



ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

GENERAL STUDIES PROGRAM COURSE PROPOSAL COVER FORM

Courses submitted to the GSC between 2/1 and 4/30 if approved, will be effective the following Spring.

Courses submitted between 5/1 and 1/31 if approved, will be effective the following Fall.

(SUBMISSION VIA ADOBE.PDF FILES IS PREFERRED)

DATE 1/15/2009

1. ACADEMIC UNIT: Department of Philosophy
2. COURSE PROPOSED: PHI 300 Philosophical Argument and Exposition 3
(prefix) (number) (title) (semester hours)
3. CONTACT PERSON: Name: Lee Quarrie Phone: 480-965-3394
Mail Code: 4102 E-Mail: lee.quarrie@asu.edu
4. ELIGIBILITY: New courses must be approved by the Tempe Campus Curriculum Subcommittee and must have a regular course number. For the rules governing approval of omnibus courses, contact the General Studies Program Office at 965-0739.
5. AREA(S) PROPOSED COURSE WILL SERVE. A single course may be proposed for more than one core or awareness area. A course may satisfy a core area requirement and more than one awareness area requirements concurrently, but may not satisfy requirements in two core areas simultaneously, even if approved for those areas. With departmental consent, an approved General Studies course may be counted toward both the General Studies requirement and the major program of study. **(Please submit one designation per proposal)**

<u>Core Areas</u>	<u>Awareness Areas</u>
Literacy and Critical Inquiry-L <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Global Awareness-G <input type="checkbox"/>
Mathematical Studies-MA <input type="checkbox"/> CS <input type="checkbox"/>	Historical Awareness-H <input type="checkbox"/>
Humanities, Fine Arts and Design-HU <input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Diversity in the United States-C <input type="checkbox"/>
Social and Behavioral Sciences-SB <input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural Sciences-SQ <input type="checkbox"/> SG <input type="checkbox"/>	
6. DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED.
(1) Course Description
(2) Course Syllabus
(3) Criteria Checklist for the area
(4) Table of Contents from the textbook used, if available
7. ***In the space provided below (or on a separate sheet), please also provide a description of how the course meets the specific criteria in the area for which the course is being proposed.***

CROSS-LISTED COURSES: ☒ No ☐ Yes; Please identify courses: _____

Is this amultisection course?: ☒ No ☐ Yes; Is it governed by a common syllabus? _____

Peter de Marneffe



ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Chair/Director (Print or Type)

Chair/Director (Signature)

Date: _____

Arizona State University Criteria Checklist for

LITERACY AND CRITICAL INQUIRY - [L]

Rationale and Objectives

Literacy is here defined broadly as communicative competence in written and oral discourse. **Critical inquiry** involves the gathering, interpretation, and evaluation of evidence. Any field of university study may require unique critical skills which have little to do with language in the usual sense (words), but the analysis of spoken and written evidence pervades university study and everyday life. Thus, the General Studies requirements assume that all undergraduates should develop the ability to reason critically and communicate using the medium of language.

The requirement in Literacy and Critical Inquiry presumes, first, that training in literacy and critical inquiry must be sustained beyond traditional First Year English in order to create a habitual skill in every student; and, second, that the skills become more expert, as well as more secure, as the student learns challenging subject matter. Thus, the Literacy and Critical Inquiry requirement stipulates two courses beyond First Year English.

Most lower-level [L] courses are devoted primarily to the further development of critical skills in reading, writing, listening, speaking, or analysis of discourse. Upper-division [L] courses generally are courses in a particular discipline into which writing and critical thinking have been fully integrated as means of learning the content and, in most cases, demonstrating that it has been learned.

Students must complete six credit hours from courses designated as [L], at least three credit hours of which must be chosen from approved upper-division courses, preferably in their major. Students must have completed ENG 101, 107, or 105 to take an [L] course.

Notes:

1. ENG 101, 107 or ENG 105 must be prerequisites
2. Honors theses, XXX 493 meet [L] requirements
3. The list of criteria that must be satisfied for designation as a Literacy and Critical Inquiry [L] course is presented on the following page. This list will help you determine whether the current version of your course meets all of these requirements. If you decide to apply, please attach a current syllabus, or handouts, or other documentation that will provide sufficient information for the General Studies Council to make an informed decision regarding the status of your proposal.

Proposer: Please complete the following section and attach appropriate documentation.

ASU - [L] CRITERIA			
TO QUALIFY FOR [L] DESIGNATION, THE COURSE DESIGN MUST PLACE A MAJOR EMPHASIS ON COMPLETING CRITICAL DISCOURSE--AS EVIDENCED BY THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:			
YES	NO		Identify Documentation Submitted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CRITERION 1: At least 50 percent of the grade in the course should depend upon writing, including prepared essays, speeches, or in-class essay examinations. <i>Group projects are acceptable only if each student gathers, interprets, and evaluates evidence, and prepares a summary report</i>	see "C-1" marked on syllabus
1. Please describe the assignments that are considered in the computation of course grades--and indicate the proportion of the final grade that is determined by each assignment.			
2. Also: <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> Please circle, underline, or otherwise mark the information presented in the most recent course syllabus (or other material you have submitted) that verifies this description of the grading process--and label this information "C-1". </div> C-1			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CRITERION 2: The composition tasks involve the gathering, interpretation, and evaluation of evidence	see "C-2" marked on syllabus
1. Please describe the way(s) in which this criterion is addressed in the course design			
2. Also: <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> Please circle, underline, or otherwise mark the information presented in the most recent course syllabus (or other material you have submitted) that verifies this description of the grading process--and label this information "C-2". </div> C-2			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CRITERION 3: The syllabus should include a minimum of two substantial writing or speaking tasks, other than or in addition to in-class essay exams	see "C-3" marked on syllabus
1. Please provide relatively detailed descriptions of two or more substantial writing or speaking tasks that are included in the course requirements			
2. Also: <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> Please circle, underline, or otherwise mark the information presented in the most recent course syllabus (or other material you have submitted) that verifies this description of the grading process--and label this information "C-3". </div> C-3			

ASU - [L] CRITERIA			
YES	NO		Identify Documentation Submitted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CRITERION 4: These substantial writing or speaking assignments should be arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments. <i>Intervention at earlier stages in the writing process is especially welcomed</i>	see "C-4" marked on syllabus
1. Please describe the sequence of course assignments--and the nature of the feedback the current (or most recent) course instructor provides to help students do better on subsequent assignments			
2. Also: <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 10px; margin: 10px auto; width: 80%;"> Please circle, underline, or otherwise mark the information presented in the most recent course syllabus (or other material you have submitted) that verifies this description of the grading process--and label this information "C-4". </div>			
C-4			

Course Prefix	Number	Title	Designation
PHI	300	Introduction to Philosophical Argument and Exposition	L

Explain in detail which student activities correspond to the specific designation criteria. Please use the following organizer to explain how the criteria are being met.

Criteria (from checksheet)	How course meets spirit (contextualize specific examples in next column)	Please provide detailed evidence of how course meets criteria (i.e., where in syllabus)
Criterion 1: At least 50 percent of the grade in the course should depend upon writing, including prepared essays, speeches, or in-class essay examinations.	50 percent of the grade for this course is based on written essays. 20 percent is based on a prepared oral presentation. Therefore, 70 percent (>50) is based on "writing" in the relevant sense.	See syllabus items marked "C-1."
Criterion 2: The composition tasks involve the gathering, interpretation, and evaluation of evidence.	In preparation for their written essays and oral presentation, students are required to extract philosophical arguments from texts and to subject these arguments to critical evaluation.	See syllabus items marked "C-2."
Criterion 3: The syllabus should include a minimum of two substantial writing or speaking tasks that are included in the course requirements.	Students are required to make one substantial oral presentation and to complete at least two polished philosophical essays.	See syllabus items marked "C-3."
Criterion 4: These substantial writing or speaking assignments should be arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments.	The instructor comments on drafts of the major essays within a week of submission and has the students submit rewritten drafts. The instructor also requires students to give each other feedback.	See syllabus items marked "C-4."

Course Description

PHI 300 Philosophical Argument and Exposition

Develops techniques of philosophical argument and exposition. Frequent written exercises. Course content may vary with instructor. Pre-requisites: major: instructor approval. *General Studies: L*

INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENTATION AND EXPOSITION

PHI 300

Instructor: Dr. Thad Botham, thad.botham@asu.edu

Office Hours: By appointment

Cell: 574.329.6652 (don't hesitate to call me if you need to)

This course uses Blackboard. Be certain you have and use your ASU email address.

Goals:

We will become better thinkers by thinking hard about hard things to think about. We'll delve into puzzles on the cutting edge of today's philosophical community. Our course aims to develop intellectual maturity, placing as much emphasis on how to think as on what to think. We will learn how to gather, interpret, and evaluate evidence (or reasons) for controversial views. More precisely, we will learn how (i) to extract philosophical arguments from texts by distilling them into a transparently rigorous form, (ii) to formulate rigorous arguments on our own, (iii) to evaluate critically arguments on our own, and (iv) to communicate clearly our findings in both written and oral formats.

C-2

A philosophic problem is a call to provide an adequate explanation in terms of an acceptable basis. If we are ready to tolerate everything as understood, there is nothing left to explain; while if we sourly refuse to take anything, even tentatively, as clear, no explanation can be given. What intrigues us as a problem, and what will satisfy us as a solution, will depend upon the line we draw between what is already clear and what needs to be clarified.

—Nelson Goodman (1953: 31) *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast*

Tasks:

To this end, each of us will, via a class presentation, communicate his or her mastery of a current philosophical problem. These presentations include arguments of our own crafting that contributes to recent literature. We will complete a sequence of writing assignments (or essays) that build upon one another, endowing us with skills to draft and to polish full-fledged thesis-driven essays. In addition to interacting critically with primary philosophical texts, we will *constructively* criticize one another's work in both written and oral formats. We'll therefore give special attention to improving one another's arguments.

As evidence that students have mastered philosophical argumentation and exposition, students will complete at least two polished, compelling, rigorous, and tightly written philosophical essays. The hope is that we'll each have an essay (or two) suitable for submitting as a writing sample to competitive graduate schools in philosophy.

C-3

Required Texts:

- Clark, Michael (2007) *Paradoxes from A to Z*, 2nd edition (New York: Routledge).
- Baggini, Julian (2006) *The Pig that Wants to Be Eaten: 100 Experiments for the Armchair Philosopher* (New York: Penguin Group).
- Selected essays from the journal *Analysis*.
- Handouts via Blackboard.

Grade Breakdown→

Participation:	10 points
Presentation:	20 points
Essays:	50 points
Written Constructive Criticisms:	20 points
Total Course Points:	100 points

C-1

- **PARTICIPATION (10 points)**. Attitude is essential!! Since interaction with one another is fundamental to philosophizing, participation includes much more than just coming to class. Sometimes a well-formulated question is better than a bold assertion. Here are some criteria for participation:

- **Attendance.** Attendance earns you no points by itself. But failing to be present at any time during the scheduled class time counts as an absence and may cost you (dearly). Come to class ON TIME and be cognitively present for the entire class. More than 2 unexcused absences will lower your overall course grade as follows:
3 absences = 1 letter grade deduction (highest is a B)
4 absences = 2 letter grade deduction (highest is a C)
5 absences = 3 letter grade deduction (highest is a D)
- **Laptops and Electronic Devices.** Prohibited during class, but certain exceptions apply.
- **Accuracy and Précision and the Truth.** Your assertions should not fall prey to easily constructed counterexamples. Speak literally. Say what you mean. Mean what you say.
- **Clarity.** Your peers should be able to understand what you are saying, even if they disagree with you.
- **Succinctness.** Speak in as few words as possible.
- **Logic.** When you give a reason for an assertion you make, be sure your reason really does support your claim.
- **Relevance.** Make sure your comments and questions address the issue at hand.
- **Community.** Do you engage your peers? Are you silent? Do you feel the need to be a show-off? The best students interact with and listen to their peers.
- **The Alive-Factor.** Does your contribution keep the discussion alive? That is, does your comment or question show that you are prepared? Does it engage your peers, provoke further reflection, and raise the standard of excellence? Does it take the discussion to the next level? Or, does your contribution throw the discussion into the dead-zone? Some examples of dead-zone triggers would be these: communicating (either explicitly or implicitly) that you failed to prepare for class, or saying things like "I don't know," "I didn't understand the thesis of the essay," "I liked the argument," "It's just a matter of faith anyway," or other such conversation-stoppers. Keep the discussion alive!
- **Novelty.** The caliber and originality of your comment/question surprises and raises the standard of intellectual integrity.
- **HOMEWORK & POP QUIZZES**. Verifies whether or not you're understanding logic, grasping crucial concepts, paying attention, or just plain keeping up.

- **PRESENTATION (20 points)**. Once during the semester you get to run the class for awhile by explaining your MASTERY of a philosophical puzzle/problem. The rest of us will try to help your case become more clear and more compelling.

- Sign up for a philosophical puzzle/issue.
- Build a portfolio. Research to develop your own intuitions. On the day of your presentation, turn in photocopies of the relevant short articles. Write four single-page précis of the top four most relevant articles to your presentation.
- WHEN DO I SUBMIT MY FOUR PRÉCIS AND MY POWERPOINT PRESENTATION ON THE DISCUSSION BOARD? Compile your précis into one file and post it on the discussion board no later than 1 week before your presentation. Post your Powerpoint slides no later than 4 days prior to your presentation. You will lose 1 point per hour if either précis or presentation is late. Again, précis due no later than 1 week prior to presentation; Powerpoint slides due no later than 4 days prior to presentation. For

C-3

C-2

example, if you're in my Monday section, then your Powerpoint is due Thursday at midnight. If you're in my Wednesday section, then your Powerpoint is due Saturday at midnight.

- Improve and modify your Presentation in light of student Criticisms submitted to the discussion board 2 days before your Presentation.
- Provide a handout in class.
- During your presentation, bring us up to speed on the debate. You may assume we've read the textbook and your précis. Explain the significance of the philosophical controversy. What is the core disagreement? What are the opposing arguments?
- What is the argument with which you disagree? Extract it and present it as 1 slide.
- Take a stand on the issue.
- Present your own novel rigorous argument (premise-premise-conclusion format) for your view. Ideally, your argument fits onto 1 slide.
- When you present your argument, do NOT merely read your premises from the screen. Instead, explain what the premise means, especially for the BASIC premises. Explain what would count as a counterexample to each BASIC premise (even though you think it is, in fact, true). Give examples that illustrate the BASIC premise's plausibility.
- Field questions.

➤ **ESSAYS (50 points).** Writing a fantastic philosophy essay is an involved and lengthy process. Nearly always, your best ideas come to you as you write rather than before you write. This course will provide you with a recipe of sorts, which includes helpful tricks, for composing impressive philosophy essays. You will compose several smallish writing assignments to gain the right sort of experience for composing at least two major philosophy essays.

- Count on writing every week!
- For the major essays, count on composing multiple drafts in response to feedback (I aim to give you helpful comments within the week).

C-4

Notes on Extracted, Transparently Rigorous, Formal Arguments

- The argument is in numbered premise-premise-conclusion format.
- Your conclusion is controversial—so, there are many reasonable and informed people who deny your conclusion.
- Each premise is justified either by flagging it as BASIC, or else by citing at most two previous premises (and the inference rule, if applicable).
- Your premises are easy to understand. They are clear and succinct.
- Your peers can clearly see how your premises really support your conclusion. In other words, each inference is valid.
- No superfluous premises: every premise is used in support of the conclusion.
- Your premises are true. At the very least, they do not fall prey to easily constructed counterexamples. There are many adherents to the truth of your BASIC (i.e., underived) premises. Ideally, *every* reasonable person would, upon a bit of reflection, believe your basic premises. This is very difficult. Imagine someone who neither believes nor denies your conclusion—she just hasn't decided yet. Would she believe your premises? If so, you're off to a great start. Now imagine someone who already denies your conclusion—you are trying to persuade him. Would he believe your basic premises? If so, you've got an outstanding argument.

- **CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISMS (20 points).** Work as a team with one another to improve weaknesses in our arguments.

- You must submit a written criticism on at least 3 student Presentations (and more, if you wish). You must proof-read at least 3 major essays written by fellow students, submitting written comments, criticisms, and suggestions.
- Be as detailed and thorough as you can be. Put a great deal of effort and time into it.
- Focus 1st on whether the conclusion is relevant and controversial.
- Focus 2nd on validity. Do the premises really perfectly support their conclusion(s)? Forget, for the moment, whether or not their premises are true. Pretend they are true. Now, were the premises true, would they guarantee that the conclusion is true? Take it a step at a time, and ask this question of every inference the argument makes—that is, does every line that cites previous lines really perfectly follow from them? If a line does not follow, you must provide a counterexample to the inference by explaining a consistent scenario where the premises are true while the conclusion (the inferred line) is false.
- Focus 3rd on whether the BASIC premises are true—or at least reasonable upon reflection. Can you come up with a counterexample to some BASIC premises? That is, can you explain a real-life situation that illustrates how the premise is false? Or, if the premise is a principle, can you describe a situation where the principle fails to apply?
- Is a BASIC premise ambiguous? That is, are there multiple interpretations of a premise each of which is a reasonable and charitable reading?
- Can you give a brief argument for denying a premise?
- Only as a last resort should you attempt to deny the truth of a line that cites other line(s). For example, suppose this is the argument:

- (1) It is immoral to cage people for experimentation. (BASIC)
- (2) Chimpanzees are a lot like people. (BASIC)
- (3) Thus, caging chimpanzees is immoral. (From 1, 2)

If you think (3) is false, you should be able either to show that a BASIC premise is false, or else to show that (1) and (2) do not really perfectly support (3). If you tap out here, then at least provide a valid argument against this inferred premise, where your BASIC premises are more intuitive than your interlocutor's BASIC premises.

- Be Constructive. Attempt to fix the Argument under scrutiny so that your criticism no longer applies.
- Be Constructive. Offer any other suggestions on how to improve the student's case. How could a BASIC premise be expressed more clearly and succinctly? If there is an invalid inference, what additional premise is needed to make the inference go through?
- **HOW DO I DETERMINE WHICH 3 PRESENTATIONS I CONSTRUCTIVELY CRITICIZE?** Of the 11 Weeks of student Presentations and each class period includes 2 Presentations, determine which Week yours occurs. For example, Week 8a. Then, add 3, add 6, and add 9 to your Week. These results indicate the Presentations you should criticize. They also indicate whose major papers you will help write via constructive criticism.
 - For example, suppose your Presentation occurs Week 8a. $3 + 8a = \text{Week } 11a$. So, you criticize the student's Presentation occurring Week 11a. $6 + 8a = \text{Week } 3a$ (since there are only 11 Weeks, Week 1 shall theoretically come immediately after Week 11). So, you should criticize the Presentation occurring on Week 3a. Finally, $9 + 8a = 6a$. Suppose your Presentation occurs Week 3b. Then you should criticize Presentations occurring on Weeks 6b, 9b, and 1b.
- **WHEN DO I SUBMIT MY WRITTEN CRITICISMS OF PRESENTATIONS ON THE DISCUSSION BOARD?** No later than 2 days before the Presentation. For example, if you are in my Monday section, submit your Criticism by Saturday's midnight. If you're in my Wednesday section, submit your Criticism by Monday's midnight.

C-4

C-4

Topics

1. Pettit, Philip (2006) 'When to Defer to Majority Testimony—and When Not,' *Analysis* 66(3): 179-187.

NOTE: If you would prefer to present and to write on a different philosophical problem not listed below, you may browse through the philosophy journals (i) *Analysis*, (ii) *Mind*, (iii) *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, or (iv) *Journal of Philosophy*. Pick an article published within the last 2 years and run it by Thad.

From Michael Clark's (2007) *Paradoxes from A to Z*:

2. The Sleeping Beauty, p.215
 - Elga, Adam (2000) 'Self-locating belief and the Sleeping Beauty problem,' *Analysis*, 60(2): 143-147. <http://www.princeton.edu/~adame/papers/sleeping/sleeping.pdf>
 - See Handout's White, Roger (2006) 'The Generalized Sleeping Beauty Problem: a Challenge for Thirders,' *Analysis* 66(2): 114-119.
3. The Paradox of Knowability, p.105
4. The Cable Guy Paradox, p.32
 - See Handout's Hájek, Alan (2005) 'The Cable Guy Paradox,' *Analysis* 65(2): 112-119.
5. The Two-Envelop Paradox, p.227
 - See references in Handout's Hájek, Alan (2005) 'The Cable Guy Paradox,' *Analysis* 65(2): 112-119.
6. The Paradox of the Charitable Trust, p.42
7. The Designated Student, p.51 & The Unexpected Examination, p.231
 - Angle: Sainsbury's argument in his book *Paradoxes* may be flawed, as there may be a problem with discharging an assumption.
 - See also *The Pig That Wants to Be Eaten's* An Inspector Calls (#208)
8. Grue (Goodman's 'New Riddle of Induction')
 - Angle: Together with *The Pig That Wants to Be Eaten's* Rabbit! (#47), there may be an argument for theism. See Thad Botham.
9. Moore's Paradox, p.130
 - Angle: Is there something here to refute Cartesian Solipsism (see Descartes' *Meditations* and note the so-called *Cartesian Circle*)?
10. The Placebo Paradox, p.158
11. Newcomb's Problem, p.142.
 - See *The Pig That Wants to Be Eaten's* Take the Money and Run (#42) and Bigger Brother (#9).

12. The Paradox of Blackmail, p.25
13. Paradox of the Ravens, p.185
14. Self-Deception, p.203

From Julian Baggini's (2006) *The Pig That Wants to Be Eaten* :

15. Just So (#31) – a problem for Evolutionary Psychology
16. Last Resort (#35) – Re the ethics of certain terrorist tactics.
17. Double Trouble (#53) – Re the doctrine of double effect.
18. Net Head (#76) – Epistemology stuff. Maybe use insights in Net Head to criticize or to defend a proper functionalist account of knowledge (if so, shoot Thad Botham an email for his short epistemology essay).

On Physicalism, which is kinda sexy nowadays.

19. See Handout's Bishop, Robert (2006) 'The Hidden Premiss in the Causal Argument for Physicalism,' *Analysis* 66(1): 44-52. Bishop criticizes the strong argument for Physicalism, arguing that it begs the question.
20. See Handout's Montero, Barbara and David Papineau (2005) 'A Defence of the *Via Negativa* Argument for Physicalism,' *Analysis* 65(3): 233-237.

On the Logic of Counterfactuals

21. Brogaard, Berit and Joe Salerno (2008) 'Counterfactuals and context,' *Analysis* 68: p 39-46. Free online here: Full Text [PDF](#) (CTRL + click)

Free Will Stuff

22. Copp, David (2008) ' "Ought" implies "can" and the derivation of the Principle of Alternate Possibilities,' *Analysis* 68: 67-75. Free online here: Full Text [PDF](#) (CTRL + click)
23. See Handout's Widerker, David (2005) 'Agent-Causation and Control,' *Faith and Philosophy* 22(1): 87-98.

Philosophy of Mind: Dualism vs. Materialism

24. See Handout's Gertler, Brie (2008) 'In Defense of Mind-Body Dualism' in Feinberg, Joel and Russ Shafter-Landua's *Reason and Responsibility* (Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth): 285-297. Coupled with Handout's Lorber, John (1980) 'Is Your Brain Really Necessary?' *Science* 210: 1232-1234.

Causation: a puzzle about our intuitions regarding preemptive causation

25. See Handout's excerpt from Hitchcock, Christopher (2003) 'Of Humean Bondage' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 54: 1, 20-21.

Presentation Topic Preferences

Name: _____

1st Choice: _____

2nd Choice: _____

3rd Choice: _____

4th Choice: _____

5th Choice: _____

☐ Yes ☐ No I prefer to deliver my Presentation early in the semester.

☐ Yes ☐ No I don't mind delivering my Presentation early in the semester.

☐ Yes ☐ No I'm strongly considering earning a graduate degree in philosophy and would like maybe to use one of my essays from this course as a writing sample to competitive graduate schools.

Table of Contents: *The Pig that Wants to be Eaten: 100 Experiments for the Armchair
Philosopher*

Preface	ix
Acknowledgements	xii
A note on sources	xiii
The evil demon	1
Beam me up	4
The Indian and the ice	7
A byte on the side	10
The pig that wants to be eaten	13
Wheel of Fortune	16
When no one wins	19
Good God	22
Bigger Brother	25
The veil of ignorance	28
The ship <i>Theseus</i>	31
Picasso on the beach	34
Black, white, and red all over	37
Bank error in your favour	40
Ordinary heroism	43
Racing tortoises	46
The torture option	49
Rationality demands	52
Bursting the soap bubble	55
Condemned to life	58

Table of Contents: *Paradoxes From A to Z*

Forward to the Second Edition	ix
Preface	xi
Acknowledgements	xiii
Achilles and the Tortoise	1
Allais' Paradox	5
The Paradox of Analysis	9
The Arrow	11
The Barbershop Paradox	13
Berry's Paradox	18
Bertrand's Box Paradox	20
Bertrand's (Chord) Paradox	22
The Paradox of Blackmail	25
The Bridge	28
Buridian's Ass	30
The Cable Guy Paradox	32
Cantor's Paradox	34
The Paradox of the Charitable Trust	42
The Chicken and the Egg	44
Curry's Paradox	46
The Paradox of Democracy	48
The Designated Student	51
The Paradox of Deterrence	52
The Eclipse Paradox	55
The Paradox of Entailment	58
The Paradox of Fiction	62
The Paradox of Foreknowledge	65
Galileo's Paradox	68
The Gentle Murder Paradox	73