

Teaching Dossier

Anthony Cross

Teaching Philosophy

In teaching a wide array of both introductory and upper-level courses in philosophy, I've found that effective teaching in philosophy takes time, practice, and above all a commitment to reflection and self-improvement. I've sought out opportunities for such improvement while teaching at a range of different types of institutions: my experiences teaching at UCLA, Princeton, and Mercer County Community College have prepared me to teach students from a variety of educational backgrounds and in a wide range of academic environments. My experience working as a graduate fellow at the McGraw Center for Teaching and Learning at Princeton has made me think critically about what good teaching looks like in a variety of disciplines and environments. Observing the teaching of my colleagues has prompted me to continually question my own pedagogy and to experiment with new ways of structuring my teaching to better facilitate student learning.

My starting point in teaching philosophy is the belief that, in order to learn philosophy, one must learn how to *do* philosophy. My students learn to interpret philosophical texts, to reconstruct and evaluate arguments, to express their ideas clearly in discussion and in philosophical writing, and to think systematically about the broader implications of any particular philosophical view. Above all, my students learn that old Socratic skill: to *question* their own beliefs and those of others in the service of knowledge. Such skills find application both in further incursions into philosophy, as well as in the rest of life beyond the classroom. It is this challenge—of teaching students not just *about* philosophy but instead how to think philosophically—that makes teaching philosophy both so difficult and so important.

My courses usually begin with students tackling a single, focused piece of philosophical argument corresponding to a core philosophical issue. In my upper-level aesthetics course, we read Hume's essay, "Of the Standard of Taste." We take our time. We map out Hume's argument, then consider potential objections and responses to those objections. The purpose of the exercise is two-fold: First, it anchors the course in a discrete philosophical problem which serves as the guiding thread through later topics. Second, and more importantly, students have the opportunity for guided practice in reading and interpreting philosophical texts. I pair our close reading with explicit guidance on how to recognize, reconstruct, and evaluate philosophical arguments.

Learning to read philosophical texts goes hand in hand with learning to write philosophically. I strongly believe that one's ideas are only as clear as their written expression; in learning how to write well one learns how to think well. Learning how to write philosophy takes time. My students develop and hone this skill through constant practice: in-class writing, weekly writing journals, and short papers. Early assignments are short, and are aimed solely at reconstructing an argument found within one of the

course readings. Later assignments take on more ambitious goals, such as evaluating multiple arguments or developing one's own philosophical views. For example, students in my aesthetics course progress to a comparison between Hume and Kant's solutions to the problem of taste. Later in the course, students write longer papers that incorporate course content and apply course methods to a topic of their choice. Along the way, I give students individual feedback on their written work in the form of written comments and at least one one-on-one meeting. This approach, while time-intensive, has yielded immense benefits for my students' writing.

Philosophy does not occur in a vacuum. My students greatly benefit in their ability to think critically and systematically about philosophical problems when they are able to connect these problems to their own experience. To facilitate this, I use activities designed to make philosophical issues first-personally salient. For example, in my course on friendship I ask my students to test philosophical accounts of the nature of friendship against their own experience: from Facebook "friends" to teammates to intimates, who counts as a friend and why? I also use film and creative writing to make philosophical issues vivid; in the same course, we watch *The Third Man* to bring to life our discussion about the potential for conflict between friendship and impartial morality.

The hardest skill to inculcate in a student is a comfort in questioning—in looking for reasoned justification both of one's own views and those of others. Such comfort comes only from some measure of confidence in one's own intuitions, as well as an openness to frank and often critical discourse. As a teacher, I aim to structure my courses so as to foster this skill. A large part of this involves getting out of the way; in addition to lecturing, I employ group work, student presentations, and short discussion segments to prompt students to actively engage with the course's content and with each other. For example, students in my seminar on the philosophy of food complete a final research project focusing on the aesthetic, moral, or social considerations bearing on a food product or practice of their choice. (Topics have ranged from the ethics of cannibalism to the political and moral concerns surrounding quinoa production.) The high point of the seminar is a research symposium during the last week of the course, where students present their projects to their peers, who engage them critically to offer extremely helpful feedback. Through activities like this, I encourage students to work independently to master course content, while also building an environment in which students feel safe sharing their ideas and questioning each other.

I've included in this teaching dossier all of the numerical evaluations of my performance as a lecturer at UCLA and as a preceptor at Princeton, as well as written feedback from three of the courses I taught at UCLA. Mercer County Community College doesn't conduct official numerical student evaluations, although I did solicit unofficial course feedback from my students there. I've also enclosed sample syllabi for four courses, each of which I've taught at UCLA: an upper-level aesthetics course, an upper-level Nietzsche course, an upper-level course in normative ethics on friendship, and a seminar on the philosophy of food. Lastly, I have asked Gavin Lawrence and Gilbert Harman to evaluate my teaching performance at UCLA and Princeton, respectively, in their letters of recommendation.

Teaching Evaluations: Numerical Scores

UCLA

The ratings below are for courses at UCLA where I served as the primary instructor. Students at UCLA are asked to rate the overall quality of the instructor (QI) and the overall quality of the course (QC) on a **scale from 1 (low) to 9 (high)**:

Class	QI	QC
Phi 177B - Historical Studies in Existentialism: Nietzsche - Fall 2013	8.61	8.5
Phi 161 - Topics in Aesthetic Theory: Values of Art - Winter 2014	8.14	8.09
Phi 153A - Topics in Ethical Theory: Ethics of Friendship - Spring 2014	8.63	8.49
Phi 191 - Variable Topics Research Seminar: Philosophy of Food - Spring 2014	8.78	8.83
Phi 153A - Topics in Ethical Theory: Ethics of Friendship - Fall 2014	8.60	8.38
Phi 177B - Historical Studies in Existentialism: Nietzsche - Fall 2014	8.69	8.69
Phi 191 - Variable Topics Research Seminar: Philosophy of Food - Winter 2015	8.85	8.75
Phi 180 - Philosophy of Action - Spring 2015	8.48	8.20
Overall Average:	8.60	8.49

Princeton

The ratings below are for courses at Princeton where I served as a preceptor, or teaching assistant. Students at Princeton are asked to rate the overall quality of the precept (QP) on a **scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high)**:

Class	Section	QP
Phi 326 - Philosophy of Art Fall 2009	Precept 01	3.67
	Precept 02	4.83
	Precept 03	4.00
Phi 306 - Nietzsche Spring 2009	Precept 01	4.25
	Precept 02	3.50
Phi 326 - Philosophy of Art Spring 2010	Precept 01	3.62
	Precept 02	4.14
Phi 202 - Intro to Moral Philosophy Spring 2012	Precept 01	4.20
	Precept 02	4.33
Overall Average:		4.06

Teaching Evaluations: Written Comments

Below I've included, verbatim, the full set of written comments received for three of the courses I've taught at UCLA: Phi 161, a mid-size class; Phi 191, a seminar; and Phi 153A, a larger lecture. Students in each class were asked to respond to the following prompt:

Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weakness of this instructor and course.

Phi 161 - Topics in Aesthetic Theory: Values of Art, Winter 2014

- Wonderful professor. He is extremely well organized and clear in his presentation of the material. Very patient and great at leading the class discussion and staying on topic. Best professor so far, I'm very glad I had the opportunity to take a class with him.
- Best philosophy professor at UCLA.
- The professor did his best to make the class engaging. I think he succeeded. Professor was excellent.
- Great presentation. Very concerned and amiable to students.
- I have never seen such an organized class. The teacher made difficult ideas very clear and raise very important debate. This class was instructive, rewarding, and offer a great picture of aesthetics; the examples of artwork are very good.
- Professor Cross is organized, genuinely concerned for his student's success & manifesting enthusiastic.
- Prof. Cross is excellent
- Prof. Cross is an amazing & well prepared professor. His classes are extremely organized, well thought out and planned—it shows he truly knows the material he's teaching. I love the handouts/outlines of class bc they help me understand the main points.
- Perhaps the best professor I've had at UCLA. Very prepared and concerned about course work and open to discuss topics outside and reviewed the course material. Very well versed in all the material he teaches and can support claims with more than 1 source.
- Prof. Cross has been very enthusiastic, knowledgeable, and helpful throughout the entire course. This is a class that I've always been excited to come to and feel as though I have gained valuable knowledge.
- Excellent professor, just felt like it was a lot of information and concepts that went by rather quickly.
- Strengths: Organized, knowledgeable. Weakness: covered material too fast/not enough time to enjoy/process it & a lot of work. Very difficult grader for how much work is expected.
- This was one of the most well organized courses I've taken in quite a while. The handouts were fantastic. The readings were a bit much to keep up with but assigned well & flowed nicely through the quarter. I could tell prof. Cross really cared about our experience in the class. GREAT professor.
- The handouts for lecture are comprehensively helpful, both for studying and for following what is going on in lecture. The material & presentation for this course were great. The examples and media used were also great. I enjoyed the course overall, and the questions/challenges and prompts were

clear and also actually got to the main points of significance and/or disagreement, which is difficult to find when some instructors can't do this. It makes things that much more interesting and challenging. My one criticism is to really find a way to allow more free discussion of the material—not so guided (which you do well at anyway). This helps me a lot because I can link/connect ideas from perhaps much older material in the term with current material and ideas or concepts. This would greatly help participation, integration, engagement, and interest/challenge. I would've liked to engage in this way, to propose, share, or examine others' ideas and insights. Thank you!

- Good explanations/exposition of claims. Interesting because wide approach and general issues throughout the whole course.
- Strengths: clear and articulate. Weakness: too many readings hard to absorb them all.
- The handouts you make for the class are very helpful. However, the notes you write on the board are oftentimes hard to connect with the material. They are very broad and ambiguous, in terms of what topic/issue they refer to.

Phi 191 - Variable Topics Seminar: The Philosophy of Food, Spring 2014

- I love that this was a small class, it made for one of the best class discussions I've had at UCLA. I liked the organization of the class with the short papers and end project. I also loved that the professor asked for feedback during the middle of class. For the in class presentation, I wish that the people who had to go first were chosen from those who rarely came to class.
- Amazing professor. Knows his subjects super well. Always friendly and always available if you need help.
- Thanks for the class Professor Cross. I really enjoyed it.
- Great Prof!
- Great class! Thank you!
- Amazing professor.
- Best Professor I've had at UCLA hire him already!
- Excellent course and wonderful professor. Thank you for offering a unique and interesting course and changing the way I think about food and my responsibilities to it. You are a wonderful professor!
- Terrific course and my favorite philosophy professor at UCLA!
- Great class!
- Best professor I've had at UCLA. Thank you professor Cross!!
- I enjoyed the small class and the paper assignments. Some of the topics were interesting. Nonetheless, the seminar was awkwardly run by a small group of students who would attack other students for their comments and it seemed like they ran the class instead of the professor.
- Best class in the philosophy department, maybe at UCLA.
- I have nothing bad to say about this class. Great teacher.
- I loved this class. It's really fun. Professor Cross is a really good professor. I learned a lot about this class was very exciting and cool. I wish I could've taken more classes with Cross.

- An excellent class and instructor overall! If the course was longer I'd like to see more about cannibalism and other topics. But it's not necessary, this class was awesome.
- I really enjoyed the quick group discussions at the beginning of each class that we started to implement toward the middle of the quarter. I think starting them from week 1 would be great. The presentation idea was fantastic. Maybe increase presentation time to 10 minute and questions to really get deep discussion going if it is possible to devote 2 full weeks to it. Thanks for an amazing class!
- Strengths: very enlightening course and Professor Cross was completely open to allowing dialogue on the subject matter. Weakness: none.
- This was my favorite class this quarter. I loved the seminar format and discussions. The presentations were very enjoyable as well. It almost felt like a grad class. professor Cross is great. I do wish the papers were longer; it would have been nice to have the space to devolve more deeply into the issues.
- Seminar was excellent. Cross did a great job managing, but not inhibiting class discussion. Topics were very interesting and he was always available and helpful.
- My only complaint is that at times the amount of reading was difficult to digest and ponder—student life is busy as hell! Otherwise, this seminar was fantastic.

Phi 153A - Topics in Ethical Theory: Friendship, Spring 2014

- I loved the class! This is my second course with Cross and I would take another. He is the best lecturer I have had. His lectures are articulate and logically prepared. Fabulous course!
- I love that we examined traditional topics in such a unique and applicable context. This course has really informed/built on my world view and personal doubts, and is a great way of coming to understand that philosophy can be ????? and applied to most anything around you. Anthony Cross is amazing
- Strengths: lectures were very well organized and easy to follow. Professor was very knowledgeable and clearly taught the content. Weakness: more examples with modern ideas of friendship.
- One of my favorite instructors. Lectures were extremely clear and concise. We would learn the information very efficiently and move on. There was quite a lot of material that we covered. I wish we would have studied less material but more in-depth.
- Really enjoyed the class!
- This class moved at a fantastic pace, and professor Cross is one of the most articulate and prepared Philosophy professors I've ever had.
- Anthony Cross is one of the best professors I've ever had, he's organized, clear, and his understanding of the material is motivating. His teacher style is perfect. (heart) Anthony Cross.
- I felt that this course might be a little too ambitious in its scope. The number of distinct readings required acted to prevent a deeper understanding of any particular work. Spending more time on fewer works could provide an opportunity for a more than superficial understanding.
- Excellent speaker, very organized, knew the material very well. No weaknesses that I can think of.
- Prof Cross is a great professor. The lectures are always well worth my time and the handouts are a huge help. Great course. I've been dissecting all of my "friendships" bc of it.

- Cross is a great professor. His lectures are very interesting and engaging.
- Great class, glad I took it. The readings were spot on and interesting. Work load was perfect and professor challenged us to think about friendship in different ways that were very eye-opening. My perspective on life expanded as a result of his teachings.
- Prof Cross genuinely cares and is passionate about philosophy and ethics. While his lectures were frequently boring, I would definitely enroll in another of his classes.
- Handouts were really helpful. All the information was really well organized.
- Really loved Prof Cross! His lectures were extremely clear and well-organized. Handouts were helpful. Great presence as a lecturer, perfect speed. Exams were fair but not overly picky would definitely take Prof Cross's class again!
- I like the outlines we are given.
- Great teacher.
- Great prof! he's a keeper for the phil department.
- Professor Cross is always prepared, receptive, and genuinely concerned about student learning outcomes. Hire him!
- I think you should pause more often in the middle of lectures to allow for possible questions to be answered, material to be digested, or more salient points to be made more obvious. By the same token, repeating or reiterating important points, even immediately after mentioning them, would also be helpful. That being said, the end of each lecture seemed like quite the blitz of information followed by us being sent almost immediately on our way—perhaps there could be more lingering on important points. Very well spoken and eloquent, nonetheless.
- This course has been my favorite by far this quarter. Professor Cross's knowledge of the material, lecture style, and organization were excellent. He has been one of my favorite lecturers so far at UCLA. Second only to Shiffrin—their styles are similar. My only criticism is that the lecture was not longer—to allow for more in-class discussion perhaps.
- I really enjoyed the lectures, which were always clear, relevant, and built on each other with a clear logical progression. My only qualm with the class is the word length maximum for homework assignments. For many prompts, I felt that I had enough space to present whichever theory I was discussing, but I always felt that I had to arbitrarily sacrifice when I was presenting my own opinions, critiques, or counter-arguments, which left them under-developed. I could present less advanced, compelling, or interesting arguments within the word limit, but this always felt academically dishonest, especially for a philosophy course.
- Great class! Prof Cross is really organized and has well structured lectures. It was very interesting overall and one of my favorite classes here. Thank you Cross!
- Professor Cross is an excellent lecturer, who is extremely knowledgeable of the course material he teaches. Everything that he brings forth in class during lecture accurately reflects the journal assignments. The course was valuable overall, and I am content!
- Great class. professor Cross explained the philosophers views clearly. I learned a lot in the course. The worksheets were good additions too.
- By far my best teacher in UCLA. Instructor Cross highlights many interesting paradoxes in an organized and very synthetic way.

- Great professor, great class. Definitely keep this class at UCLA.
- Professor Cross is one of the best lecturers I have had the pleasure of taking a class with in the philosophy department. I find his lectures very engaging and particularly appreciate the handouts he provides every class. They really help me better understand the material. He is extremely knowledgeable and eager to share his thoughts with his students. I am very glad to have taken one of his classes; it is definitely one of my favorites from the past four years.
- Very organized, very knowledgeable, well structured, dependable and on time.
- Professor Cross is very organized and knows exactly what he is talking about. I appreciate his clarity.

Phil 177B Historical Studies in Existentialism: Nietzsche

Syllabus

Fall 2014

Lecture: MW 2:00pm-3:50pm 1337 Public Affairs
Instructor: Anthony Cross
Email: across@humnet.ucla.edu
Office Hours: MW 4-5pm, 378 Dodd Hall, or by appointment
Course Website: <https://ccle.ucla.edu/course/view/14F-PHILOS177B-1>

Course Description: This course presents an in-depth introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. The dominant theme of the course is Nietzsche's diagnosis of and reaction to what he perceived as the most serious problem facing the culture of his time: the collapse of faith in objective values. Most famously articulated in Nietzsche's discussion of the "death of God", this problem will serve as a guiding thread through Nietzsche's major philosophical works. We'll begin by exploring Nietzsche's first efforts to come to terms with the problem in his early works, *The Birth of Tragedy* and "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense." We'll then follow the progression of Nietzsche's thought through later works, such as *The Gay Science*, *Beyond Good and Evil*, and *Of The Genealogy of Morality*. Along the way, we'll discuss some of Nietzsche's most suggestive (and provocative) philosophical notions, including the eternal recurrence, perspectivism, the will to power, and Nietzsche's criticisms of traditional morality.

Readings

1. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy (BT)*, translated by Walter Kaufmann
2. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science (GS)*, translated by Walter Kaufmann
3. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil (BGE)*, translated by Walter Kaufmann
4. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals (GM)*, translated by Walter Kaufmann
5. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Portable Nietzsche (PN)*, edited and translated by Walter Kaufmann
6. Supplementary readings to be distributed via CCLE

Course Expectations

You will complete a set of short writing assignments, an in-class midterm exam, and a take-home final. Final grades will be calculated according to the following distribution:

Short Writing Assignments - 30%
Midterm Exam - 25%
Take-home Final - 35%
Participation - 10%

Short Writing Assignments

Throughout the quarter, you will complete six short writing assignments consisting of responses to prompts or questions I will post on the course website. Each response will consist of 300 - 400 words, to be uploaded through CCLE. **NB:** Grading is blind; do not include any identifying information in your assignment. Responses are due by midnight on the listed due date. Late submissions will be penalized at the rate of $\frac{1}{3}$ of a letter grade per day late.

Exams

The midterm exam will be an in-class exam on 11/5/2014; the final exam will be a take-home exam, turned in via CCLE on 12/15/2014. Further details about each will be distributed in class.

Participation

Students are expected to attend class and to participate in class activities and discussions. In order to participate effectively, you will need to *do the course reading*. I recommend completing the assigned reading *before* class, which will

allow you to maximize the effectiveness of class for helping you to read and understand Nietzsche.. You will also need to bring a copy of the reading to class with you; much of class will be spent looking carefully at selections of Nietzsche's writing, and you will need to have these in front of you in order to participate effectively.

Collaboration, Sources, and Academic Integrity

You are allowed to discuss course materials with other students in the class. Similarly, you may—although this is not necessary—consult non-assigned academic sources relevant to the course. In both cases, it should always be the case that the final work that you complete for the course is your own. In this course, we will strictly follow the [UCLA Student Conduct Code](#). Please be sure that you are familiar with it, and in particular review the sections associated with academic integrity, which are summarized here: <http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/dos/students/integrity/> Any violations will be directly reported to the Office of the Dean of Students, and will usually result in you failing either an assignment, the course, or both. If you have *any* questions about acceptable collaboration, sources, or academic integrity, please don't hesitate to ask me. **NB:** I will upload all submissions to TurnItIn for originality reporting.

Course Timeline

Week 1

10/06/2014 Course Introduction; Administrative Issues; Nietzsche's life and thought; How to read Nietzsche.

10/08/2014 Nietzsche's idea of the "death of god" and the loss of faith in objective values. Reading: *GS* §108-125.

Week 2

10/13/2014 Nietzsche's early diagnosis of the problem in the *Birth of Tragedy*. The 'Apollonian' and 'Dionysian'. The function of tragedy in Greek culture. Reading: *BT* §1-10.

10/15/2014 The death of Greek tragedy; Socratic rationalism. Reading: *BT* §11-17.

10/19/2014 **Writing Assignment #1 DUE DATE**

Week 3

10/20/2014 Nietzsche abandons the metaphysics of *BT*. Reading: *PN*, "On 'Truth' and 'Lie' in an Extra-Moral Sense", *BT*, "Attempt at a Self-Criticism", *GS* §54, 57-58.

10/22/2014 The Eternal Recurrence as consequence of Nietzsche's notion of the self. Reading: *GS* §340-342; *PN* 267 "On the Vision and the Riddle"; Nehamas "The Eternal Recurrence."

10/26/2014 **Writing Assignment #2 DUE DATE**

Week 4

10/27/2014 Giving style to one's character: Nietzsche's characterization of the great individual. Reading: *GS* Book IV.

10/29/2014 Nietzsche's Perspectivism and the status of his philosophical project. Reading: *BGE* Book 1. Optional: *BGE* Book 2; Ken Gemes, "Nietzsche's Critique of Truth."

11/02/2014 **Writing Assignment #3 DUE DATE**

Week 5

11/03/2014 Towards a Nietzschean ontology? The will to power as an interpretation of self *and* world. Reading: *BGE* §13, 36; Nehamas "A Thing is the Sum of Its Effects."

11/05/2014 **MIDTERM EXAM**

Week 6

- 11/10/2014** Nietzsche's account of what is "noble"; The critique of morality: first pass. Reading: *BGE* Book IX.
- 11/12/2014** Nietzsche's attack on morality: What is the status of his critique? 'Good' and 'Bad' vs. 'Good' and 'Evil.' The Slave Revolt in Morality. Reading: *GM* Preface, Essay I.
- 11/16/2014** **Writing Assignment #4 DUE DATE**

Week 7

- 11/17/2014** Essay I continued: Nietzsche's moral psychology vs. that of traditional morality. Reading: *GM* I §13; Williams "Nietzsche's Minimalist Moral Psychology."
- 11/19/2014** Nietzsche's *Genealogy*, second essay: The Moralization of Bad Conscience. Reading: *GM* Essay II.
- 11/23/2014** **Writing Assignment #5 DUE DATE**

Week 8

- 11/24/2014** What is Genealogy? Reading: *GM* II §12, Guess "Nietzsche and Genealogy."
- 11/26/2014** **LECTURE CANCELLED.** N.B. Reading: Begin reading *GM* Essay III.

Week 9

- 12/1/2014** Nietzsche's *Genealogy*, third essay: the meaning of ascetic ideals considered. Reading: Finish reading *GM* Essay III.
- 12/3/2014** Ascetic Ideals continued: The Ascetic Ideal and the Will to Truth. Reading: *GM* Preface, III § 23-28; *GS* §343-346.
- 12/7/2014** **Writing Assignment #6 DUE DATE**

Week 10

- 12/8/2014** Nietzsche's life and work, by his own lights. Reading: *Ecce Homo*, "Preface", "Why I Am So Wise", "Why I Am So Clever."
- 12/10/2014** Conclusion
- 12/15/2014** **TAKE-HOME FINAL DUE**

Phil 161 Topics in Aesthetic Theory

Syllabus

Fall 2015

Instructor: Anthony Cross
Email: across@humnet.ucla.edu
Lecture: TR 2:00pm-3:50pm Bunche 3156
Office Hours: TBD.

Course Description: Is beauty in the eye of the beholder? Is there something distinctive about our experience of objects that are beautiful? What might such aesthetic experience have to do with the arts? What is art, anyway? And what is its relationship to the rest of life? Is it inappropriate to evaluate artworks morally or politically?

In this course, we'll get acquainted with aesthetics and the philosophy of art by way of discussion of each of the above questions. We'll primarily approach these questions by way of historical and contemporary philosophical readings in the analytic tradition. However, we'll also supplement these readings with discussions of selected artworks and art criticism.

Readings: All readings and supplementary materials will be posted on CCLE. You are responsible for completing course readings *before* coming to class. You should also plan to have a copy of the readings with you in class, as we will often discuss specific passages of the readings in detail. The readings are generally quite difficult; be sure to give yourself plenty of time to complete them. I may add additional supplemental material or make changes to the syllabus as the class progresses; I will announce this in lecture and by course email.

Course Expectations: You will complete a writing journal and a final paper. Final grades will be calculated according to the following distribution:

Writing Journal - 50%
Final Paper - 35%
Participation - 15%

Writing Journal: You will keep a weekly writing journal throughout the course, consisting of short responses to prompts or questions I will post on the course website. You will be responsible for writing **four** total responses during the session. Each response will consist of 400 - 600 words, to be uploaded through CCLE. Responses will be graded according to a rubric that I will distribute in class, and which will be available on CCLE. **NB:** Grading will be blind; do not include any identifying information in your submission. Responses are due by midnight on the listed due date. Late submissions will be penalized at the rate of $\frac{1}{3}$ of a letter grade per day late.

Final Paper: There will be a take-home final exam, to be turned in via CCLE on 9/11/2015.

Participation: Your participation grade will be determined by your attendance and participation in class discussions. If for any reason you cannot attend, you should contact me to let me know about it and to plan on making up what material you've missed.

Collaboration, Sources, and Academic Integrity: You are allowed to discuss course materials with other students in the class. Similarly, you may—although this is not necessary—consult non-assigned academic sources relevant to the course. In both cases, it should always be the case that the final work that you complete for the course is your own. In this course, we will strictly follow the [UCLA Student Conduct Code](http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/dos/students/integrity/). Please be sure that you are familiar with it, and in particular review the sections associated with academic integrity, which are summarized here: <http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/dos/students/integrity/>¹²

Any violations will be directly reported to the ~~Office of the Dean of Students~~ Office of the Dean of Students, and will usually result in you failing either an assignment, the course, or both. If you have *any* questions about acceptable collaboration, sources, or academic integrity, please don't hesitate to ask me. **NB:** All written work will be submitted to TurnItIn for originality reporting.

Course Timeline

Week 0: *Introduction*

9/24/15 Course Introduction

Week 1-2: *Beauty and the Problem of Taste*

9/29/15 On the nature of beauty. *Reading:* Plato, *Symposium*, selections. David Hume, "The Skeptic", selections.

10/1/15 Hume and the Problem of Taste *Readings:* David Hume, "Of The Standard of Taste."

10/6/15 Hume concluded. Kant on the Beautiful, pt. 1 *Readings:* Immanuel Kant, "Analytic of the Beautiful."

10/8/15 Kant on the Beautiful, pt. 2 *Readings:* Immanuel Kant, "Analytic of the Beautiful."

10/11/15 **First Writing Journal Due**

Week 3-4: *The Aesthetic*

10/13/15 From Beauty to the Aesthetic. *Readings:* Larry Shiner, "From Taste to the Aesthetic"

10/15/15 Aesthetic Experience *Readings:* John Dewey, "Having an Experience"; George Dickie, "Beardsley's Phantom Aesthetic Experience."

10/20/15 The Aesthetic Attitude. *Readings:* Edward Bullough, "Psychical Distance"; George Dickie, "The Myth of the Aesthetic Attitude."

10/22/15 The Aesthetic Point of View. *Reading:* Monroe Beardsley, "The Aesthetic Point of View."

10/25/15 **Second Writing Journal Due**

Week 5-6: *What is art? What does it do?*

10/27/15 Art as imitation. *Readings:* Plato, *Republic X*.

10/29/15 Art as expression. *Readings:* Leo Tolstoy, *What Is Art?*

11/3/15 The Aesthetic Theory of Art. *Reading:* Clive Bell, "Art."

11/5/15 Is it *possible* to define art? *Reading:* Morris Weitz, "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics."

11/8/15 **Third Writing Journal Due**

Week 7-8: *Definitions of Art*

11/10/15 Towards a relational definition of art. *Reading:* Arthur Danto, "The Artworld."

11/12/15 **NO CLASS; CROSS ABSENT FOR ACADEMIC TRAVEL**

11/17/15 Institutional Definitions of Art. *Reading:* George Dickie, "Defining Art."

- 11/19/15** Historical Definitions of Art. *Reading:* Carroll Levinson, "Defining Art Historically."
-
- 11/22/15** **Fourth Writing Journal Due**
- Week 9-10: Art, Morality, and Politics*
- 11/24/15** Art, Censorship, and Politics. *Reading:* Dave Hickey, *The Invisible Dragon*, selections; Mary Devereaux, "Protected Space: Politics, Censorship, and the Arts".
- 11/26/15** **NO CLASS THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY**
- 12/1/15** Art and Morality. *Reading:* John Dewey, "Art and Civilization"; Noel Carroll, "Art, Narrative, and Moral Understanding".
- 12/3/15** Art and Morality, pt 2. Course Conclusion.
- 12/8/15** **FINAL PAPER DUE**

Syllabus

Winter 2015

Instructor: Anthony Cross
Email: across@humnet.ucla.edu
Seminar: T/R 10:00am-11:50am, SLICHTR 2834
Office Hours: T/R 12:00pm-1:00pm, 378 Dodd Hall
Course Website: <https://ccle.ucla.edu/course/view/15W-PHILOS191-1>

Course Description: Plato banned rich sauces, Sicilian relishes, and Attic pastries from his ideal city, arguing that they might lead to disease and ill health among its citizens. In 2012, for strikingly similar reasons Mayor Michael Bloomberg sought to ban the sale of large sugary drinks in the city of New York. In between, we find two thousand years of argument—philosophical, political, and cultural—focused on the central deliberative question which motivates this seminar: *what should we eat and why?* To answer this question, we critically examine the range of ethical, aesthetic, and political considerations governing our food choices. Our first course is the problem of taste. We analyze the Scottish philosopher David Hume’s essay “Of the Standard of Taste” and use it as a lens to appraise the objectivity of aesthetic judgments about food and drink. We then question the ethics of eating meat by putting the writings of author David Foster Wallace into conversation with philosophical discussion from philosophers like Peter Singer, Roger Scruton, and others. To cap off the course, students research a food practice of their choice and evaluate the cultural, political, and traditional meanings of its production and consumption.

Readings: Many of the readings will be accessible online through CCLE. The following textbook is required:

1. Steve Sapontzis ed. *Food for Thought: The Contemporary Debate over Eating Meat*, Prometheus, 2004. ISBN: 1591021189. (FT)

Course Expectations

You’ll be responsible for completing the following coursework:

- Paper 1 - 20%
- Paper 2 - 20%
- Final Presentation - 10%
- Final Paper - 30%
- Participation - 20%

Short Papers

You will complete two short papers consisting of responses to prompts or questions I will post on the course website. Each response will be 4-6 pages in length, to be uploaded through TurnItIn. Responses are due by midnight on the listed due date. Late submissions will be penalized at the rate of 1/3 of a letter grade per day late.

Final Paper

For the final paper, you will be responsible for choosing your own topic; this must be cleared with me in advance. Further details will be assigned midway through the quarter. Your paper will be between 8-10 pages in length, and must be uploaded through TurnItIn. Final papers are due by midnight on the listed due date. Late submissions will be penalized at the rate of 1/3 of a letter grade per day late.

Presentation

In addition to completing your final paper, you will also be responsible for presenting your paper to the class in the final week of the seminar. Expect to present for 5-7 minutes, followed by 5 minutes for questions, comments, and group discussion.

Participation

Your participation grade will be determined by your attendance and participation in seminar. Given the seminar format,

participation is a *very important* component of determining both your own success and the success of the seminar as a whole. Attendance is mandatory, and you *must* complete the assigned reading *before seminar*. If you must miss a seminar, please let me know; unexcused absences will affect your participation grade.

Collaboration, Sources, and Academic Integrity

You are allowed to discuss course materials with other students in the class. Similarly, you may—although this is not necessary—consult non-assigned academic sources relevant to the course. In both cases, it should always be the case that the final work that you complete for the course is your own. In this course, we will strictly follow the [UCLA Student Conduct Code](#). Please be sure that you are familiar with it, and in particular review the sections associated with academic integrity, which are summarized here: <http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/dos/students/integrity/> Any violations will be directly reported to the Office of the Dean of Students, and will usually result in you failing either an assignment, the course, or both. If you have *any* questions about acceptable collaboration, sources, or academic integrity, please don't hesitate to ask me .

Course Timeline

Unit One: Food, Taste, and Judgment

Week 1: Taste, Art, and Judgment

1/6/15 Course Introduction; Disagreements about Tastes
Reading: David Hume, "Of the Standard of Taste".

1/8/15 Aesthetic Taste and Gustatory Taste
Reading: Brillat-Savarin, "On Taste"; Carolyn Korsmeyer, "Philosophies of Taste: Aesthetic and Non-Aesthetic Senses."

Week 2: Taste, Food, and Objectivity

1/13/15 De gustibus non disputandum est?
Reading: Michael Shaffer, "Taste, Gastronomic Expertise, and Objectivity"; Steven Shapin, "Hedonistic Fruit Bombs"; Optional: Carolyn Korsmeyer, "The Science of Taste."

1/15/15 Knowledge, Taste, and Pleasure
Reading: Kent Bach, "Knowledge, Wine, and Taste."

Week 3: Food and/as Art

1/20/15 Food as a Minor Art
Reading: Elizabeth Telfer, "Food as Art".

1/22/15 Taste and Meaning
Reading: Carolyn Korsmeyer, "Delicious, Delightful, Disgusting".

1/25/15 **First Short Paper Due**

Unit Two: Meat and Morality

Week 4: Eating Animals, pt.1: Basic Issues

1/27/15 Introduction: "Consider the Lobster"
Reading: David Foster Wallace, "Consider the Lobster".

1/29/15 Two arguments against eating meat
Reading: James Rachels, "The Basic Argument for Vegetarianism, *FT* p. 70-79; Evelyn Pluhar, "The Right Not to be Eaten", *FT* p. 92-105; Peter Singer, "Becoming a Vegetarian", *FT* p. 114-116.

Week 5: Eating Animals, pt. 2: Conscientious Carnivorism?

2/3/15 Arguments for eating meat *in the right way*

Reading: Roger Scruton, "The Conscientious Carnivore", *FT* p. 81-91; Jeff McMahon, "Eating Animals the Nice Way."
Optional: Michael Pollan, "An Animal's Place"
Anthony Cross - Teaching Dossier

2/5/15 Are the pleasures of eating themselves sensitive to moral evaluation?

Reading: Carolyn Korsmeyer, "Ethical Gourmandism", *PF*, p. 87-102.

Week 6: *Eating Animals, pt. 3: Feminist and Religious Approaches to Meat and Morality*

2/10/15 Feminism and the argument against eating meat

Reading: Lori Gruen, "Empathy and Vegetarian Commitments", *FT* p. 284-292; Deane Curtin, "Contextual Moral Vegetarianism", *FT*, p. 272-283.

2/12/15 Eating Meat and Religious Teachings

Reading: Roberta Kalechofsky "The Jewish Diet and Vegetarianism", *FT* p. 168-176; Tom Regan, "Christians Are What Christians Eat", *FT* p. 177-185.

2/15/15 **Second Short Paper Due**

Unit Three: Food, Society, and Culture

Week 7: *Food Systems and Society*

2/17/15 Feeding the world: Industrial agriculture, Productionism, and Global Hunger

Reading: Michael Pollan, "The Farm" from *Omnivore's Dilemma*; Jeffrey Sachs, "Ending World Hunger"; Paul B. Thompson, "The Productionist Paradigm"

2/19/15 Sustainability: Is our food system unsustainable? And what should we do about it?

Reading: Warren Belasco, "The Future of Food;" Peter Singer and Jim Mason, "Eating Locally."

Week 8: *Food Systems, Culture, and the Environment*

2/24/15 A cultural case for Agrarianism; an environmental critique of industrial agriculture.

Reading: Wendell Berry, *The Unsettling of America*, selections; Aldo Leopold, "The Land Ethic."

2/26/15 Food and Technology

Reading: Gary Comstock, "Ethics and Genetically Modified Foods"; Benjamin Hale, "Gavagai goulash: Growing Organs for Food"

Week 9: *Food and Tradition; Student Presentations*

3/3/15 Food and Tradition

Reading: Samuel Scheffler, "The Normativity of Tradition"; Gary Comstock, "Subsistence Hunting."

3/5/15 Student Presentations, pt. 1

Week 10: *Student Presentations and Course Conclusions*

3/10/15 Student Presentations, pt. 2.

3/12/15 Student Presentations, pt. 3; Course Conclusion.

3/16/15 **Final Paper Due**

Syllabus

Fall 2014

Instructor:	Anthony Cross
Email:	across@humnet.ucla.edu
Lecture:	M/W 12:00pm-1:50pm, Public Affairs 1222.
Office Hours:	M/W 4:00-5:00pm, 378 Dodd Hall
Teaching Assistant:	Jonathan Gingerich, jgingerich@humnet.ucla.edu Office Hours: W11:00am-12:00pm; W2:00pm-3:00pm, Lu Valle Commons
Course Website:	http://ccle.ucla.edu/course/view/14F-PHILOS153A-1

Course Description

There's an old joke that a good friend is someone you call when you need to move house, but a *great* friend is someone you call when you need to move a body. Our friendships are some of our most valued personal commitments, but—as the above joke illustrates—they might often appear to stand in an uneasy relationship with the demands of impartial morality.

In this course, we'll explore a number of ethical questions related to friendship. We begin with a historical introduction to philosophical thought about friendship: we look to Aristotle's influential account of the nature and value of friendship, then consider the (limited) discussion of friendship in the modern ethical theories of Kant and the utilitarian Henry Sidgwick.

We'll then attempt to answer a set of questions related to the ethics of friendship: What is the nature and value of friendship? Can our love for our friends be rationally justified? Is there a conflict between the demands of morality and the demands of friendship? Can one's true friends be less than virtuous? We'll close by attempting to situate questions about friendship within a broader discussion of partiality in ethics.

Readings

All readings will be posted on CCLE.

Course Expectations

You will complete a set of short writing assignments, an in-class midterm exam, and a take-home final. Final grades will be calculated according to the following distribution:

1. Short Writing Assignments- 30%
2. Midterm Exam - 25%
3. Take-home Final Exam - 30%
4. Participation - 15%

Short Writing Assignments

Throughout the quarter, you will complete four short writing assignments consisting of responses to prompts or questions I will post on the course website. Each response will consist of 300 - 500 words, to be uploaded through CCLE. Responses will be graded according to a rubric that I will distribute in class, and which will be available on CCLE. **NB:** Grading will be blind; do not include any identifying information in your submission. Responses are due by midnight on the listed due date. Late submissions will be penalized at the rate of $\frac{1}{3}$ of a letter grade per day late.

Exams

The midterm exam will be an in-class exam on 11/03/2014; the final exam will be a take-home final, turned in via CCLE on 12/13/2014.

Participation

Your participation grade will be determined by your attendance and participation in your discussion section. *Attendance in discussion sections is mandatory.*

Collaboration, Sources, and Academic Integrity Anthony Cross - Teaching Dossier

You are allowed to discuss course materials with other students in the class. Similarly, you may—although this is not necessary—consult non-assigned academic sources relevant to the course. In both cases, it should always be the case that the final work that you complete for the course is your own. In this course, we will strictly follow the [UCLA Student Conduct Code](#). Please be sure that you are familiar with it, and in particular review the sections associated with academic integrity, which are summarized here: <http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/dos/students/integrity/> Any violations will be directly reported to the Office of the Dean of Students, and will usually result in you failing either an assignment, the course, or both. If you have *any* questions about acceptable collaboration, sources, or academic integrity, please don't hesitate to ask me or your TA. **NB:** All written work will be submitted to TurnItIn for originality reporting.

Course Timeline

Historical Introduction

Week One: Course Introduction: Ancient Approaches

10/6/14 Course Introduction

10/8/14 Aristotle on Friendship.
Reading: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* Book VIII, ch. 1-12.

Week Two: Aristotle Continued, Augustine.

10/13/14 Aristotle continued.
Reading: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* Book IX, ch 3-10.

10/15/14 Friendship and Christianity
Reading: Augustine, *Confessions*, Book 4 ch. IV-IX; Kierkegaard, *Works of Love*, selection.

10/19/14 **Writing Assignment #1 Due**

Week Three: Friendship in Modern Moral Philosophy

10/20/14 Kant on Friendship
Reading: Selections from Immanuel Kant, *Lectures on Ethics* and *The Metaphysics of Morals*.

10/22/14 Friendship and Utilitarianism
Reading: Selections from Sidgwick, *Methods of Ethics*.

10/26/14 **Writing Assignment #2 Due**

Contemporary Accounts of Friendship

Week Four: The Nature of Friendship

10/27/14 What distinguishes friendships from other relationships?
Reading: C.S. Lewis, "Friendship - the Least Necessary Love"; Laurence Thomas, "Friendship and Other Loves".

10/29/14 What is involved in acting well within a friendship?
Reading: Diane Jeske, Selections from *Rationality and Moral Theory: How Intimacy Generates Reasons*. Optional: Sarah Stroud, "Epistemic Partiality in Friendship", *Section I only*.

Week Five: Midterm; Friendship and Love pt. 1

11/03/14 **IN-CLASS MIDTERM**

Anthony Cross - Teaching Dossier

11/05/14 Friendship, Love, and Character
Reading: Amelie Rorty, "The Historicity of Psychological Attitudes."

Week Six: *Friendship and Love pt. 2: Is there a rational justification for our having the particular friendships that we have?*

11/10/14 The "No Reasons" View of Love and Friendship
Reading: Harry Frankfurt, Selection from *The Reasons of Love*.

11/12/14 Friendship as a Response to Value
Reading: Niko Kolodny, "Love as Valuing a Relationship.", p. 135-153.

11/16/14 **Writing Assignment #3 Due**

Week Seven: *What is the good of friendship?*

11/17/14 Friendship and the Self
Reading: Cocking & Kennett, "Friendship and the Self"

11/19/14 Friendship and the Self, pt. 2
Reading: Nehamas, "The Good of Friendship"

Friendships and Morality

Week Eight: *Friendship's Relationship with Morality and Moral Theory*

11/24/14 Do modern moral theories ignore friendship?
Reading: Michael Stocker, "The Schizophrenia of Modern Ethical Theories"

11/26/14 Is friendship a moral good?
Reading: Lawrence Blum, "Friendship as Moral Phenomenon."

11/30/14 **Writing Assignment #4 Due**

Week Nine: *Is friendship morally dangerous?*

12/1/14 Friendship and moral danger in *The Third Man*
Reading: *The Third Man*, CCLE video reserve; Julia Driver, "Justice, Mercy, and Friendship in *The Third Man*."

12/3/14 Friendship and Moral Danger (cont.)
Reading: Cocking and Kennett, "Friendship and Moral Danger."

Week Ten: *Friendship and Partiality*

12/8/14 Varieties of Partiality: A General Justification for Being Partial?
Reading: Susan Wolf, "Morality and Partiality"

12/10/14 Conclusion and Course Review

12/13/14 **TAKE-HOME FINAL DUE**