

PHILOSOPHY UPPER COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

WINTER - 2018

(Revised 10/26/17)

PHIL 300: PREDICATE LOGIC -- MWF 12:00–1:10 pm

Prof. Tony Roy - troy@csusb.edu - (909) 537-5870

They say that “all aspirin is not alike.” Is this to be taken literally? (Surely not.) Suppose everybody loves my baby, and my baby don't love nobody but me. Does it follow that I am my baby? (It does.) Investigate these questions and more in Philosophy 300! Philosophy 300 introduces the standard predicate calculus. We will push beyond treatment of the logical operators, ‘if . . . then’, ‘if and only if’, ‘and’, ‘not’, ‘or’, and move on to the quantifiers ‘all’ and ‘some’. This material greatly expands the power of our symbolic logic, including to general mathematical reasoning. It is foundational to disciplines as diverse as philosophy, mathematics and computer science, and essential for those who will investigate theoretical underpinnings in such areas; it will be illuminating for those who would undertake further course work or reading in these and related disciplines. The text is a manuscript by Prof. Roy.

Phil 300 has Phil 200 (or consent of instructor) as prerequisite. If it's been some time since you had Phil 200, you might check out the material from chapter 1, and the first parts of chapters 2, 4, 5 and 6 in the manuscript, Symbolic Logic: An Accessible Introduction to Serious Mathematical Logic. In this course, we complete chapters 2, 4, 5 and 6, along with chapter 7.

PHIL 313: HISTORY OF MODERN PHIL: KNOWLEDGE & REALITY -- MWF 1:20–2:30 pm

Prof. William Vanderburgh - wvanderburgh@csusb.edu - (909) 537-3998

The early modern period in philosophy, normally said to begin around the time French philosopher René Descartes began publishing in 1637, was an exciting time of great intellectual and social turmoil. Old ways were being overturned and replaced with radical new ideas. As reason came to dominate over tradition and scientific reasoning began to develop in opposition to assumption and superstition, even the very methods of doing philosophy came into question. Our course, an introduction to this period's ways of approaching questions about the nature of reality and how we come to know it, will start with a rough distinction between the so-called “Rationalists” (Descartes, Leibniz, and others) and “Empiricists” (most notably Locke, Berkeley and Hume). Although philosophers in this period usually wrote on a multitude of different subjects, we will be focusing on their various approaches to epistemology and metaphysics, including their answers to questions like these: *What is the nature of reality? How do we come to know things, and what does it mean “to know”?* *What kinds of things exist? What is the relationship between God and the world, and between God and human knowledge? What are the limits of the knowable? How should skeptical doubts figure in our intellectual life, and how should we use evidence to make decisions about what kinds of claims to believe?* The variety of contrasting answers early modern philosophers gave to these and related questions will provide a foundation for beginning to form our own views on these matters. This course forms an important part of any Philosophy degree and is crucial background if you are considering graduate studies in Philosophy. *Prerequisites: Completion of the GE Critical Thinking (A4) and Philosophy (C4) requirements.*

(Descriptions continued on reverse)

PHIL 362: PHILOSOPHY OF LAW -- MWF 10:40–11:50 am

Prof. Chris Naticchia - cnaticch@csusb.edu - (909) 537-5489

Do we have a duty to obey the law, and if so, why? Do we have duties to vote, to pay taxes, and to defend our country? Politicians and pundits tell us that we do. These are the duties of citizens, they say. Are they right? From the time of Plato's *Crito*, philosophers have wrestled with this question, and their answers are by no means unanimous. Some of them argue that we do have these duties, because we've consented to undertake them, or because fairness requires us to fulfill them in exchange for enjoying the benefits – security, prosperity, democracy -- that others' fulfillment of them provides. Some say the case is even more straightforward: the consequences of requiring obedience, etc. are far better than they would be were we to lack such duties. But there are dissenters, too, who deny that we have these duties, and that citizens who mistakenly believe that they do wind up shirking their *true* moral duties, trapping the poor and the oppressed in the process by dutifully obeying the authorities when they should instead disobey and agitate for more radical change. In this course, we will examine each of these positions and attempt to come up with a reasoned all-things-considered judgment as to which one is best. In the process, students will learn about the sources, scope, and limits of their duties of citizens; and hone the reading, writing, and critical thinking skills that will serve them in law or graduate school or the workforce. **This course counts toward the minor in Philosophy, Policy, and Economics, as well as the minor in Law and Philosophy.**

PHIL 383: PHILOSOPHY OF MATHEMATICS -- TR 10:00–11:50 am

Prof. John Mumma - jmumma@csusb.edu - (909) 537-5872

Since the time of Plato, philosophers have held up rigorous mathematical proof as the ideal form of proof. In this course, students will examine this ideal from a philosophical, mathematical and historical perspective. From the philosophical perspective students will gain an understanding of the how (i.e. the logic) of rigorous mathematical proof and from the mathematical perspective an understanding of the what (i.e. the content) of rigorous mathematical proof. Their work will culminate in a project in which they gain an understanding of the why by researching and reporting on the rigorization of a historically significant mathematical theorem or subject matter.

PHIL 472: ADVANCED ISSUES IN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION:

ATHEISM AND PHILOSOPHICAL NATURALISM -- TR 12:00–1:50 pm

Prof. Matthew Davidson - mld@csusb.edu - (909) 537-7277

In this class we will examine philosophically some of the recent and classic attempts to flesh out a naturalistic worldview on which no being like the God of Western monotheism exists. There has been a significant amount of effort over the last twenty years or so in defending the intellectual respectability of a naturalistic worldview. After examining some historical precursors (e.g. Marx, Freud, Hume), we will spend extensive time evaluating the claims and arguments made recently, in particular by some of the "New Atheists" (with Dawkins and Dennett in particular).