues in a Technological Order” <i>Recommended:</i> Colin Koopman, “The Age of ‘Infopolitics’” in <i>The New York Times</i> <read online at https://nyti.ms/2jLaZLZ >
3/15	Assignment #4 due Fri. of Week 10 at beginning of section

	CONCLUSION: Ethical Reflection and Self-Transformation
3/13	<u>Moral Meliorism: Making Better Moralities</u> William James, “The Will to Believe” in <i>WTB</i>
3/15	Section Discussion of <u>Why Morality Matters</u> with your GTF
3/15	<u>Moral Meliorism: Making Better Moralities</u> William James, “The Will to Believe” in <i>WTB</i> (reread it, as an experiment)
3/19	Assignment #5 due Tues. at 5pm of Exam Week

Student Work & Assessment:

There are *five main writing assignments* you will be expected to complete for this course (see #1-5 below)—if you fail to turn in any two of these then you will fail this course no matter what grade you received on the other assignments.

In addition, a portion of your grade will depend upon attendance and participation (see #6 and #7 below)—if you miss a significant number of class sessions (as stated below in #6 and #7) .

Online and Hardcopy Submission: All writing assignments (#1-5 below) must be turned in online; you must also turn in a hardcopy unless your section instructor (your GE) explicitly tells you that they do not require a hardcopy.

Writing Assignments Portion of Grade:

1. One Short Argumentative Essay (10% of class grade)

- In his book *Morality: An Introduction*, Bernard Williams seeks to “defuse” a variety of moral skepticisms, including perhaps most importantly moral relativism. You are to write a two-part short-answer essay on this topic.
 - *Part I (please label this ‘Part I’ on your assignment): What for Williams is the “central confusion” of relativism? You may quote Williams to explain your answer. Then, in your own words, explain how Williams describes this confusion? This should bring you to about the halfway point of your paper.*
 - *Part II (please label this ‘Part II’): Respond to Williams’s assessment of relativism (in Part I of your assignment) by offering an argument in favor of Williams’s view*

(even if you do not yourself agree with Williams). One strategy (though there are plenty of other viable approaches) for this might be to begin the second half of the assignment with a hypothetical objection to Williams's claim that you could imagine a defender of relativism entertaining; you could then argue against this hypothetical objection.

- Format requirements: your essay should be approximately 500 words (between 1½-2 pages but no more than 2 pages), and set in 12 pt. Times New Roman, double-spaced, 1-inch margins all around, with any notes as single-space footnotes 10 point. (If you cite material and include a list of references these will not count as words for your word-count limits.)
- This written assignment will be graded on the following three assessment criteria: *1) the quality of your writing (including grammar, style, and organization), 2) your demonstration of understanding (comprehension of the concepts you write about, accuracy in describing the views of assigned reading material, accuracy in citation and quotation), 3) quality of your argument (including the soundness/cogency of your argumentation and the completeness of your argument in engaging reasonable alternative views)*

2. One Take-Home Short Essay Midterm Exam (25% of class grade)

- The midterm will be distributed online on our class website.
- Format requirements: your midterm should be set in 12 pt. Times New Roman, double-spaced, 1-inch margins all around, with any notes as single-space footnotes 10 point. (If you cite material and include a list of references these will not count as words for your word-count limits.)
- Here is a preview of the midterm and what we are looking you to produce:
 - Part I of the midterm will consist of three very-short-answer essays. This portion of the midterm will be graded on the following assessment criteria: *1) the quality of your writing (including grammar, style, and organization), 2) your demonstration of understanding (comprehension of the concepts you write about, accuracy in describing the views of assigned reading material, accuracy in citation and quotation).*
 - Part II of the midterm will consist of one longer short-answer essay question chosen from a list of prompts. This portion of the midterm will be graded on the following three assessment criteria: *1) the quality of your writing (including grammar, style, and organization), 2) your demonstration of understanding (comprehension of the concepts you write about, accuracy in describing the views of assigned reading material, accuracy in citation and quotation), 3) quality of your argument (including the soundness/cogency of your argumentation and the completeness of your argument in engaging reasonable alternative views).*

3. One Argumentative Essay (25% of class grade)

- For this assignment, you will write a short argumentative paper discussing an important issue of interest to you from our units on inequality and identity.

- Part of your assignment for this essay is to formulate a good and interesting question, which you will then give a good answer to. As such, there will not be an assigned question/prompt except for the following. The requirement for the topic of the essay is the following: *You will frame your essay around a claim of your choice as it is argued by one of our authors in our assigned class readings for the unit of the class relevant to your topic (ideally, you would find a clear quote from one of our assigned readings as conveying the topic of your argument). Your essay will then argue either for or against that claim. If you argue against the author, be charitable to their view but patiently explain why you find it incorrect, considering potential counter-arguments they would offer in reply. If you argue for the author's claim, then you need to frame your argument around a plausible critique of that claim (either a hypothetical critique or an actual critique from another class reading or an outside source). Your essay should also frame your argument using one or more of the conceptual frameworks studied in the first half of class (one of the three major moral theories of deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics).*
 - Format requirements: your essay should be 1200-1500 words (roughly 4-5 pages), and set in 12 pt. Times New Roman, double-spaced, 1-inch margins all around, with any notes as single-space footnotes 10 point. In addition your paper must contain a bibliography of all references cited in the paper (which should be included with your paper but will not count as words for your word-count limits).
 - This written assignment will be graded on the following three assessment criteria: *1) the quality of your writing (including grammar, style, and organization), 2) your demonstration of understanding (comprehension of the concepts you write about, accuracy in describing the views of assigned reading material, accuracy in citation and quotation), 3) quality of your argument (including the soundness/cogency of your argumentation and the completeness of your argument in engaging reasonable alternative views).*
4. **One Group Technology Ethics Report (15%)**; full guidelines will be available on Canvas soon after the beginning of class (see the Files->Privacy folder), but here is a brief summary:
- For this assignment, you will work in small groups (of 3 to 4 students) to produce a two-part report on an actually-existing privacy problem (contemporary or historical) that you choose based on your independent research. You will be given time in class to work on this project, but you will also need to plan on a small number of outside-of-class group meetings (*if this does not work for you, then you should drop this class*). The report will be written as if you are on a team of ethicists working at an ethics consulting firm that has been hired to report on this issue. The report will be due in two parts:
 - The first part (label this 'Part I') will be a group report written for your firm's client (you decide who this will be, it might be a government agency, such as a regulatory body or the Office of the President, or a corporation, or a non-profit lobby like Electronic Frontier Foundation, or even an individual). This report must consist of (at least) three portions: first, a description of the problem or issue you are reporting on; second, an analysis of the context of the case in the terms of the Contextual

Integrity model of privacy (to be presented in lecture); third, a recommendation for how the client should act, with a consideration and discussion of at least two possible courses of action.

- The second part (label this 'Part II') will be a solo-authored document (each member of the group will turn this in separately) that could be described as internally-facing process description document. This document will consist of, firstly, an executive summary prepared not for your client, but for the chief officers of your firm (in this case, these will be your session instructor and class professor). This should be a very brief (one paragraph) abstract or summary of the report. This document will contain, secondly, a short description of your group's work process, and a quantification of the amount of work undertaken by each group member (as a percentage of the total work put into the project, with the max. for all group members combined being 100%).
- Format notes: *Make sure to include the names and email addresses of all group members on Part I your assignment (one person in the group will upload your document but all will receive credit and a grade on Canvas).* Format your document as follows: 1500-1800 words (roughly 5-6 pages), 12 pt. Times New Roman, double-space, 1-inch margins all around, notes as single-space footnotes 10 point. In addition, your paper must contain a bibliography of all references cited in the paper (which should be included with your paper but will not count as words for your word-count limits).
- This assignment will be graded primarily on the basis of an effort with an eye to the following assessment criteria: *1) your individual commitment to working as a member of a group (as evidenced by Part II of the assignment); 2) the clarity of your group's writing and the comprehensiveness of your report (as evidenced by Part I of the assignment).*

5. **Final Reflective Personal Essay (10%):** a final brief reflective essay

- In this concluding assignment you will address the following topic(s): "*What do you will to believe? Why does moral self-transformation matter to you? How are you, or do you plan to transform, yourself as a moral agent with respect to the moral matters that matter most to you?*" You will want to consider which moral matters are most important (the *what*), offer an explanation of why those issues are important to you (the *why*), and describe what you do (or plan to do) to act according to the stated importance with which you regard this issue (the *how*).
- Format notes: 750-900 words (or approx. 2½ pages, with 3 pages as a hard limit), 12 pt. Times New Roman, double-space, 1-inch margins all around, notes as single-space footnotes in 10 pt. type.
- This written assignment will be graded on the following three assessment criteria: *1) the quality of your writing (including grammar, style, and organization), 2) your demonstration of understanding (comprehension of the concepts you write about, accuracy in describing the views of assigned reading material, accuracy in citation and quotation), 3) depth of reflection displayed by your essay.*

Participation and Attendance Portion of Grade:

6. Lecture Attendance & Participation in Group Exercises during Lecture (5%)

- Attendance is very important in this class, in part because we will be dealing with difficult and complicated philosophical material that you will get the most out of if you both do the readings and benefit from the contextualization and explication offered in lecture. This portion of your grade will be assessed based on a combination of:
 - *Daily written reading responses* to be turned in at the *very beginning* of class (these will *not* be accepted if late). You must write (either on a sheet of paper or printed out) a very short two-sentence (or more) response to the assigned reading. First, you must pose a question about the reading with regard to something you did not fully understand. Second, you must state what you found most compelling about the assigned reading selection.
 - These will be *due at the beginning of every lecture session* from Wednesday of Week 1 until Friday of Week 10.
 - *Participating in group and individual exercises announced during lecture*, to be graded based on exercises including a brief in-class writing component which you will then turn in to your GTF at the end of lecture (those turning in these writings will receive full credit for this portion of their grade).
 - You may miss up to 1 of our lecture meetings *without any automatic penalty* but for each additional lecture missed without an accepted reason you will lose 20% of this portion of your grade (which is equivalent to a 1% deduction on your overall class grade). Thus, missing six (or more) lectures will result in a 0% on this portion of your grade (which is equivalent to a 5% deduction on your overall class grade).
 - In the application of this rule, absences will only be excused for documented medical reasons or clear emergencies; other reasons will not serve as excuses.

7. Discussion Section Attendance & Participation (10%)

- Discussion section is extremely important to your success in this class. Our readings, subject matters, and methods in this class are extremely complex. From lecture you will receive explanations and contextualization. But in discussion section you will have a fuller chance to pose questions, deliberate with others, and think through this material in a fuller way.
- Failure to attend section will result in the following deductions:
 - You may miss up to 1 of your Friday section meetings with your GTF *without any automatic penalty*.
 - If you miss more than 1 section, this portion of your grade will be cut in half (i.e., your *overall* grade for the class will be lowered 5%)
 - If you miss more than 2 sections, you will receive 0 points for this portion of your grade (i.e., your *overall* grade lowered by 10%)

- If you miss more than 4 sections (without a justifiable reason for absence), you will automatically fail the course.
- In the application of this rule, absences will only be excused for documented medical reasons or clear emergencies; other reasons will not serve as excuses.
- Beyond the above deductions for failure to attend, this portion of your grade will be assessed on: *your preparedness when you come to class, your degree of participation in class, your conducting yourself in a respectful manner in contributing to class discussions.* Thus, even if you attend all 10 section meetings, if you are not prepared to discuss the material you may lose some points on this portion of your grade.

Required Books:

You *must* use the edition listed and you *must* have a physical copy (hardcopy) that you bring to every class in which that material is discussed; other editions will *not* be acceptable for this class. Our four primary class books will be available in the DuckStore:

- William James, *The Will to Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy* (Dover Books)
- Immanuel Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals* (Hackett Publishing)
- John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism* (Hackett Publishing)
- Bernard Williams, *Morality: An Introduction* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Canto edition) – hardcopy preferred but e-book acceptable
- Beyond these four books all other readings will be available as PDFs or URLs on our course website. It is your responsibility to make sure you have access to them. If you do not have access to an assigned reading, check with your section instructor, and let me know as soon as possible.

Learning Objectives:

This course is designed to provide you with the opportunity to:

- Understand the central moral-theoretical frameworks in which many moral and political issues today are debated.
- Gain additional exposure to some of the key terms of debate of a selection of important contemporary moral issues.
- Discuss these moral theories and moral issues in a respectful environment so that you may gain practice in deliberative exchange on moral issues using philosophical thinking.
- Improve your argumentative writing skills.
- Collaboratively work with others on a philosophical reflection on ethical issues in the form of a group written report.

Additional Notes & Statements:

Grading Standards: The following rubric reflects the general standards of the Philosophy Department at the University of Oregon:

- A = Excellent. No mistakes, well-written, and distinctive in some way or other.
- B = Good. No significant mistakes, well-written, but not distinctive in any way.
- C = Acceptable. Some errors, but a basic grasp of the material.
- D = Poor or Unacceptable. Several errors, with a tenuous grasp of the material.
- F = Failing. Problematic on all fronts, with no real grasp of the material, or a complete lack of effort.

Computer Use in Lecture: My policy for this class is that you may use laptops and tablets in class (but not cell phones, smart phones, etc.) provided that you *do not sit in the back four rows of the lecture hall* and provided also that you *do not use your computers to check your email, your social network sites, shop for shoes, etc.* If need be, we will revise this policy as the class progresses. Successful use of computers in the classroom is up to *you*, it's not up to me. Don't abuse this privilege such that it interferes with others' enjoyment of it.

Cell Phone Use in Lecture: Usage of cell phones in class is not permitted under any circumstances (unless I directly tell you otherwise). If there is something that is so important that you cannot keep your cell phone put away during class, then you should probably not come to class.

Academic Honesty: The instructor reserves the right to assign a grade of 'F' for the course to students who engage in any acts of academic dishonesty, including but not limited to:

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is the inclusion of someone else's product, words, ideas, or data as one's own work. When a student submits work for credit that includes the product, words, ideas, or data of others, the source must be acknowledged by the use of complete, accurate, and specific references, such as footnotes. By placing one's name on work submitted for credit, one certifies the originality of all work not otherwise identified by appropriate acknowledgements. Verbatim statements by others must be enclosed by quotation marks or set off from the regular text as indented extracts. Students will avoid being charged with plagiarism if there is acknowledgement of indebtedness. Indebtedness must be acknowledged whenever: 1) one quotes another person's actual words or replicates all or part of another's product; 2) one uses another person's ideas, opinions, work, data, or theories, even if they are completely paraphrased in one's own words; 3) one borrows facts, statistics, or other illustrative material—unless the information is common knowledge. Unauthorized collaboration with others on papers or projects can inadvertently lead to a charge of plagiarism. If in doubt, consult the instructor or seek assistance from the staff of Tutoring and Academic Engagement Center (Knight Library, 4th Floor, 541-346-3226). In addition, it is plagiarism to submit as your own any academic exercise prepared totally or in part by another person, even if that person is acting as a tutor or editor (and ends up substantially producing part of the work).

Fabrication: Fabrication is the intentional use of information that the author has invented when he or she states or implies otherwise, or the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive. Examples include, but are not limited to: 1) citing information not taken from the source indicated; 2) listing sources in a reference not used in the academic exercise; 3) inventing data or source information for research or other academic exercises.

Cheating: Cheating is an act of deception by which a student misrepresents or misleadingly demonstrates that he or she has mastered information on an academic exercise that he or she has not mastered, including the giving or receiving of unauthorized help in an academic exercise. Examples include but are not limited to: 1) copying from another student's work; 2) collaborating without authority or allowing another student to copy one's work in a test situation; 3) using the course textbook or other material not authorized for use during a test; 4) using unauthorized material during a test; for example, notes, formula lists, cues on a computer, photographs, symbolic representations, and notes written on clothing; 5) resubmitting substantially the same work that was produced for another assignment without the knowledge and permission of the instructor; 6) taking a test for someone else or permitting someone else to take a test for you.