

Teaching Dossier

Louis Doulas

Contents

1	Teaching Statement	2
2	Diversity Statement	4
3	Teaching Interests	6
4	Teaching Experience	7
4.1	As Main Instructor	7
4.2	As Teaching Assistant	7
4.3	Pedagogical Training & Other Teaching Experience	8
5	Teaching Evaluations	9
5.1	Quantitative Evaluations	9
5.2	Qualitative Evaluations	9
6	Sample Syllabi	12
6.1	Puzzles and Paradoxes	13
6.2	Doing It with Style	16
6.3	Lost to History: Susan Stebbing's Place in Analytic Philosophy	20
6.4	When Disagreement Gets Deep	22

1 Teaching Statement

Philosophy can be intimidating for the uninitiated; the barrier for entry can be high. Philosophers have their own specialized, idiosyncratic language for articulating puzzles and problems and for representing and understanding the world. My teaching practice therefore puts a high premium on *accessibility* and *contextualization*. I try to show my students that philosophy isn't just a set of puzzles and problems thought up from scratch, in a vacuum, but part of a large and developing conversation with connections to every domain—a conversation that, importantly, they *can* and *do* have a voice in.

One of my favorite texts to teach is a classic of philosophy frequently assigned in both lower- and upper-level courses: Descartes' *Meditations*. The diaristic prose (characteristic of the meditative genre) combined with the philosophical depth makes for a compelling and surprisingly accessible introduction to philosophy. Yet, students don't always grasp the full force of the skeptical problem presented; the possibility of Descartes' evil demon or the possibility that one is currently dreaming are too farfetched to threaten our sturdy, scientific knowledge of the world. After all, doesn't science already disprove such possibilities?

To get students to grow beyond this reaction, I believe it's important to provide them with a context for assessment. To that end, I explain how Descartes' thought experiments were part and parcel of a particular method—the method of doubt—which he used to place science on a more secure foundation. Students are usually surprised to learn that philosophy and science are things that aren't necessarily in tension with one another, and that the latter grew out of the former. This usually prompts them to reassess the importance of Descartes' thought experiment and better appreciate how contextual factors give shape to philosophical problems. By the end of the class, as a result of our discussion, the whiteboard is typically covered in different beliefs that students currently take for granted and the different ways such beliefs can be vulnerable to doubt.

Another reason I like to teach the *Meditations* is because of what I like to discuss alongside it: Teresa of Ávila's *El Castillo Interior* (*Interior Castle*) which appeared fifty-three years before the *Meditations*. A compelling case has been made that Descartes was likely inspired by Ávila and that some of the tropes we find in the *Meditations* owe to *Interior Castle*.¹ Discussing *Interior Castle* serves several important purposes. First, it's helpful for students to see that all ideas, even highly theoretical ones, have genealogies. Second, most students' impressions of our discipline is that it is written and produced by dead old white men. Expanding the canon and exposing students to thinkers who were historically and historiographically marginalized provides them—especially students who are historically underrepresented in philosophy—with the opportunity to identify with philosophy. Teaching Ávila—or Cavendish, Stebbing, Davis, or Srinivasan—*shows* students that they belong here too.

Appreciating and coming to grasp philosophical problems is one thing. Writing philosophy is another. Students are often told that what they've learned in other writing-intensive courses won't necessarily fly in philosophy. Yet not much class time is dedicated to how to write philosophy papers. This is why in every course I've taught I devote multiple sessions to honing this skill.

Since writing a philosophy paper involves more than just adapting to new stylistic norms, many of my sessions typically focus on two things: (i) learning how to write concisely and (ii) learning how to identify and construct arguments. I have found that group-oriented sessions are most effective for this. For example, I'll assign a group a particularly clunky or

¹ See Christia Mercer's "Descartes' debt to Teresa of Ávila, or why we should work on women in the history of philosophy," *Philosophical Studies* (2017) 174: 2539–2555.

verbose paragraph and challenge them to work together to trim it down to half its length, replacing jargon terms with plain English. Or I'll provide a specific passage from that week's reading and ask them to reconstruct an argument from it, taking care to identify premises, conclusions, and supplying additional ones when necessary. I'll also frequently pull various passages from online media (a long political Instagram caption or the latest from the New York Times), giving students the opportunity to develop a sensitivity for bad arguments and muddled thinking "in the wild," outside the context of philosophy.

Another writing exercise that students have found especially fun and effective was one that I introduced Summer 2021, for my Puzzles and Paradoxes course in which I was the primary instructor. Every week students were required to send someone—a parent, sibling, or friend—a "Philosophy Email."² With me CC'd, students were asked to explain one of the puzzles/paradoxes we covered in class that week and briefly explore one potential response all in 300 words or less. They were also encouraged to get creative with the subject line.

I chose email for several reasons. The format, first of all, is highly familiar to students; it's also a format that doesn't naturally encourage lengthy messages, thereby challenging students to explain abstract concepts in clear and accessible language to someone who isn't familiar with them—skills that students will eventually need to acquire outside the philosophy classroom.

While the barrier for entry in philosophy can be high, it doesn't need to be. With the right set of tools and approaches, we can make philosophy more accessible, both inside and outside the classroom.

² This assignment was inspired by Sophie Horowitz.

2 Diversity Statement

I teach philosophy to students who are historically underrepresented in philosophy.³ Knowing that, historically, the classroom hasn't been a site of equity and equality, knowing, furthermore, that the *philosophy* classroom is no exception here, a commitment to diversity and inclusivity is, first and foremost, for me, a commitment to empathy.

In my classroom, the first day is all about communicating empathy. I let my students know that I'm here to advocate for them. I normalize the idea that philosophy is hard, that it's OK to be puzzled, stumped, and frustrated, and that having to eyeball a text multiple times is not a mark of ineptitude but a recipe for aptitude. I reinforce the idea that, despite impressions to the contrary, philosophy is for everyone and that they are and can be part of the conversation. I also, importantly, let them know where *I'm* coming from. I worked part-time in college—just like many of them. My parents are immigrants as well. There are no academics in my family either. Philosophy can feel like a struggle for me, too. By the end of the first class, my students feel a little less apprehensive and little more like they belong. This sets an important tone for the rest of the semester: feeling like one is being heard, understood, and represented, is the foundation to any successful pedagogical environment. As one student has described my efforts: “empathetic, supportive and accommodating, absolutely love to see it.”

While empathy is crucial, a commitment to educational equity and equality requires more than this; it requires tools and resources; it requires doing one's homework. The Humanities Pedagogical Certificate Program I undertook in Fall 2018, as well as the graduate pedagogical seminar I'm currently enrolled in—Rhetoric and the Teaching of Composition—have exposed to me a variety of indispensable pedagogical theory texts and ideas. These texts have instilled in me the effectiveness of active learning, group work, and student peer review. Indeed, the students I teach come from different backgrounds, have different levels of preparation, and learn in different ways. For some, English is a second or even third language. Teaching requires accommodating these pluralities and creating opportunities for different pathways to success. In my courses, reading assignments are often accompanied by other supplementary content: a podcast on the mind-body problem or a YouTube video—a clip from the *The Parent Trap* that speaks to the problem of personal identity. Sometimes I even use props: I bring a ball of Play-Doh to class to help illustrate the puzzle of material constitution. My experience as an English Language Learner Tutor at Brandeis University has also helped me develop a sensitivity to related issues. I anonymize all my grading and I don't penalize students for grammar issues or for failing to adhere to classroom and writing norms more familiar to white or Westernized students.

My commitments to diversity and inclusivity also extend to my research as well. My work in the history of analytic philosophy focuses on figures who are comparatively understudied, or due to oppressive social structures, hardly studied at all. Susan Stebbing (1885–1943) is one such figure I've spent a lot of time thinking and writing about.

Stebbing studied philosophy at Girton College, the first women's college at Cambridge, but wouldn't go on to receive a degree—degrees wouldn't be issued to Cambridge-educated women until several years after her death. Despite this, Stebbing found a way to make herself visible in the male-dominated world of academic philosophy, going on to make (literal) headlines as Britain's first female Professor of Philosophy twenty-six years later. Stebbing's philosophical presence seems, however, to have faded mid-century. Her influence, and the

³ UC Irvine is federally designated as a Hispanic-Serving Institution and an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institution.

crucial role she played in the early beginnings of what we now call “analytic” philosophy, has been conveniently forgotten, absent even from esteemed historical surveys. Her prolific and innovative contributions to various subfields of philosophy have gone largely unexamined, buried underneath the works of “greater men,” the founding fathers of analytic philosophy: Frege, Russell, Moore, and Wittgenstein.

Much of my historical work attempts to reinstate Stebbing’s place in the analytic tradition by developing a more inclusive historical narrative that positions her at the fore. In this way, my goals as a researcher and instructor are largely of a piece: to elevate people—historical figures and students—especially those from historically marginalized backgrounds, by using my privilege to dismantle the barriers that unjustly prevent them from flourishing.

3 Teaching Interests

I have wide-ranging teaching interests and experiences. Below is a list of areas that I would be happy to teach at the undergraduate level. Courses with an asterisk (*) are ones that I would be happy to teach at the graduate level. I have provided sample syllabi for courses in **bold**. I am always happy to help meet departmental needs by developing further teaching competencies.

INTRODUCTORY

- Introduction to Philosophy
- Introductory courses in epistemology, metaphysics, the philosophy of mind, the philosophy of language, the philosophy of mathematics, the philosophy of science
- Critical Reasoning

VALUE THEORY

- **Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art**
- Applied Ethics
 - Ethics of Artificial Intelligence
 - Conspiracy, Propaganda, and Misinformation
 - Bioethics
 - Environmental Ethics
 - Free Speech
 - Human Rights
- Ethics
- Existentialism
- Philosophy of Law

FORMAL TOOLS

- Symbolic Logic

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

- **History of 19th-20th Analytic Philosophy***
- Philosophy of History

METAPHYSICS AND EPISTEMOLOGY

- **Deep Disagreement***
- Epistemic Circularity*
- Hinge Epistemology*
- Knowledge, Skepticism, and Relativism*
- Metaontology*
- Ordinary Objects*
- Philosophical Progress*
- Philosophy of Space and Time
- **Puzzles and Paradoxes***
- Social Epistemology
- Social Metaphysics

4 Teaching Experience

4.1 As Main Instructor

As instructor, I was responsible for all aspects of the course including syllabus design, writing and delivering lectures, determining essay topics and exams, and holding office hours.

1. **The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence** (UC Irvine: Spring 2024)
2. **Conspiracy, Propaganda, and Misinformation** (UC Irvine: Winter 2024)
3. **Free Speech and its Limits** (UC Irvine: Fall 2023)
4. **Puzzles and Paradoxes** (UC Irvine: Summer 2021)
5. **Critical Reading and Writing** (Brandeis University: Summer 2017)

4.2 As Teaching Assistant

As TA, I was responsible for leading weekly discussion sections, holding office hours, and grading all assignments.

Upper Division

1. **Skepticism and Relativism** (UC Irvine: Summer 2022, Winter 2022)
2. **Nonexistence and Indeterminacy** (UC Irvine: Fall 2019)

Lower Division

1. **Contemporary Moral Problems** (UC Irvine: Summer 2022)
2. **Introduction to Ethics** (UC Irvine: Spring 2023, Winter 2021, Summer 2020)
3. **Introduction to Philosophy** (UC Irvine: Summer 2023, Winter 2023, Summer 2020; Brandeis University: Fall 2017; Harvard University: Summer 2016)
4. **Puzzles and Paradoxes** (UC Irvine: Summer 2023, Fall 2022, Spring 2020, Winter 2019)
5. **Aesthetics** (Brandeis University: Spring 2018)
6. **Philosophy of Law** (Brandeis University: Spring 2017, Fall 2016)
7. **Environmental Ethics** (Brandeis University: Spring 2016)
8. **Human Rights** (Brandeis University: Fall 2015)

Non-Philosophy

1. **Art History: Image Collision** (UC Irvine: Fall 2021)
2. **Art History: Modern Art in Europe and America** (UC Irvine: Spring 2021)
3. **Legal Studies: Civil Liberties** (Brandeis University: Spring 2018)
4. **Critical Reading in the Humanities and Social Sciences** (Brandeis University: Summer 2017)

4.3 Pedagogical Training & Other Teaching Experience

1. **Humanities Pedagogical Certificate Program** (UC Irvine: Fall 2018)

Over a series of six workshops, this program offers graduate students training on research-based pedagogical practices, with an emphasis on teaching disciplines within the humanities.

2. **TH!NK: Philosophy for Early Adolescents** (UC Irvine: Winter 2019)

Once a week, for four weeks, I met with a small group of 5th-grade students at Mariners Elementary for 45-minute sessions introducing them to philosophical thought and discourse.

3. **English Language Learner Reading and Writing Tutor** (Brandeis University: Fall 2015)

I held weekly, 50-minute, one-on-one writing tutorials with undergraduate English Language Learner students in the School of Arts and Sciences to help develop their critical thinking, analytical writing, and academic oral communication skills.

5 Teaching Evaluations

Below is a summary of the evaluations I have received—both quantitative and qualitative—as an instructor and teaching assistant at UC Irvine. (Please note that my department does not have data available concerning departmental and university wide TA averages.)

5.1 Quantitative Evaluations

The following table uses a 1-9 scale (1=lowest, 9=highest) to present the mean values of student ratings for the “overall quality of instruction” in philosophy⁴ courses that I have taught from Fall 2019 to Spring 2023.⁵ Because two sections of the same course are taught within the same quarter, the ratings below reflect the average of these scores across the sections. The student response rate is also recorded below, although it should be noted that UC Irvine students are not required to complete course evaluations.

‡≡ Upper Division

*≡ Taught during COVID

Term	Response	Department	Role	Course Title	Instructor Rating
Fal 19	54	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	‡Nonexistence and Indeterminacy	8.09/9
Wtr 20	14	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	*Puzzles and Paradoxes	8.24/9
Spg 20	15	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	*Puzzles and Paradoxes	6.72/9
Fal 20	26	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	*Introduction to Ethics	8.46/9
Wtr 21	16	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	*Introduction to Ethics	7.96/9
Sum 21	2	Philosophy	Instructor	*Puzzles and Paradoxes	9.00/9
Wtr 22	22	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	‡Skepticism and Relativism	8.28/9
Spg 22	21	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	Contemporary Moral Problems	8.35/9
Sum 22	17	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	‡Skepticism and Relativism	8.24/9
Sum 22	13	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	Introduction to Philosophy	8.40/9
Fal 22	15	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	Puzzles and Paradoxes	7.84/9
Wtr 23	22	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	Introduction to Philosophy	7.50/9
Spg 23	13	Philosophy	Teaching Assistant	Introduction to Ethics	8.99/9

5.2 Qualitative Evaluations

The following are unedited written comments that I have received from students from the courses above. While I have categorized the comments based on their content, there is some overlap between them.

Passion and Enthusiasm

Louis is very passionate about philosophy and his enthusiasm for the course material helps bring confidence to his students in what they are learning. His excitement and

⁴ I have not included the two Art History courses I have TA'd for because the Art History department uses scales that are different from the Philosophy department.

⁵ The course I am presently teaching as lead instructor—Conspiracy, Propaganda, and Misinformation—is in progress and data is not available. Also, I don't have evaluations for the two most recent summer sessions I have TA'd for (Introduction to Philosophy) because of a system error.

clear explanations are what make this class truly unique from any other philosophy TA I have ever experienced.

The instructor's strengths while teaching were showing enthusiasm and excitement about the topics. I think his excitement made the material a bit more fun to dissect. Another strength of the instructor was to provide clear explanations that those provided by the material which did help my overall understanding.

Mr. Doulas has lots of strengths as an instructor. He is very engaging and helpful during our meetings. He is able to explain most if not all of the concepts well with interesting support for his teachings. He is very kind and always welcoming and happy during our meetings. I enjoy going to the meetings every week.

Louis is incredibly friendly and helpful. His humor and lively personality creates a comfortable learning environment yet he always stays on task. His explanations are clear and concise, even more so than the professor's. He listens to students carefully and frequently checks in to make sure he fully answered the question asked. He never rambles and allows himself to be interrupted if the student feels their question is not being answered or something is unclear.

Communication and Clarity

Clearly explains complex philosophical concepts while making the content fun and compelling to learn. I cannot stress enough how good Louis is at teaching. Absolutely the greatest teacher Ive had in general, which is a massive thing to say about a teacher's aid.

Our TA is one of the best I have been taught. He makes comprehensive slides every lecture and explains the ideas very well. The discussion sessions are highly helpful in this course.

Very clear and concise with explanations I felt that Louis was better at simplifying concepts than the actual professor Helpful, and reachable Responds in a reasonable amount of time Greatly encourages student particular Is patient with students.

Louis organizes the information from the readings very clearly in a way that is easier to understand. He is also very responsive and approachable, and was always willing to help his students. His help and feedback was imperative for my understanding of the course material. I believe this was so for other students as well—there's a reason his office hours was always packed with students. He also seems to genuinely care about his students wellbeing. I really hope he continues teaching so that other students can benefit from his teaching as well.

Louis is very good at breaking down extremely complicated topics and making them comprehensive.

He has a tremendous grasp for the hard concepts we covered in this course, and was able to clearly explain these concepts in a way that anybody, regardless of thier back ground could understand.

He spent sooo much time ensuring all of his students understood each of the concepts. He made each student feel comfortable asking as many questions as they needed. Very productive office hours and discussions.

Instructor's notes to prepare lecture presentations are exceptionally well-crafted and a sign of mastery over course material.

Mr Douglas was a great presenter and easily accessible outside of office hours. He was engaging and very supportive when giving help about philosophical theories. He is very clear and eloquent.

Classroom Climate

He was a great speaker who I could clearly understand and did an amazing job in making me feel important and understood.

He is very good at explaining the concepts. He also makes me feel understood and is good at working with me to find a solution.

Empathetic, Supportive and accommodating, absolutely love to see it.

Lectures well, nice calming voice, tries to create discussions and answers well.

Helpful and understanding to the students in his discussion section. Acknowledges that philosophy is hard and provides us with help.

His lecture slides contain key information and I found them very helpful. He is very good at organizing and structuring class and comes prepared to teach. His articulation of the texts and ideas are spot on, clear and concise. Straight off the bat he was welcoming and encouraged students to ask questions regarding the material and if they needed help on anything. Very accessible and responsive.

This instructor goes all out for students and makes lessons engaging and provides astounding tips for future writing.

This instructor was very enthusiastic when teaching, brought a great vibe to the class, and was always willing to help out students.

Incredibly transparent and communicative. Great at helping everyone.

6 Sample Syllabi

Below you will find syllabi for four courses.

Unabridged

- Puzzles and Paradoxes (Summer 2021)
- Doing It with Style (proposed)

Abridged

- Lost to History: Susan Stebbing's Place in Analytic Philosophy (proposed)
- When Disagreement Gets Deep (proposed)

These can be suitably modified for upper-division or graduate level courses.

6.1 Puzzles and Paradoxes

INSTRUCTOR	Louis Doulas ldoulas@uci.edu
STUDENT HOURS	Tuesdays, 12pm–1pm (Zoom)
COURSE DATES	June 21–July 28, 2021
DESCRIPTION	We all believe things. Some of our beliefs are justified. Some even amount to knowledge. We know, for example, that the sun will rise tomorrow, that two things can't occupy the same space at the same time, and that it's impossible to go back in time and change the past. Or so we claim. The puzzles and paradoxes that we'll encounter in this course threaten each of these claims. This is what a good puzzle or paradox does: it brings out a tension in our beliefs and forces us to reconsider them. Such puzzles and paradoxes are at the heart of philosophy.
COURSE GOALS	This course serves as an introduction to the core areas of philosophy (metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, aesthetics, logic). Along the way, you'll learn how to read and think <i>better</i> : how to present an argument in premise and conclusion form, evaluate it for validity, and apply this method to a broad range of texts.
FORMAT	This course is entirely online and asynchronous. There are no live lectures. Two pre-recorded lecture videos will be posted to Canvas each week. Optional synchronous student hours will be held each week. These sessions will give you a chance to interact with your instructor and fellow classmates in real time.
REQUIREMENTS	The requirements of this course are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Philosophy Email (40%): Due every Sunday by 11:49 pm. Pick a friend, family member, roommate, etc. and write them an email each week. The subject line should read "Philosophy Email: Week X" (but replace "X" with the relevant week). You are to CC me on the email. In the email, in 300 words or less, you will do two things: (1) Explain, in your own words, one of the puzzles/paradoxes we covered in class that week. (2) Explore one potential response to said puzzle/paradox. Your response shouldn't just be a rehash of the author(s) we read. This is an opportunity for you to <i>do</i> philosophy. I want to know how <i>you</i> think we should respond to the puzzle/paradox. The goal of Philosophy Email is to get you to explain challenging, abstract concepts in clear and accessible language to someone who isn't a philosophy student. This is a skill that will take you beyond the philosophy classroom.• Paper Outline (20%): Due Friday, July 16th by 11:59pm. You are to produce an outline of your final paper. This need not be a complete draft. The outline should be at least 1 page in length and formatted in 12pt Times New Roman. It should also include

page numbers, a tentative title, and your first and last name. I will review your outline and provide you with feedback. For outline examples and paper topics please see our Canvas page.

- **Final Paper** (40%): Due Friday, July 20th by 11:59pm.

Write 5-6 pages on one of the following essay topics (see Canvas). Papers should be double-spaced with one inch margins, headers and footers, and formatted in 12pt Times New Roman. As a general rule, approximately 3 pages should be devoted to careful and sympathetic exposition of the relevant positions or arguments. Approximately 2-3 pages, at least, should reflect your critical or reflective engagement with the relevant positions or arguments. Exposition and critical engagement can be intermingled. Do not neglect either task; doing both well is essential for the assignment.

SCHEDULE	<i>All readings are available on Canvas.</i>
WEEK 1	<i>A Brief Guide to Logic and Argumentation</i> Ted Sider, "Constitution"
WEEK 2	David Lewis, "The Paradoxes of Time Travel" Duncan Pritchard, "Is Knowledge Impossible?"
WEEK 3	G.E. Moore, "Proof of an External World" William Poundstone, "Hempel's Raven"
WEEK 4	Nelson Goodman, "The New Riddle of Induction" Colin Radford, "How Can We Moved by the Fate of Anna Karenina?"
WEEK 5	Thomas Nagel, "Moral Luck" William G. Lycan, "What, exactly, is a paradox?"

COURSE POLICIES

WITHDRAWAL POLICY	It is the student's responsibility to officially drop/withdraw from any courses before the deadline posted by the university's registrar's office. Please refer to UCI's academic calendar http://www.reg.uci.edu/enrollment/withdrawals/ for the withdrawal policy, procedure, and refunded schedule.
-------------------	---

DISABILITY STATEMENT	The University of California, Irvine, is committed to providing a barrier-free environment for learning and an electronic environment that is accessible to everyone, including individuals with disabilities. Students with disabilities who believe they may need accommodations in this class are encouraged to contact the Disability Services Center at https://dsc.uci.edu/ or by phone at 949-824-7494 as soon as possible to better ensure that such accommodations are implemented in a timely fashion.
----------------------	---

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY	Any student who compromises the academic integrity of this course is subject to a failing grade. The work you submit must be your own. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to submitting someone else's written work as your own, copying answers from another student, allowing another student to copy your answers, communicating exam answers to other students during an exam, attempting to use notes or other aids during an exam, or tampering with an exam after it has been corrected and then returning it for more credit. If you do so, you will be in violation of the UCI Policies on Academic Honesty, which you can find here: https://aisc.uci.edu/ . It is your responsibility to read and understand these policies. Note that any instance of academic dishonesty will be reported to the Academic Integrity Administrative Office for disciplinary action.
FOOD & HOUSING	Any student who has difficulty affording groceries or accessing sufficient food to eat every day, or who lacks a safe and stable place to live, and believes this may affect their performance in the course, is urged to contact the FRESH Basic Needs Hub and the Basic Needs Coordinator, Andrea Gutierrez, at Andrea.g@uci.edu . You can find out more information about UCI Basic Needs and FRESH here: https://basicneeds.uci.edu/ . Furthermore, please notify me if you are comfortable doing so. This will enable me to inform you of resources that might be of help.
WELLNESS & HEALTH	For resources related to healthcare, counseling, wellness, and other support services, visit the UCI WHCS website here: http://whcs.uci.edu/ . All enrolled students have access to free counseling services. You can find more information and make an appointment here: http://www.counseling.uci.edu/ .
RESEARCH SUPPORT	Librarians are available to help you find articles and books as you research your projects and papers. If you have questions about how to find additional sources or resources, you can make an appointment or chat with a librarian via the library website: http://www.lib.uci.edu or in person at the library.
TECHNICAL SUPPORT	Contact the OIT helpdesk at oit@uci.edu or call (949) 824-2222 for all technical support and training needs.

6.2 Doing It with Style

INSTRUCTOR	Louis Doulas ldoulas@uci.edu
STUDENT HOURS	–
COURSE DATES	–
DESCRIPTION	Many people can make paintings, design buildings, dress themselves, and write books. Not all can do it with <i>style</i> . Style is one of those elusive concepts: we know it when we see it. Because style is often understood as being concerned not with <i>what</i> is said, but <i>how</i> it is said, style is often derided for being superficial. Yet, style matters. In this course, we'll try to get a grip on what exactly we're talking about when we talk about style, what we take style to express, and why we take matters of style to be of great importance in art, design, fashion, literature, and even philosophy.
COURSE GOALS	By the end of this course, students will have developed <ul style="list-style-type: none">• an in-depth understanding of philosophical debates surrounding style in the arts, literature, and philosophy;• the ability to advocate for a position clearly and rigorously;• the ability to give constructive, critical, and thoughtful feedback on the arguments and ideas of their peers; and• the ability to communicate and discuss complex ideas through in-class discussions and written assignments.
REQUIREMENTS	The requirements of this course are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paper 1: Context Paper (Prospectus) (10%) Before you start writing your first paper (see below), you must submit either a comprehensive outline or 500-word summary of your paper for feedback.• Paper 1: Context Paper (Final) (25%) For this first paper, you will focus on contextualizing an issue related to one of our discussions of style. The goal of this first paper is largely <i>expository</i>: to summarize and evaluate a conversation/debate related to style. The paper should be no longer than 1500 words.• Paper 2: Argument Paper (Prospectus) (10%) Before you start writing your second paper (see below), you must submit either a comprehensive outline or 500-word summary of your paper for feedback.• Peer Review: Argument Paper (5%) You will provide written feedback on drafts of Paper 2 for one of your peers.

- **Paper 2: Argument Paper (Final)** (35%)

For this second paper, you will focus on advocating for a view related to one of our discussions of style. (The topic can be different from the topic of Paper 1). The goal of this second paper is largely *argumentative*: to advocate and support your view about style with respect to a conversation/debate covered in class. The paper should be no longer than 2500 words.

- **Participation** (15%)

You will submit a discussion question once a week, 24 hours before that day’s reading. Come to class prepared to discuss your question and the reading.

SCHEDULE	<i>All readings are available on Canvas.</i>
	Clarifying Style
WEEK 1	Stephanie Ross, “Style in Art” (2005) Catharine Abell, “Realism and the Riddle of Style” (2006)
WEEK 2	Nelson Goodman, “The Status of Style” (1978 [1975]) Dale Jacquette, “Goodman on the Concept of Style” (2000)
WEEK 3	Kendall Walton, “Style and the Products and Processes of Art” (2008 [1979])
	An Expression of Ideals
WEEK 4	Nick Riggle, “Personal Style and Artistic Style” (2015)
WEEK 5	Robert Hopkins and Nick Riggle, “Artistic Style as the Expression of Ideals” (2021)
	Style in Visual Art
WEEK 6	Jenefer Robinson, “Style and Significance in Art History and Art Criticism” (1981) Amanda Ruggeri, “When Mistakes Make the Art” (2022) [BBC article]
WEEK 7	Arthur Danto, “Metaphor, Expression, and Style” (1983) Sondra Bacharach “The Style Matrix” (2022)
WEEK 8	Richard Wollheim, “Pictorial Style: Two Views” (1990 [1979])
	Fashion Style
WEEK 9	Anya Farennikova and Jesse Prinz, “What Makes Something Fashionable?” (2011)
	Literary and Philosophical Style
WEEK 10	Monroe Beardsley, “Style and Good Style” (1969 [1966])
WEEK 11	Arturo Fontaine, “Writing with Style” (2022)

- WEEK 12 Jenefer Robinson, “Style and Personality in the Literary Work” (1985)
- WEEK13 Marjorie Perloff, “Writing Philosophy as Poetry: Literary Form in Wittgenstein” (2015)
- WEEK 14 Alois Pichler, *Style, Method, and Philosophy in Wittgenstein* [Ch. 3, Poetry in Philosophy] (2023)
- End of Class Reflection: Modifying Lang’s List**
- WEEK 15 Berel Lang, “Questions on the Concept of Style: A Check-list” (1979)

WITHDRAWAL POLICY It is the student’s responsibility to officially drop/withdraw from any courses before the deadline posted by the university’s registrar’s office. Please refer to UCI’s academic calendar <http://www.reg.uci.edu/enrollment/withdrawals/> for the withdrawal policy, procedure, and refunded schedule.

DISABILITY STATEMENT The University of California, Irvine, is committed to providing a barrier-free environment for learning and an electronic environment that is accessible to everyone, including individuals with disabilities. Students with disabilities who believe they may need accommodations in this class are encouraged to contact the Disability Services Center at <https://dsc.uci.edu/> or by phone at 949-824-7494 as soon as possible to better ensure that such accommodations are implemented in a timely fashion.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY Any student who compromises the academic integrity of this course is subject to a failing grade. The work you submit must be your own. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to submitting someone else’s written work as your own, copying answers from another student, allowing another student to copy your answers, communicating exam answers to other students during an exam, attempting to use notes or other aids during an exam, or tampering with an exam after it has been corrected and then returning it for more credit. If you do so, you will be in violation of the UCI Policies on Academic Honesty, which you can find here: <https://aisc.uci.edu/>. It is your responsibility to read and understand these policies. Note that any instance of academic dishonesty will be reported to the Academic Integrity Administrative Office for disciplinary action.

FOOD & HOUSING Any student who has difficulty affording groceries or accessing sufficient food to eat every day, or who lacks a safe and stable place to live, and believes this may affect their performance in the course, is urged to contact the FRESH Basic Needs Hub and the Basic Needs Coordinator, Andrea Gutierrez, at Andrea.g@uci.edu. You can find out more information about UCI Basic Needs and FRESH here: <https://basicneeds.uci.edu/>. Furthermore, please notify me if you are comfortable doing so. This will enable me to inform you of resources that might be of help.

WELLNESS & HEALTH	For resources related to healthcare, counseling, wellness, and other support services, visit the UCI WHCS website here: http://whcs.uci.edu/ . All enrolled students have access to free counseling services. You can find more information and make an appointment here: http://www.counseling.uci.edu/ .
RESEARCH SUPPORT	Librarians are available to help you find articles and books as you research your projects and papers. If you have questions about how to find additional sources or resources, you can make an appointment or chat with a librarian via the library website: http://www.lib.uci.edu or in person at the library.
TECHNICAL SUPPORT	Contact the OIT helpdesk at oit@uci.edu or call (949) 824-2222 for all technical support and training needs.

6.3 Lost to History: Susan Stebbing's Place in Analytic Philosophy

INSTRUCTOR	Louis Doulas ldoulas@uci.edu
STUDENT HOURS	–
COURSE DATES	–
DESCRIPTION	Analytic philosophy has many founding fathers. Conspicuously absent, however, are its founding mothers—where are they and why have they gone missing? One curious case is that of the British analytic philosopher, Susan Stebbing (1885–1943). The magnitude of Stebbing's contributions makes it hard to believe that Britain's first female Professor of Philosophy could so easily be pushed out of the very tradition she helped build. This course will survey many of Stebbing's key contributions to early analytic philosophy. We'll start first with her important work on metaphysics and analysis, then proceed to examine her contributions to the philosophy of physics before concluding with her bold contributions to social/public philosophy.
SCHEDULE	<i>All readings are available on Canvas.</i>
	Background
WEEK 1	Morgan Grayce Willow, "L. Susan Stebbing" (1995) [Section 1] Siobhan Chapman, <i>Susan Stebbing and The Language of Common Sense</i> (2013) [Introduction] Frederique Janssen-Lauret, <i>Susan Stebbing</i> (2022) [Introduction]
	The Varieties of Philosophical Analysis
WEEK 2	Michael Beaney, "Conceptions of Analysis in Analytic Philosophy" (2014) L.S. Stebbing, "The Method of Analysis in Metaphysics" (1932)
WEEK 3	L.S. Stebbing, "Logical Positivism and Analysis" (1933) Max Black, "Philosophical Analysis" (1933)
WEEK 4	L.S. Stebbing, "Directional Analysis and Basic Facts" (1934) L.S. Stebbing, "Some Puzzles about Analysis" (1938–39)
	Time, Materialism, and the New Physics
WEEK 5	J.M.E. McTaggart, "The Unreality of Time" (1908)
WEEK 6	L.S. Stebbing, "Some Ambiguities in Discussions Concerning Time" (1936)
WEEK 7	Arthur Eddington, <i>The Nature of the Physical World</i> (1927) [Selections from Ch. 12–15]
WEEK 8	L.S. Stebbing, "Abstraction and Science" (1927)
WEEK 9	L.S. Stebbing, "Realism and Modern Physics" (1929) L.S. Stebbing, "The New Physics and Metaphysical Materialism" (1942–43)

- WEEK 10 L.S. Stebbing, *Philosophy and the Physicists* (1937)
[Introduction & Ch. 3]
- Philosophy for Democratic Thinking**
- WEEK 11 L.S. Stebbing, *Thinking to Some Purpose* (1939/2022)
[Foreword, Introduction, and Preface]
- WEEK 12 L.S. Stebbing, “Potted Thinking” in *Thinking to Some Purpose*
- WEEK 13 L.S. Stebbing, “Propaganda: An Obstacle” in *Thinking to Some Purpose*
- WEEK 14 L.S. Stebbing, “Taking Advantage of Our Stupidty” in *Thinking to Some Purpose*
- WEEK 15 L.S. Stebbing, “Democracy and Freedom of Mind” in *Thinking to Some Purpose*

6.4 When Disagreement Gets Deep

INSTRUCTOR	Louis Doulas ldoulas@uci.edu
STUDENT HOURS	–
COURSE DATES	–
DESCRIPTION	Unlike ordinary disagreements, rational resolution of <i>deep</i> disagreements seem unlikely, or worse, impossible, even in principle. This is because cases of deep disagreement involve our most fundamental beliefs, commitments, values, or worldviews. For example, while we may disagree about which specific COVID vaccine is most efficacious, we nevertheless agree that vaccination is reliable and effective. If, however, you don't think any COVID vaccination is effective or reliable because you think the vaccines are being used by the government to control citizens, then our ordinary disagreement has taken a turn for the deep, and it becomes hard to see how our disagreement could be rationally resolved. While I might be able to bully you out of your beliefs (or vice versa) this is far and away from an <i>epistemically</i> rational resolution. Unlike cases of ordinary disagreement, then, it seems there is much to despair over in cases of deep disagreement. Should this despair get the best of us? This course will address this question by exploring several different aspects of deep disagreement.
SCHEDULE	<i>All readings are available on Canvas.</i>
	What's "Deep" about Deep Disagreements?
WEEK 1	Robert Fogelin "The logic of deep disagreements" (2005) D.M. Adams, "Knowing when Disagreements are Deep" (2005)
WEEK 2	Chris Ranalli "What is Deep Disagreement?" (2018) Richard Friemann, "Emotional backing and the feeling of deep disagreement" (2005)
	Incommensurability
WEEK 3	Paul Boghossian, <i>Fear of Knowledge: Against Relativism and Constructivism</i> (2006) [Selections]
WEEK 4	Michael Williams, "Why (Wittgensteinian) Contextualism Is Not Relativism" (2007) Duncan Pritchard, "Epistemic Relativism, Epistemic Incommensurability, and Wittgensteinian Epistemology" (2011)
WEEK 5	J.A. Carter, "Incommensurability, Circularity and Epistemic Relativism" (2016)
	Rational Resolvability
WEEK 6	Chris Ranalli, "Deep disagreement and hinge epistemology" (2020)

- WEEK 7 Richard Feldman, “Deep disagreement, rational resolutions, and critical thinking” (2005)
- WEEK 8 Jonathan Matheson, “Deep disagreement and rational resolution” (2018)
- WEEK 9 E.O. Popa, “On the rational resolution of (deep) disagreements” (2022).
Deep Political Disagreements and What to Do about Them
- WEEK 10 Chris Campolo, “Deep disagreement in a multicultural world” (2009)
- WEEK 11 J.A. Carter, “Politics, Deep Disagreement, and Relativism” (2021)
- WEEK 12 Jeroen de Ridder, “Deep Disagreements and Political Polarization” (2021)
- WEEK 13 Tim Dare, “Disagreement over vaccination programmes: deep or merely complex and why does it matter” (2013)
- WEEK 14 Scott Aikin, “Deep disagreement, the dark enlightenment, and the rhetoric of the red pill” (2019)
- WEEK 15 S.W. Patterson, “The methodological usefulness of deep disagreement” (2015)