The 2011-12 academic year brings to a close Ohio State’s 90-year experiment with the quarter system. This is the last Fall Quarter at Ohio State until … well, maybe 2102, when we convert from the semester system back to the quarter system. Needless to say, the complete curricular overhaul required by an academic calendar conversion is an enormous undertaking. (The metaphor of turning the Queen Mary comes to mind.) There were 12,000 courses and 600 Ohio State programs to convert to the new calendar. The Department of Philosophy had only 106 of these courses and three programs: the undergraduate major, the undergraduate minor, and the PhD programs. A small fraction of the Ohio State pie, but it was still an enormous amount of work. Fortunately, our semester conversion czar, Tim Schroeder, worked hard and effectively to bring us through the process successfully.

One aspect of the change, though, will cause some difficulties for a while, especially for us old-timers. For decades, our course numbering has been relatively stable, though it showed a gradual evolutionary drift away from whatever rational basis it originally possessed. Tim has created for us a rational structure, but it will be hard to begin to think of Introduction to Philosophy as ‘Philosophy 1100’ and Epistemology as ‘Philosophy 3750.’

In this, the last year of quarters, we welcome four new graduate students. Juan Garcia comes to us from … The Ohio State University. We decided to overlook any weakness this might imply about his undergraduate philosophical background. Juan is interested in the history of philosophy, especially medieval and modern philosophy, and numerous issues in the philosophy of religion. Also joining us is Allison Massoff, from Franklin and Marshall University (Lancaster, PA). Aly’s philosophical interests concern metaethics, especially moral epistemology. Hope Sample comes to us with a BA from Illinois State and an MA from Northern Illinois (DeKalb, IL). Hope is interested in normative and metaethics and, like Aly, moral epistemology. And Jerilyn Tinio joins us from the University of Illinois (Chicago, IL). Jerilyn’s current philosophical interests include epistemology, the philosophy of perception, and the philosophy of mind in the early modern period through Kant. We’re very pleased to welcome all four of our new graduate students to our department.

We also welcome our newest affiliated faculty member, Eric MacGilvray (Ohio State, Political Science). Eric, whose research interests lie primarily in modern and contemporary political thought, is a co-leader (with Piers Turner) of the Democratic Governance focus group of the Center for Ethics and Human Values Innovation. Eric’s expertise provides a valuable addition to the strength of the department in value theory.

This academic year begins an exciting project that is being led by a few of us in the Department of Philosophy with some colleagues in political science. Ohio State is conducting a yearlong “conversation” on immigration. This is the prototype of an ongoing program that we call COMPAS (Conversations on Morality, Politics, and Society). The Immigration COMPAS grew out of one of the focus groups of the Ohio State Center for Ethics and Human Values Innovation. We believe the COMPAS program will demonstrate to the university the sort of breadth of impact that the center can have. To learn more about the Immigration COMPAS, see the story on p. 11 and visit our website at: immigration.osu.edu
Kirsten Kinnell came late to undergraduate studies in 2009 as a 33-year-old mother of two. Though she had always liked school and had intended to go to college, her life had kept her fairly busy to that point. Kirsten remembered, “a bachelor’s degree seemed extraneous, even if desirable.” However, in 2008, Kirsten and her husband decided against a move to East Africa to work on a water project, and that autumn their youngest entered kindergarten. For the first time in her adult life, Kirsten didn’t have a full-time obligation—so, she enrolled at Ohio State.

Kirsten’s initial plan was to study economics to work in international development. Kirsten’s experience trying to establish a cross-cultural NGO, as well as what she had learned when traveling in Africa, had convinced her that any effort toward poverty alleviation is fraught with difficulty. “Although there are, of course, economists who are concerned with poverty, there is some truth in the saying that to a hammer everything is a nail. It didn’t seem as clear to me as it does to most economists that economic development is an unqualified good.” Kirsten said.

Kirsten found that the discipline of economics is not designed to answer the questions that seemed most pressing to her: “What do we, individually and corporately, owe the poor? How do we fulfill this obligation without violating the demands of justice in the process? Should the ends be good themselves, or is it enough that the ends are projected to be good? I didn’t realize it at the time, of course, but I was barking up the wrong tree.”

Kirsten’s theoretical questions were complicated by more personal questions about how to live in light of these issues. Through a creative writing class she rediscovered a love for poetry that she set aside several years before. Kirsten said, “But how could I consider studying and working in something like poetry, instead of something practical, something that could save lives?”

Although Kirsten was not familiar with the problems of Utilitarianism at the time, she was certainly experiencing some of them. Again, Kirsten wondered, “What, after all, was my happiness worth in the face of global injustices? If, by studying something I didn’t enjoy I could have a positive impact on even just a few, what right did I have to write poetry, of all things?” Though she was unsettled by these concerns, Kirsten was sure, by now, that a career in economics wasn’t for her.

In the midst of this internal turmoil, Kirsten enrolled in Symbolic Logic with Ben Caplan, merely to fulfill a GEC requirement. Kirsten thought, “The methodical and cogent way that Dr. Caplan presented the material was refreshing and invigorating. This was not the prosaic, navel-gazing philosophy I had imagined, but a discipline that analytically poses questions that interest and sometimes worry me, questions that others often dismiss as picky and minute.

“I’ve since chosen a philosophy major, and I’m grateful to find myself in over my head much of the time. It’s great fun to get to listen to really smart people talk about the things they know well and care about. The rigor required in philosophy is not only helping me to explore the questions before me, but is also pushing my writing to new, hopefully better, places.”
“Moreover, this is a discipline that takes language seriously, something that matters to me a great deal. Still, philosophy seemed like poetry—an exciting, challenging, useless thing that I liked a lot.

“Of course, it was not as though I had never asked this question before; nor did I feel at a complete loss for an answer—I’m a religious person, and these kinds of questions are the stuff of my faith. But what I had encountered was the need for a way to think about what it means to do actual good in our complex and intricately interconnected world. The development field is rife with the wreckage of ideas that once sounded good, including some of my own. My good intentions no longer seemed enough to satisfy the obligations that my religious convictions generate. It’s easy to agree that we should care for the poor, but doing good, it seems to me, is way more complicated.”

It is a good thing that Kirsten found philosophy because it is an excellent fit for her. Of Kirsten, Ben said, “She’s in her element. She’s taken to it like a duck to water.”

It wasn’t until Kirsten took Introduction to Moral Philosophy with Justin D’Arms that she started to understand how studying philosophy could help her think about all these issues. The readings helped Kirsten with some of her internal debates by identifying, disentangling, examining, and juxtaposing them with other problems and concerns.

In Justin’s course, Kirsten found that her intuitions about what is right and good were challenged, and her dissatisfaction with easy answers was reinforced. The broad contours of Utilitarianism vs. Kantianism, with a little Hume tossed in for good measure, mapped the terrain of her concerns.

Not only did she find a new way to approach these interests, but also a new way to think about why her intuitions are what they are and what cultural drifts had produced them. Kirsten thought, “In this way, this course was helpful beyond any of my expectations.”

She repeatedly raised the level of conversation and pushed students to come along with her. In both Ethical Theory (431) and Metaethics (631), Kirsten wrote excellent papers that demonstrated a keen critical eye and an ability to think her way into philosophical perspectives of others.”

Kirsten’s focus for this autumn is an independent study, on development ethics, with Piers Turner. The course covers a range of issues from economic development and sustainability to more agent-centered questions about pursuing international development in a world constrained by certain economic, political, and environmental realities.

Of Kirsten, Piers said, “She’s very bright and is remarkable for her ability to synthesize the philosophical questions about justice with real-world practicalities of political economy. I always learn something talking to her and it’s been a pleasure interacting with her personally. She’s a very real person, engaged, but with perspective and a sense of humor.” Kirsten hopes this course will help her to gain a clearer understanding of how ethics interacts with international development.
Barry Wacksman graduated from Ohio State in 1986 with a BA in philosophy, served as president of the undergraduate Philosophy Club during his senior year, and won the Bingham prize that same year for his essay, “Some Old Problems for the New Materialism”—an attack on the eliminative materialism of Paul Churchland.

Barry recalled, “Ohio State was a dream come true for a young, budding philosopher. Who could have imagined that what is often thought of as a gargantuan (Ohio State was the largest university in the land even back then, with a student population near 60,000), faceless public university could foster such a rich intellectual life, even for an undergrad? But there it was: a highly engaged faculty that often opened their doors, literally, to enthusiastic undergrads such as me. Between Philosophy Club, colloquia with visiting professors, lively nights of conversation at Larry’s and the amazing philosophy lounge in University Hall, there was always a place to engage in my favorite pastime: philosophical discussion. Based on this incredible experience, I fully intended to become a professional philosopher.”

With recommendations from Professors Don Hubin, Jim Scanlan, and Bernie Rosen, Barry was accepted to the PhD program at Syracuse University. He entered in the fall of that year. Barry said, “After Ohio State, Syracuse had a lot to live up to. And, it didn’t—at least for me. While it boasted an excellent faculty and a great group of grad students, it just lacked the camaraderie I had come to expect after four years at Ohio State.”

Deciding to take some time off before perhaps re-entering another graduate program elsewhere, Barry moved to New York City. Of his move, Barry recalled, “I fulfilled a lifelong dream of living in the world’s greatest city, New York. And, I arrived just in time for the stock market crash of 1987! With few marketable skills (a BA in philosophy is a tough sell to most of the major industries of NYC: finance, publishing/media, advertising or fashion), I did whatever I needed to pay the rent—which meant two, or sometimes even three, jobs. Little did I know how well philosophy had prepared me for life in the ‘real’ world. The deep skills of analysis, writing, presenting, defending, arguing—and winning—that philosophers use every day

“LITTLE DID I KNOW HOW WELL PHILOSOPHY HAD PREPARED ME FOR LIFE IN THE REAL WORLD. THE DEEP SKILLS OF ANALYSIS, WRITING, PRESENTING, DEFENDING, ARGUING – AND WINNING – THAT PHILOSOPHERS USE EVERY DAY TO ADVANCE THEIR LIFE’S WORK ARE EXACTLY THE SAME SKILLS NEEDED TO WIN IN BUSINESS – ONLY PHILOSOPHERS ARE JUST BETTER AT IT THAN OUR FELLOW BUSINESSPEOPLE!”
to advance their life’s work are exactly the same skills needed to win in business—only philosophers are just better at it than our fellow businesspeople! Whereas I was practically dripping with nervous energy when I delivered my Bingham paper to the Ohio State philosophy family, now I routinely speak at conferences and events in front of thousands of people without breaking a sweat.”

Through a happenstance of circumstances, Barry ended up in the internet industry starting in the earliest days of web design, around 1994. The company Barry works for now, R/GA, is one of the world’s most famous agencies for all things internet: web site design, application development, social media and even the development of new digitally-enabled products and services. When Barry joined R/GA in 1999, as the head of business development, they had 45 staff and worked for companies like IBM (R/GA was responsible for the design of www.ibm.com) and Bed Bath & Beyond (R/GA developed their first e-commerce site).

Today, R/GA employs about 1,200 staff across eight global office locations and is most famous as the creators of Nike+, a technology platform that enables runners to track their runs, set goals and measure performance over time. Barry is considered one of the industry gurus of internet marketing, has published articles in a wide variety of industry publications and is invited to speak at conferences all over the world.

“I consider what I do to be philosophy-in-action. It is my job to uncover business ideas and paradigms, and convince our clients that these are the right courses of action to help them grow their businesses. Without training in philosophy, how else could I have come up with concepts like ‘Functional Integration,’ or the ‘Ecosystem of Value?’” said Barry of his current work.

Yet these are a couple of examples of the kinds of ideas that are talked about every day inside of the halls of R/GA, with their clients and throughout the technology industry. Barry said, “I can trace it all right back to the days of sitting in the philosophy lounge in University Hall, having an intense argument with Jonathan Kandell or Tom Hall or Dave Drebushenko or Marty Rice. Or, maybe one of our beloved professors wandered in and set us all straight. Either way, we were really LIVING the good life of the mind.”

CURRENT GRADUATE STUDENTS

STEVEN BROWN AND WESLEY CRAY

While Steven Brown and Wesley Cray share some current interests, they came to philosophy from different paths. Wesley was first drawn to issues in modality back in 2003, while he was a sophomore at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania. After writing an undergraduate thesis on issues in the metaphysics of modality, Wesley came to Ohio State to pursue a PhD in philosophy. Since then, he’s developed interests in philosophy of language, philosophy of religion, and philosophy of art, but his main interests are still in modality, specifically in the inconstancy of de re modal attributions.

On the other hand, Steven’s interest in philosophy began as an interest in theology. Having spent most of his childhood in Christian schools, when Steven first entered public school in 10th grade, he naturally started to ask a lot of questions about God and the nature of religious belief. After high school, Steven joined an interdenominational volunteer organization that enabled him to study theology while traveling the world doing work in schools, orphanages, and refugee camps.

(Continued on the next page.)
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Those were deeply formative years for him, and they have had a longstanding impact on the shape of his intellectual life.

Four years later, Steven decided to return to the ordinary academic world and (after a few short detours) ended up at the University of Pittsburgh. Steven progressed as a double-major in physics and philosophy for three years, but after a magnificent semester studying 20th century physics in both the philosophy department and the physics department, he found that his thirst for physics was quenched and he threw himself into philosophy full time. Soon after, Steven started at The Ohio State University. Here at Ohio State, Steven has focused primarily on topics in value theory, especially metaethics and normative theory, but retained an interest in anything connected to the philosophy of religion (e.g. the philosophy of time).

Both Steven and Wesley are at the dissertation stage of their graduate careers. Wesley is currently writing his dissertation under the supervision of Ben Caplan, while Steven is writing under the supervision of Justin D’Arms.

Wesley’s dissertation provides metaphysical, semantic, and conceptual considerations in favor of the deep view of the inconstancy of de re modal attributions, and he considers some results the view might have in various debates in metaphysics and metametaphysics.

Steven’s dissertation is on the theory of right action in virtue ethics; specifically, his focus is on the relationship between the actions and attitudes of virtuous agents and the moral evaluation of acts performed by agents who have not yet fully developed the virtues.

FORMER GRADUATE STUDENT

DOUG HUSAK

Doug Husak joined Ohio State’s PhD program after studying philosophy at nearby Denison University (Granville, OH). With regard to this transition, Doug said, “I am psychologically unable to reflect on my experience as a graduate student at Ohio State without recalling the unusual circumstances that brought me there.”

Doug had planned to attend law school at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI). As a native of Cleveland, it never occurred to him to leave the Midwest, and Michigan was the only school to which he applied. This plan changed abruptly when he received an order to report for induction into the military. Doug had been drafted! He was not especially politically active at Denison, but self-interest and moral judgment pointed to the same result: “I should refuse to allow myself to serve in the armed forces.”

“I HAVE LEAD A CHARMED LIFE, AND ONE OF MY MOST FORTUNATE MOMENTS INVOLVED THE RECEIPT OF MY ORDER OF INDUCTION. OF COURSE, THE NEWS SEEMED AWFUL AT THE TIME. BUT THIS CLOUD HAD A SILVER LINING. HAD I NOT BEEN DRAFTED, I WOULD NOT HAVE ATTENDED OHIO STATE. UNDOUBTEDLY I WOULD HAVE BECOME A LAWYER—A PROFESSION THAT I SUSPECT WOULD HAVE OFFERED ME ONLY A SMALL FRACTION OF THE ENJOYMENT AND SATISFACTION I NOW RECEIVE AS A TENURED PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY.”

When not writing their dissertations, both Steven and Wesley are active in the group, The Amiable Association of Articulate Atheists, Agnostics, and Adherents (abbreviated A7)—a group that meets monthly at a local arts cooperative, that generally has between 15 to 35 people in attendance, and that also has over 100 followers of the group’s podcast. (amiableassociation.org) When not doing philosophy or participating in A7, Wesley enjoys cycling and playing homemade instruments in his one-person punk band, Goatbucket. When Steven is not doing philosophy or participating in A7, he is spending time with his wife and kids—typically camping, hiking, or playing board games.
Doug’s advisor at Denison, Anthony Lisska, offered to help by assuring the admissions committee at Ohio State that Doug would be a decent addition to the incoming class. Tony remembered Doug as “an excellent student who asked probing questions in class, read assiduously the assigned materials, worked diligently at his philosophy, and wrote very fine philosophy essays for an undergraduate student. [Doug] was a genuine joy to have in class.” Tony was happy to help—he described Doug as “an outstanding undergraduate philosophy student.” At that time, Doug did not have a burning desire to study philosophy in Columbus, but preferred it to the jungles of Vietnam. Doug recalled, “Somehow, I formed the belief that a position as a TA would earn me a deferment from military service (which turned out to be false, although that’s another story).”

Once at Ohio State, Doug started to enjoy philosophy and the department. Doug recalled, “After a fairly rough transition, I began to do reasonably well in my courses. I was determined not to make Tony look foolish when he had gone to such extraordinary lengths to go to bat for me.”

The department chair at the time, Robert Turnbull, persuaded Doug to stay and earn both a law degree and a PhD rather than transferring to Michigan. Doug took his advice and graduated with both degrees on his 28th birthday: June 11, 1976. Following graduation, Doug accepted a one-year position at Indiana University in Bloomington—an excellent job for a new graduate.

When a tenure-track position opened at Rutgers, Professor Alan Hausman encouraged Doug to apply rather than to remain on a series of one-year appointments at Indiana. As Doug recalled, this was “more good advice!” Rutgers became one of the best philosophy departments in the world. “I was lucky to be a member of a department that rose from mediocrity to excellence, without having to change jobs or location,” wrote Doug. Although Doug has visited at eight different schools, he’s remained happily at Rutgers ever since 1977.

Of his time at Ohio State, Doug remembered fondly, “What fun I had during those politically and socially turbulent times at Ohio State! Like most graduate students, I made lasting friendships with a number of my fellow students. I also established a lasting relationship with several of my professors, nearly all of whom are now deceased or retired.” Surprisingly, Doug never set foot in the University of Michigan Law School until he was hired there as a visiting professor of law in 2007.

"APART FROM A GREAT EDUCATION, I WAS THE BENEFICIARY OF SOME EXCELLENT ADVICE I HAD THE GOOD SENSE TO FOLLOW. I HAVE FOND MEMORIES OF INTELLECTUAL RIGOR COMBINED WITH PERSONAL INFORMALITY. TO THIS DAY, THAT UNUSUAL MIX HOLDS GREAT APPEAL TO ME. I TRY TO IMPART TO MY OWN STUDENTS SOME OF THE AFFECTION I FELT FROM SO MANY OF MY MENTORS AT OHIO STATE."

"FROM A GREAt edUCAtIoN, I WAs the beNefICIArY of some exCeLLeNt AdvICe I hAd the Good seNse to foLLoW. I hAve foNd memorIes of INteLLeCtUAL rIGor CombINed WIth PersoNAL INformALItY. to thIs dAY, thAt UNUsAL mIx hoLds GreAt APPeAL to me. I trY to ImPArt to mY oWN stUdeNts some of the AffeCtIoN I feLt from so mANY of mY meNtors At ohIo stAte."

Doug Husak
In June 2011, the Dubrovnik Conference focused on moral and political philosophy, with the theme of “Reason and Right.” Organized by Don Hubin and Piers Norris Turner, it brought together twenty leading analytic philosophers to discuss a range of important issues, including practical reason, moral authority, public reason liberalism, enforcement rights, self-ownership, procreative liberty, and criminal responsibility.

As usual, the week-long conference provided an ideal setting in which to explore these issues at length, both formally and informally, including a sea-kayaking excursion.

In its ninth year since the series was restarted after the Balkan conflict, the Dubrovnik Conference has developed a remarkable track-record for bringing together a distinguished group of philosophers each year. Other participants included: Boran Berčič (Rijeka), Fred D’Agostino (Queensland), Justin D’Arms (Ohio State), Julia Driver (Washington University), Gerald Gaus (Arizona), Daniel Jacobson (Michigan), Friderik Klampfer (Maribor), Tea Logar (Koper, Slovenia), Nenad Miščevic (Maribor), Ryan Muldoon (Western Ontario), Henry Richardson (Georgetown), Jonathan Riley (Tulane), Melinda Roberts (College of New Jersey), Connie Rosati (Arizona), David Shoemaker (Tulane), David Sobel (Nebraska), Vojko Strahovnik (Ljubljana, Slovenia) and Peter Vallentyne (Missouri).
The topic for the 2012 Ohio State/Maribor conference in Dubrovnik is “Contextualism and Relativism.” It will be co-sponsored by our Department of Linguistics, in addition to the usual partners, the Department of Philosophy and the philosophers from the area. The event is organized by Stewart Shapiro, Craig Roberts, and Kevin Scharp. In addition, William Taschek and Judith Tonhauser will participate from Ohio State, along with four or five philosophers from Croatia and Slovenia.

The aim is to include a session for graduate student participants, as this was particularly successful in 2010. Among established scholars, invitations have been sent to Chris Barker (NYU), Berit Brogaard (University of Missouri, St. Louis), Herman Cappelen (St. Andrews), Andrew Egan (Rutgers), Iris Einheuser (Duke), Michael Glanzberg (Northwestern), Chris Kennedy (UChicago), Max Köhl (UBarcelona), Peter Lasersohn (U Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), John MacFarlane (UC Berkeley), Diana Raffman (U Toronto), Francois Recanati (L’Institut Jean Nicod), Jason Stanley (Rutgers), Tamina Stephenson (Yale), Brian Weatherson (Rutgers), and Crispin Wright (St. Andrews/NYU). Most have accepted already; only two have formally declined.

On a Saturday last May, the second annual Dan Farrell Undergraduate Philosophy Retreat got underway at Jeffers Tree Farm in southeastern Ohio. A group of seven philosophy majors, Seth Baldosser, Bianca Briggs, Danny Williams, Skyler Martin, Phillip Moyer, Hannah Johnson, and David Lantz, were joined by a grad student, Christa Johnson, and a faculty member, Tim Schroeder, to spend a couple of days roasting marshmallows and discussing philosophy at the rustic and beautiful resort, the use of which was donated by philosophy department graduate and benefactor Jim Jeffers. Mike Perkins is also owed tremendous thanks for funding the whole venture, and allowing the students to eat what they agreed were the most delicious cheese sandwiches of their lives so far.

The topic of conversation was the good will, with Kant as the starting point and some more modern work serving as a challenge to the Kantian view. That more modern work included a draft of a book chapter written by Tim and Nomy Arpaly of Brown University. Tim reports that the conversation was very useful and the list of acknowledgments needed when the book is finally published will now be eight names longer.

Particularly insightful things were said about the nature of habit and about the expression of good will when one has mixed motives. About the former, a few people emphasized the importance of crediting people for the good deeds they do without a second thought. About the latter, there was an insightful discussion of how it might be that a person who must overcome his own prejudice in order to do the obvious right thing has an occasion to display a great deal of concern for the right: it takes very little good will for an unprejudiced person to perform an unprejudiced act, but it takes the prejudiced person much more good will to perform the same act, and so the same act can be a greater expression of good will from the prejudiced person than from the unprejudiced one though the character of the latter is clearly better overall.

In addition to philosophy, there was a good amount of hiking, throwing horseshoes, petting Jim Jeffers’ joyfully slobbering dogs, and discussing how being cut off from cell phone service helped to remind us of just how fun it can be to sit down and talk undistracted over a cup of coffee.
For a third year, the Department of Philosophy offered its Introduction to Logic and Critical Thinking course, Philosophy 150, to students at Metro High School. And for the third time, the course was a rousing success.

The generous donation from Ohio State alumni Louise and Phil Vigoda has given the philosophy department the opportunity to allocate one graduate teaching associate to teach Philosophy 150 at Metro during summer quarters. This has allowed the philosophy department to provide more summer support for its graduate students and extend the reach of its philosophical instruction. Graduate student Owen King taught this special course in the summer of 2011.

As in a more typical Philosophy 150 course, students were taught to identify and diagram arguments, evaluate arguments for validity and soundness, and apply some basic principles of sentential logic to the arguments they were examining.

In addition, following a suggestion from Louise, this summer Owen emphasized the recognition and criticism of fallacious reasoning. From appeals to pity, to red herrings, to false dilemmas, the students learned the textbook examples and found instances of the fallacies “out in the wild” (i.e., in editorials and discussions on the internet). Owen had the students catalog fallacies, along with the examples they found, in an online wiki (using structure and software of Wikipedia). Owen said, “I think the wiki was a pretty good idea. We don’t have a very extensive catalog of fallacies yet, but I think it’s something we can build on in the future.”

In an attempt to gauge the effectiveness of the course, students were given a pre-test and post-test covering the sort of critical reasoning skills Philosophy 150 aims to build. Though the test showed improvement in all the students, it did not seem to track all that closely student achievement in the course. During a recent lunchtime conversation with Louise and Phil, Louise pointed out one possible reason for this. She noted that the second question on the exam involved issues about whether income tax deductions for charitable contributions should be limited. She remarked that this sort of subject matter was very foreign to high school students and their concerns. Of course, she was right.

Reflecting on Louise’s insight, Owen noted, “Well, I think this is one more reminder that our teaching, like our scholarship, is something we’re always discovering new ways to improve.” It is safe to say that this holds to an even greater degree in an innovative outreach program like the ongoing collaboration between the philosophy department and Metro High School.

A generous gift from Louise and Philip Vigoda in 2007 made possible the creation of an innovative outreach program: a special version of our critical reasoning course designed for students at Metro High School. Metro is a small public high school in Columbus open (on an application basis) to students from sixteen public school districts in Franklin County. The public school districts run the school with help from Ohio State and Battelle Memorial Institute. Metro features a STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) curriculum. The course was designed by Ohio State graduate students to address a concern that Louise Vigoda articulated about the apparent decline in the ability of ordinary citizens to engage in critical reasoning about pressing social issues.

For a third year, the Department of Philosophy offered its Introduction to Logic and Critical Thinking course, Philosophy 150, to students at Metro High School. And for the third time, the course was a rousing success.

The generous donation from Ohio State alumni Louise and Phil Vigoda has given the philosophy department the opportunity to allocate one graduate teaching associate to teach Philosophy 150 at Metro during summer quarters. This has allowed the philosophy department to provide more summer support for its graduate students and extend the reach of its philosophical instruction. Graduate student Owen King taught this special course in the summer of 2011.

As in a more typical Philosophy 150 course, students were taught to identify and diagram arguments, evaluate arguments for validity and soundness, and apply some basic principles of sentential logic to the arguments they were examining.

In addition, following a suggestion from Louise, this summer Owen emphasized the recognition and criticism of fallacious reasoning. From appeals to pity, to red herrings, to false dilemmas, the students learned the textbook examples and found instances of the fallacies “out in the wild” (i.e., in editorials and discussions on the internet). Owen had the students catalog fallacies, along with the examples they found, in an online wiki (using structure and software of Wikipedia). Owen said, “I think the wiki was a pretty good idea. We don’t have a very extensive catalog of fallacies yet, but I think it’s something we can build on in the future.”

In an attempt to gauge the effectiveness of the course, students were given a pre-test and post-test covering the sort of critical reasoning skills Philosophy 150 aims to build. Though the test showed improvement in all the students, it did not seem to track all that closely student achievement in the course. During a recent lunchtime conversation with Louise and Phil, Louise pointed out one possible reason for this. She noted that the second question on the exam involved issues about whether income tax deductions for charitable contributions should be limited. She remarked that this sort of subject matter was very foreign to high school students and their concerns. Of course, she was right.

Reflecting on Louise’s insight, Owen noted, “Well, I think this is one more reminder that our teaching, like our scholarship, is something we’re always discovering new ways to improve.” It is safe to say that this holds to an even greater degree in an innovative outreach program like the ongoing collaboration between the philosophy department and Metro High School.
Over the past three years, members of the Department of Philosophy have been instrumental in the effort to establish an Ohio State Center for Ethics and Human Values, funded by an Innovation Grant from the university. Don Hubin is the principal investigator on the grant, while Piers Turner and Justin D’Arms serve as “focus group” organizers. The center has successfully reached across campus to lay the groundwork for what is hoped to be a major new center at Ohio State. Such a center will focus Ohio State’s efforts to promote civil and informed debate on important social issues, as well as provide resources to philosophy and other departments to bring in visiting professors, organize workshops, and otherwise expand the place of ethics research on campus.

To demonstrate the potential value of such a Center at Ohio State, the Innovation Group has started “focus groups” on five topics: Health and Justice; Morality and the Emotions; Well-being; Ethics and Institutions; and Democratic Governance. These groups cut across the humanities and social sciences to departments in the College of Medicine, Moritz College of Law, and Fisher College of Business.

Growing initially out of the Democratic Governance group led by Eric MacGilvray (political science) and Piers Turner, the Innovation Group’s largest effort to date is an initiative to establish a biennial series of “year-long, university-wide conversations” called “Conversations on Morality, Politics, and Society” or COMPAS. The COMPAS program aims to demonstrate how the university’s comprehensive intellectual resources can be aligned along their ethical dimension in order to help solve some of the serious problems confronting us. In doing so, it aims not only to establish a new, more expansive model for a university ethics center, but to show how ethical concern provides a basis for productive exchange on complex social issues among researchers from diverse fields, and between the university and the broader community.

The first COMPAS program will focus on the topic of immigration, during the 2011-2012 academic year (see immigration.osu.edu). The Immigration COMPAS organizers—Hubin, Turner, MacGilvray, and Michael Neblo (political science)—received generous support from President Gordon Gee, College of Arts and Sciences Executive Dean Joe Steinmetz, the Mershon Center, and other groups to fund an “Academic Core” comprising two major interdisciplinary conferences and six additional COMPAS Colloquia. With the help of immigration researchers from numerous Ohio State departments, these events promise to explore the many facets of immigration that make it such a complicated ethical issue.

Organizers have also worked with other university units to align existing programs with the Immigration COMPAS, as part of its “University Life” component. These coordinated activities, including the first-year Buckeye Book Community, which read and discussed the book, Outcasts United; the undergraduate colloquium series, a movie series at the Wexner Center for the Arts, an art show, and other events will make the conversation a truly university-wide event. In addition, the program has an “educational” component anchored by a COMPAS-related undergraduate course, and a further “Community Outreach” component promoting events with area civic groups and schools.

The major fall conference, “Immigration: What’s at Stake?” was held October 20-21. It hosted a distinguished set of speakers, including Steve Trejo (UT-Austin), Jack Citrin (political science, UC Berkeley), Jennifer Hochschild (government, Harvard), David Miller (politics, Oxford), Mark Rosenzweig (economics, Yale), Jacqueline Stevens (political science, Northwestern), and keynote speaker Jorge Castañeda (NYU), the former Foreign Minister of Mexico.

The spring conference, “Immigration: Moving Forward,” will be held May 10 – 11, 2012. This conference will be the culmination of the year’s events, focusing on practical solutions to various challenges related to immigration. The developing line-up of speakers includes: George Borjas (Kennedy School, Harvard), Mathew Coleman (Geography, Ohio State), Lilia Fernandez (History, Ohio State), Mark Krikorian (Executive Director, Center for Immigration Studies), Amalia Pallares (Political Science/Latin American and Latino Studies, University of Illinois at Chicago), Doris Marie Provine (School of Justice and Social Inquiry, Arizona State), Rogers Smith (Political Science, University of Pennsylvania), Aristide Zolberg (Political Science, The New School). The journalist Jose Antonio Vargas will give a keynote address.

A listing of all COMPAS events can be found at immigration.osu.edu.
In Spring 2011, Steven Brown and Wesley Cray co-taught a course on the philosophy of religion. While the course, Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, is not a new course for the department, Steven and Wesley’s method of teaching it was quite novel—Steven is a theist and Wesley is an atheist.

Wesley and Steven first met while grading for Sukjae Lee’s History of 17th-Century Philosophy course back in Autumn 2005. They found common ground in the form of a mutual love for the adventures of Bilbo and Frodo Baggins, but soon found themselves locked in a series of philosophical arguments about the existence and supposed nature of God. Five years later, these conversations reached a fevered pitch and, while working together to paint Philosophy Professor Neil Tennant’s new office, Wesley and Steven hatched a plan to propose a new team-taught, debate-style version of Ohio State’s Introduction to Philosophy of Religion course.

Frustrated with the amount of unfriendly and unsophisticated dialogue in the public debate over the existence of God, Wesley and Steven endeavored to construct a class that would show students two things: first, that the debate can be had in an amiable fashion, and second, that the debate is harder than most students might initially think. Brainstorming, they put together a syllabus that not only involved more traditional readings, from the likes of Anselm, Aquinas, and Pascal, but also included some more contemporary material on set theory, probability theory, modal logic, big bang cosmology, evolutionary biology, and existential considerations. The course would then take the form of a debate, with Wesley and Steven trading off blocks of lecture time, defending the atheistic and theistic positions, respectively.

Even before it began, there was some buzz about the course in the form of an article in the campus newspaper, The Lantern. That article was linked to a number of religiously-themed blogs, including Christianity Today, and this led to a write-up and lengthy discussion about the course on the well-known atheist blog, The Friendly Atheist.

Student responses to the course were overwhelmingly positive. In discursive evaluations, many students mentioned how the debate format helped them understand the material better. Wesley and Steven found the experience to be positive, as well. Although teaching and preparing for the class was much more demanding than for any class either of them had previously taught, both found a new respect for the nuances of the material and for each other’s positions. They are looking forward to teaching the class again in Spring 2012.

When not butting heads about the existence of God and related issues, Wesley and Steven spend very little time together. However, they do hope to someday co-author a short, accessible text focusing on what they take to be the fundamental differences between their atheistic and theistic worldviews.
The Denman Undergraduate Research Forum highlights the top undergraduate research projects from across the university. This past spring, philosophy students were recognized and honored in this highly-selective competition, which requires a significant research project and endorsement from the student’s major advisor. Of the 33 entrants representing 15 humanities departments, three were philosophy majors. And two of the four Denman award winners from humanities were from the Department of Philosophy.

**James Kinkaid** wrote an honors thesis entitled “Swallowing the World” on the ethical import of the nature of the self. He first surveyed opposing theories of selfhood—essentialism and anti-essentialism, suggesting that Plato, Descartes, and Kant are historical examples of essentialists about the self, while Martin Heidegger and G.W.F. Hegel stand out as early proponents of the anti-essentialist view, which has been articulated more recently by Richard Rorty and others. He then argued that a proper understanding of the anti-essentialist nature of the self has profound implications for how we choose to live our lives, including our responsibility to others. James is now studying philosophy in a graduate program at Boston University, Boston, MA. Tamar Rudavsky served as James’ thesis advisor for this work.

**Matthew Verdin** won third prize for his research entitled “John Stuart Mill and a Plausible Interpretation of Paradigmatic Paternalism.” Matthew argues that Mill’s attention to expertise in his justification of his liberty principle threatens his anti-paternalism in certain cases. Matthew, who is currently writing an honors thesis on democracy and judicial review, will attend law school next year (he is already receiving scholarship offers from prestigious law schools). His Denman (and honors thesis) adviser was Piers Turner.

**Daniel Giglio** was awarded first prize in humanities for his research that analyzes the notion of individuality on the quantum level. Danny sketched out the problems associated with treating quanta as self-identical individuals. Relying on sophisticated philosophical work on concepts like identity, individuality, and indiscernibility, Danny argued that imparting individuality to quanta leads to empirically incorrect results. As a result, quanta cannot rightly be regarded as individuals. Danny explored the claim that quanta are non-individuals further, in terms of the elusive concept of haecceity, by discussing and elaborating on relevant portions of “Quantum Mechanics and Haecceity” by Paul Teller. Robert Kraut served as Danny’s thesis advisor. Of Danny, Robert said, “As a philosophical interlocutor Danny is outstanding; conversations with him always prompt new and productive ways of thinking about a topic: whether instrumentalism, reduction, theory/observation, semantic content, or the nature of logic.”

Congratulations to all of the young philosophers whose work for the Denman Forum reflects so well on the Department of Philosophy.
Lee Brown has published a number of articles over the past year:

Ben Caplan’s “Ontological Superpluralism” is forthcoming in Philosophical Perspectives. He gave talks in Denmark (at workshops in Aarhus and Copenhagen), Norway (at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim and also at the University of Oslo), Sweden (at Stockholm University and the Royal Institute of Technology, both in Stockholm). Closer to home, he gave a talk in Kalamazoo, MI (at Western Michigan), and he’ll be giving talks in Columbus (at the Semantics Workshop of the American Midwest and Prairies) and in Montreal, Canada (at a workshop at the University of Montreal).

James McGlothlin presented “Is God above Logic?” at the Midwest Evangelical Philosophical Society, March 2011 in Cincinnati, OH. He will also present “Logical Contradiction and God’s Omnipotence” at the annual Evangelical Philosophical Society, November 2011 in San Francisco, CA. McGlothlin is a Visiting Researcher at The Center for Philosophy of Religion at Notre Dame University, South Bend, IN, for fall semester of 2011.

Lindsay Mouchet presented “Believing the Speaker” at the 2nd Annual Notre Dame/Northwestern Epistemology Conference, held at Notre Dame University, South Bend, IN, on April 15, 2011.

Cathy Muller gave comments on “What is Social Construction?” by Esa Diaz-Leon at the Society for Analytical Feminism group session at the Central APA, Minneapolis, MI, this spring. Muller was also placed in a full-time position as a teaching associate at Marist College, Poughkeepsie, NY.

Joe Reich presented “Diagnosing Logical Pluralisms” at a philosophy graduate student conference on logic, mathematics, and physics at the University of Western Ontario, London, Canada, May 2010.

Wesley Cray’s article “Omniscience and Worthiness of Worship,” was published online in The International Journal for the Philosophy of Religion, July 2011.

Mike Ferreira presented “Simmons on Leibniz on the Intentionality of Sensation” at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Leibniz Society of North America in Houston, TX, in December 2010.

Tim Fuller has published “Is Scientific Theory Change Similar to Early Cognitive Development? Gopnik on Science and Childhood,” Philosophical Psychology (Forthcoming); “Overselling the Case against Normativism,” with Richard Samuels, Brain and Behavioral Sciences, (Forthcoming); a comment on “Subtracting ‘Ought’ from ‘is’: Descriptivism versus Normativism in the Study of Human Thinking” by Shira Elqayam and Jonathan St. B. T. Evans; and “Non-Conceptual Content: The Richness Argument and Early Visual Processing,” Southwestern Review, (Forthcoming). Fuller also presented “Bayes Nets, Scientific Inference, and Early Cognitive Development;” at Lingnan University, Hong Kong, March 2011 and again at The Society for Philosophy and Psychology, in Montreal, Canada, July 2011. He will also present “Non-Conceptual Content: The Richness Argument and Early Visual Processing,” at The Southwestern Philosophical Society, Austin, TX, in November 2011.

James McGlothlin presented “Is God above Logic?” at the Midwest Evangelical Philosophical Society, March 2011 in Cincinnati, OH. He will also present “Logical Contradiction and God’s Omnipotence” at the annual Evangelical Philosophical Society, November 2011 in San Francisco, CA. McGlothlin is a Visiting Researcher at The Center for Philosophy of Religion at Notre Dame University, South Bend, IN, for fall semester of 2011.

Lindsay Mouchet presented “Believing the Speaker” at the 2nd Annual Notre Dame/Northwestern Epistemology Conference, held at Notre Dame University, South Bend, IN, on April 15, 2011.

Cathy Muller gave comments on “What is Social Construction?” by Esa Diaz-Leon at the Society for Analytical Feminism group session at the Central APA, Minneapolis, MI, this spring. Muller was also placed in a full-time position as a teaching associate at Marist College, Poughkeepsie, NY.

Joe Reich presented “Diagnosing Logical Pluralisms” at a philosophy graduate student conference on logic, mathematics, and physics at the University of Western Ontario, London, Canada, May 2010.
Wrong Kinds of Reason and the Opacity of Normative Force” with Daniel Jacobson, Dubrovnik Moral Philosophy Conference, June 2011; “Value and the Regulation of Emotions,” Syracuse University Dept. of Philosophy, Syracuse, NY, April 2011; “Value and the Regulation of Attitudes for Correctness” at the NOISE conference at Tulane, New Orleans, LA, February 2011; Wooster College Philosophy Roundtable, Wooster, OH, April 2011, “Empathy, Approval and Disapproval in Moral Sentimentalism,” University of Memphis Spindel Conference, Memphis, TN, October 2010. D’Arms is a major participant in a grant from the John Templeton Foundation for a research project on “The Science of Ethics.” Daniel Jacobson, of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, is the project director. The portion of the grant supporting D’Arms’ work will bring approximately $120,000 to Ohio State over three years.


Ryan Jordan, visiting lecturer, presented “What is Expedient Means Denying” at the 2011 Alabama Philosophical Conference annual meeting, Pensacola, FL.


(Continued on the next page.)

Lisa Shabel has a forthcoming article “On Kant’s question ‘How is Pure Mathematics Possible?’” invited for inclusion in a collective commentary on Kant’s *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*. Professional talks over the past year include: Invited Plenary Speaker at the Classical Model of Science Conference at the Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, August 2011; Keynote Speaker at the Graduate Student Conference on Kant and the Exact Sciences, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, IN, Sept 2011; and Roundtable Panelist at the Modern Mind Conference in Honor of Gary Hatfield, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, November 2011.


Declan Smithies published, “Mentalism and Epistemic Transparency,” *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* and “Moore’s Paradox and the Accessibility of Justification,” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. Smithies co-edited with Chris Mole and Wayne Wu, *Attention: Philosophical and Psychological Essays*. (Oxford: 2010); and, co-authored the editorial introduction to the Attention volume and contributed a chapter: “Attention is Rational-Access Consciousness.” Smithies gave talks at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA; Cornell University, Ithaca, NY; and (with Jeremy Weiss) at the University of St Louis, St. Louis, MO. Smithies will be giving a talk at a conference on “The Normative Significance of Consciousness,” at the University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland, in December.

Piers Norris Turner will soon see published his, “Authority Progress and the ‘Assumption of Infallibility,’ in On Liberty,” *Journal of the History of Philosophy* (Forthcoming). Recently, he gave papers at the 11th conference of the International Society for Utilitarian Studies, where he also organized a panel on “Liberal Utilitarianism,” and at the College of Wooster, Wooster, OH. He co-organized this year’s Dubrovnik Conference on the topic “Reason and Right,” and is a co-organizer of a major initiative by the nascent OSU Center for Ethics and Human Values on the topic of immigration (see immigration.osu.edu).