

Compulsory Research Methodology Course for Ph D in Philosophy

The Objective

The main objective of the course is to help scholars acquire adequate grasp of major philosophical methods by making them equipped with sufficient cognitive resources to be able to grasp and interpret philosophical texts. This course accordingly aims at making Ph D scholars successfully identify main philosophical problems in their chosen area of research and train them to develop skills of argumentation, writing summaries, abstracts and research papers and finally their thesis. It helps researchers in developing skills in how to use the available research material for writing and making references while making them aware of academic ethics.

Module 1 Philosophical Methods:

The researchers shall be introduced to different Indian and Western Philosophical Methods in this module, like, Advaita Vedanta, Buddhist, Nyaya, Critical analysis, Phenomenological, Hermeneutic, Critical theory, Postmodern, Feminist and Analytic.

Section A: Issues in the Methodology of Indian Philosophy

Section B: Methods in Western Philosophy

Module 2: Aspects of Thesis Writing

1. Identification of research Problem.
2. Using resource material: How to cite and acknowledge sources and prepare bibliography.
3. Critical writing-summarizing, developing arguments, reviewing, writing research paper, references, etc.
4. Academic Ethics- Plagiarism
5. Computer Applications- How to use Web based research resources, Power point presentation, multimedia, editing, etc.

Suggested Readings:

Albahari, Miri. (2006), *Analytical Buddhism: The Two-Tiered Illusion of Self*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barnet, Sylvan and Bedau, Hugo. *Critical Thinking, Reading and writing: A brief guide to argument*, Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011.

Beaney, Michael (ed.) (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of The History of Analytic Philosophy*. Oxford: OUP.

Beaney, Michael. (2013). "What is Analytic Philosophy?" In Beaney (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Analytic Philosophy*, Oxford: OUP, pg. 3-29.

Eco, Umberto. *How to Write a Thesis*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press. 2015.

Foucault, Micheal , "Introduction", *Archeology of Knowledge* , London; Routledge, 1989.

Ganeri, J. *Philosophy in Classical India* , Ch.1, The Motive and Method of Rational Inquiry, London: Routledge 2001.

Garfield, Jay L. "Western Idealism Through Indian Eyes: A Cittamātra Reading of Berkeley, Kant and Schopenhauer," in P. Bilimoria and A.B. Irvine (eds.), *Postcolonial Philosophy of Religion*, Amsterdam: Springer, 2009.

Glock, Hans-Johann (2008). *What is Analytic Philosophy?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gold, Jonathan C. *Paving the Great Way*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

Grice, H. P. (1989). "Conceptual Analysis and the Province of Philosophy" (1987) in *Studies in the Way of Words*, Harvard University Press, pg. 181-185.

Horkheimer, Max. "Traditional and Critical Theory", *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, New York: Continuum, 1973, pp.188-243.

Kalpahana, D.J. (1994), *A History of Buddhist Philosophy: Continuities and Discontinuities*, Indian edition, Delhi, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass.

Levy, Albert William. "'Introduction", *Philosophy as Social Expression*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974.

Martinich, A. P. *Philosophical Writing: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

Modern Language Association, *MLA Hand Book for writers of research papers (Seventh edition)*, Modern Language Association of America, 2009.

Murti, T.R.V. (1955), *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism*, London, George Allen & Unwin.

Norman, K.R. (1997), *A Philological Approach to Buddhism*, London, University of London.

Prasad, Rajendra. *A Conceptual –Analytic Study of Classical Indian Philosophy of Morals*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing, Ch3, 2008.

Raatikainen, Panu. (2013). "What Was Analytic Philosophy?" *Journal for the History of Analytical Philosophy*, Vol. 2, pg. 10-27

Rorty, Richard. "The Historiography of Philosophy: Four Genres". In Rorty, Richard, J B Schneewind and Quentin Skinner (Eds), *Philosophy in History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 49-76.

Skinner, Quentin. "Meaning and Understanding in History of Ideas", *History and Theory*, Vol.8.No.1 (1969), pp.3-53.

Soccio, Douglas J. *How to get the Most out of Philosophy*, Chs 3, 7 & Appendix A, Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth, , 2007.

Swami Satchidanandendra Saraswati, *The Method of the Vedanta: A Critical Account of the Advaita Tradition*, translated from the Sanskrit by A. J. Alstion, New Delhi: Motilal Banarasi Dass, 1977.

Taylor, Charles. "Social theory as Practice", *Philosophy and Human sciences: Philosophical papers 2*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Westerhoff, Jan (2009), *Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka: A Philosophical Introduction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Williamson, Timothy. (2007). "The Linguistic Turn and the Conceptual Turn" in his *The Philosophy of Philosophy*, Blackwell Publishing, 2007, pg. 10-23

MPhil Optional Course

Exploring the interconnections between Reasoning, Rationality and Normativity (Dr Ayesha Gautam)

Course Description

Much of normative theory over the last few decades has taken a 'turn to reasons'. Scholars like Derek Parfit, Thomas Michael Scanlon and Joseph Raz are of the opinion that the notion of a reason is a fundamental normative notion and is tightly linked with reasoning and rationality. Joseph Raz in his recent work has opined: "It is more or less common ground that an important explanation of normativity relates to the way Reason (our rational power), reasons (for beliefs, emotions, actions, etc.) and reasoning, with all its varieties and domains are interconnected" [Raz, J. (2015), 'Normativity: The Place of Reasoning', King's College London Law School Research Paper no. 2015-08: 1]. According to this theory practical reasons are "provided by facts about what is relevantly good or worth achieving". Our reasons are provided by these facts; rationality of our desire on the other hand depends on our beliefs. Normative reasons according to Parfit are not provided by motivational states. A normative reason thus becomes a motivating reason if and only if the agent believes the normative reason. There are still other philosophers like Niko Kolodny who are of the opinion that rational requirements are not normative requirements. Standards of rationality according to Kolodny would be normative only if there were some general reasons for conforming to them and as per Kolodny's position there is no such general reason. This course will be an attempt to look at some of the influential contributions to the literature on the interconnections between normativity, rationality and Reasoning.

Essential Readings

1. Broome , John. 2013. "Rationality and Normativity "in John Broome, *Rationality through Reasoning* , Blackwell Publication, Oxford, pp 192-204
2. Broome, John.2005, "Does Rationality Give Us Reasons?", *Philosophical Issues*, Vol. 15, Normativity, pp. 321-337
- 3.Korsgaard, Christine M.2009, "The Activity of Reason", *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, Vol. 83, No. 2, pp. 23-43
4. Kolodny, Niko.2005. 'Why Be Rational?', *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 114, No. 455, pp. 509-563
5. Parfit Derek. 2001,"Rationality and Reasons", In Dan Egonsson(ed) *Exploring Practical Philosophy*, Ashgate, pp 17-39
6. Raz, Joseph. "Reason, Rationality and Normativity" in *From Normativity to Responsibility*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011, pp 85-106

7. Raz, Joseph. “The myth of instrumental rationality” in *From Normativity to Responsibility*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011, pp 141-172

Secondary Readings

1. Broome, John. and Piller, Christian “Normative Practical Reasoning”, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes*, Vol. 75 (2001), pp. 175-193+195-216
2. Parfit, Derek. “Rationality and Time”, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series*, Vol. 84 (1983 - 1984), pp. 47-82
3. Wedgwood, Ralph. “The A Priori Rules of Rationality”, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (Mar., 1999), pp. 113-131
4. Schroeder, Mark. ‘Having reasons’, *Philosophical Studies*, 139 (2008), pp. 57–71.
5. Raz, Joseph. “ Explaining Normativity: On Rationality and the justification of Reason” *Ratio (new series)* XII 4 December 1999 0034–0006, pp 354=379
6. Schroeder, Mark, *Slaves of the Passions*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2007

Note* Readings may be changed or added.

PhD Optional Course

Contemporary Debates on Reading Philosophy as Literature (Dr. Ayesha Gautam)

Course Description

There is a growing consensus among both philosophers as well as literary theorists that the separation of philosophy from literary studies has not done any benefit to either of the disciplines. "Nowhere is the dynamic relationship between literature and philosophy more intricate than in the deceptively simple practice of reading. Ploughing through a text, whether literary or a philosophical work , inevitably involves an amount of interpretation- at least some degree of inferring the 'meaning' of the work - yet within this activity there is rarely a readily apparent separation between the pursuit of the literary aspects of the text (wondering what a certain metaphor suggests , or contemplating the implication of a troubling turn of phrase) and the more abstract activity that is labelled 'doing philosophy...There is no shortage of literary texts that debate or explore philosophical problems and issues. Furthermore, many classic works of philosophy are shot through with stylistic or generic features that can only be described as 'literary'. Many thinkers – both philosophers and literary critics are of the opinion that there is a deep-seated overlap between the genres of literature and philosophy.(David Rudrum (Ed.), Literature and Philosophy A Guide to Contemporary Debates, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, pp 159) This course will be an endeavor to look at some of the contemporary debates on Reading Philosophy as literature.

Primary Readings

Benjamin Andrew, " Literary Potential: The Release of Criticism " in David Rudrum (Ed.), Literature and Philosophy A Guide to Contemporary Debates, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, pp 170-178

Eagleton Robert, "Philosophy's Metaphors: Dennett, Midgley, and Derrida" in David Rudrum (Ed.), Literature and Philosophy A Guide to Contemporary Debates, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, pp 179-193

Eskin Michael, " Who is Speaking? Brodsky, Heidegger, Wittgenstein, and the Question of Genre" in David Rudrum (Ed.), Literature and Philosophy A Guide to Contemporary Debates, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, pp 163-169

Fischer Michael, " Redefining Philosophy as Literature: Richard Rorty's "Defense" of Literary Culture", Soundings : An Interdisciplinary Journal, Vol. 67, No. 3 (Fall 1984), pp 312-324, Penn State University Press

R'ee Jonathan, "Gibberophobia: Philosophy, Fear, and the Plain Style" in David Rudrum (Ed.), *Literature and Philosophy A Guide to Contemporary Debates*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, pp 179-193

Rudrum David, "Hearing Voices: A Dialogical Reading of Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations" in David Rudrum (Ed.), *Literature and Philosophy A Guide to Contemporary Debates*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, pp 179-193

Secondary Readings

Miscevic Nenad, "Philosophy as Literature: The non-argumentative tradition in continental philosophy"

David Rudrum (Ed.), *Literature and Philosophy A Guide to Contemporary Debates*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, pp 179-193

Note* Readings may be changed or added

ASPECT PERCEPTION: With Special Reference to Later Wittgenstein

Course-Instructor: Enakshi Ray Mitra

The notion of perceiving aspects as contrasted to perceiving objects (like duck-rabbit, convex-concave, background -foreground) is an intriguing area in the field of perception. Several opposing strands of thought like Empiricism, Gestalt theories, Neurological theories address this issue. This course shall incorporate some standard theories on aspect perception - both traditional and modern - and identify the exact points in which they converge and disperse. We shall ultimately privilege later Wittgenstein's view of aspect-perception to show how it outgrows the standard dichotomies in this area to eke out a new approach in both the spheres of language and mind. The course will explore how this notion has been effectively deployed in various fields other than that of perception – viz. in the discourse on self, action, language and mathematics.

Essential Readings

1. Wittgenstein Ludwig, *Philosophical Investigations*, ed. G.E.M. Anscombe, R. Rhees, and G.H. Von Wright (trans.: G.E.M. Anscombe), Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1984, Part II, section xi.
2. Dunlop, Charles, E.M., “Wittgenstein on Sensation and Seeing – as”, *Synthese*, Vol. 60, No. 3, 1984.
3. Stromberg, Wayne H., “Wittgenstein and the Nativism-Empiricism Controversy”, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. XLI, Nos. 1 – 2, Sept. – Dec., 1980.
4. * William Day and Victor J Kerbs ‘Seeing Aspects in Wittgenstein’
5. *Laugier Sandra, ‘Aspects, Sense and Perception’
6. *Timothy Gould, ‘An Allegory of Affinities’
7. *William Day, ‘Aspect Blindness and Language’
8. Floyd Juliet, * ‘On Being Surprised’, Wittgenstein on Aspect Perception, Logic and Mathematics

Further Readings

1. _____, *Last Writings on the Philosophy of Psychology*, Von Wright and Nyman H (ed), Luckhardt C G and Aue M. A. E. (tr), Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1998, Vol I (indexed sections on aspect-seeing, seeing-as)
2. _____, *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology*, Anscombe G. E. M and Von Wright (ed), Anscombe G E M (tr), Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1980., Band I, Vol I, sections 956 – 1137
3. _____, *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology*, Von Wright and Nyman H (ed), Luckhardt C G and Aue M. A. E. (tr), Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1980, Vol II, sections 37-42, 304-5, 360-549.

4. Wittgenstein Ludwig, Ludwig, *Zettel*, (selected portions: sections 194-201, 208-15)
5. *Minar Edward, 'The Philosophical Significance of Meaning-Blindness'
6. *Baz, Avner, 'On Learning from Wittgenstein, or What Does it Take to See the Grammar of Seeing Aspects?'
7. Raftopoulos A, 'The Cognitive Impenetrability of Perception and Theory Ladenness' in 'Journal for General Philosophy of Science'

8. *Krebs, Victor 'The Bodily Root: Seeing Aspects and Inner Experience'
9. *Affeldt Steven J, 'On the Difficulty of Seeing Aspects and the Therapeutic Reading of Wittgenstein'
10. *Bearn Gordon, 'The Enormous Danger'

All these marked readings are available in Day, William and Kerbs. J Victor (ed), *Seeing Wittgenstein Anew*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

Meaning in Perception, Thought, and Language: (Phenomenological and EESC (Embodied-Enactive-Situated Cognition) Inquiries)

How do objects (in perceptions) and utterances or signs (in language) acquire meanings? Do meanings (or thoughts) exist in some third realm - neither in the material world nor in the minds, the way Frege wants us to believe? Are meanings decided by some a priori rules, independent of psychologism, by whose authority meanings are conferred to the signs in objective manner? Does it mean meanings don't need to be grounded in the minds and can exist independently? Then there is problem of Husserlian 'transcendental ego' *detached* from the world, faced with the problem of solipsism, filled with ideas or representations *to derive* the sense or meaning of the world. But Heidegger abandons Husserl's transcendental reductions and claims that human consciousness is "Da-sein"(being-there), inherently bound with the world, its culturality and historicity, and is pre-reflectively equipped with knowledge of certain 'background conditions' obviating the need of representations, rules and derivations to make sense of the world. The world is *presupposed* in Dasein's primordial instrumental or practical and communal relation with the world. We will also consider Merleau-Ponty's emphasis upon pre-reflective human perception as the origin of language and meaning. For the query that what makes it possible for language to be about the world, he answers that meaning in language is made possible by grounding in certain basic, pre-linguistic intentional structures. Interestingly, we find similar musings in later-Wittgenstein's works which rejects internal representationalism of individual minds, rejects notion of language to transfer *independently* constituted thoughts, and talks about communal customs and 'forms of life' to confer meaning to the signs and words (even to the sensations). In modern times, we see similarity of these views to what is called as 'extended' or 'situated' cognition. Similarly, Dreyfus point towards the untenability of a computer-program or computational-representational model of mind (CRMM) as a model of human mentality and argues to make cognitive science 'Heideggerian'. We see similar attempts by Sean Kelly while advocating the role of phenomenology in cognitive science. The course looks into what is the nature of language and meaning by studying what is involved in understanding natural language at least as a challenge to the artificial intelligence - in work of John Haugeland, and by studying how Wittgensteinian 'form of life' is crucially involved while learning a name by an infant - in the work of Stuart Shanker. The course also looks into how language processing is embodied-enactive-embedded-situated phenomenon and not functioning of a dedicated, distinct language-module.

Readings -

Frege, G. (1956). The Thought: A Logical Inquiry. *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 65, No. 259, pp. 289-311

Kiverstein, J. and Wheeler, M. (2012). Chapter 1. What is Heideggerian Cognitive Science?', In *Heidegger and Cognitive Science*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Kelly, S. (2001). Chapters 1,2,5. In *The relevance of phenomenology to the philosophy of language and mind*. New York: Routledge.

Proudfoot, D. (2009) Meaning and mind: Wittgenstein's relevance for the 'Does Language Shape Thought?' debate, *New ideas in Psychology*, 27, 163-183.

Dreyfus H., Haugeland J. (1974) The Computer as a Mistaken Model of the Mind. In: Brown S.C. (eds) *Philosophy of Psychology*. Palgrave Macmillan, London

Taylor, C. (1993). Engaged agency and background in Heidegger, In *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger* (Ed. Guignon, C.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haugeland, J. , Understanding natural language (1998). In *Language and Meaning in Cognitive Science*, Ed.:Toribio, J. & Clark, A..

Lapointe, Francois (1973). Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology of Language and General Semantics

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). Chapter 6. The Body as expression and speech, In *Phenomenology of Perception*. Colin Smith (trans.), New York: Humanities Press.

Degenaar, J. and O'Regan, K. (2017). Sensorimotor theory and enactivism. *Topoi*. 36, 393-407.

Gangopadhyay, N. and Kiverstein, J.(2009) . Enactivism and the unity of perception and action, *Topoi*, 28:63–73

Gallagher, S. (2009). Philosophical antecedents of situated cognition, In *The cambridge handbook of situated cognition*. Ed.: Robbins, P. and Aydede, M.

Zwaan R.A and Kashak M.P.(2009). Language in the brain, body and world. In *The cambridge handbook of situated cognition*. Ed.: Robbins, P. and Aydede, M.

Additional Readings -

Raftopoulos, A. The Cognitive Impenetrability of Perception and Theory-Ladenness, *J Gen Philos Sci*, 46:87–103, 2015.

Shanker, Stuart, What children know when they know what a name is: The non-cartesian view of language acquisition. *Current Anthropology*, vol 42, 4, 2001.

Spivey M. and Richardson D. Language processing embodied and embedded. (2009). In *The cambridge handbook of situated cognition*. Ed.: Robbins, P. and Aydede, M.

O'Regan, J.K and Noe, A (2001). A sensorimotor approach to vision and visual consciousness. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 24 (5): 939-973

MPhil/Phd Combined Course/2017-18

University of Delhi/Department of Philosophy

Indexicals

Nilanjan Bhowmick

This is a course in philosophy of language. It is about indexicals. These are said to be context sensitive expressions. That is, *what is said*, when we use an indexical to say something, depends on the context of utterance. Our basic question is: how do we understand words like “I,” “you,” “he,” “she,” “that,” “this,” etc. Are these directly referring expressions, as Kaplan maintains, or do they have senses which act as “modes of presentation,” as Frege seems to have thought? We will spend quite some time pondering over the exact interpretation of Frege and Kaplan’s views on indexicals through what they have written and what has been written about them. After that we will look at John Perry and David Lewis’s writings about the “essentiality” of indexicals and the problem this poses for the usual dichotomy between *de re* and *de dicto* propositions.

BASIC PAPERS	ACCOMPANYING PAPERS
(1) Frege, Gottlob (2010). On sense and reference. In D. Byrne & M. Kölbel (eds.), <i>Arguing About Language</i> . Routledge. pp. 36--56.	(1) Perry, John (1977). Frege on demonstratives. <i>Philosophical Review</i> 86 (4):474-497.
(2) Frege, Gottlob (1956). The thought: A logical inquiry. <i>Mind</i> 65 (259):289-311	(2) Burge, Tyler (1979). Sinning Against Frege. <i>Philosophical Review</i> , Vol. 88, No. 3, pp. 398-432.
(3) Anscombe, G. E. M. The First Person, In Yourgrau’s <i>Demonstratives</i> , OUP, 1990.	(3) Evans, Gareth (1981). Understanding demonstratives. In Herman Parret (ed.), <i>Meaning and Understanding</i> . Clarendon Press. pp. 280--304.
(4) Kaplan, David (1989). Demonstratives. In Joseph Almog, John Perry & Howard Wettstein (eds.), <i>Themes From Kaplan</i> . Oxford University Press. pp. 481-563.	(4) Harcourt, Edward (1999). Frege on 'I', 'now', 'today' and some other linguistic devices. <i>Synthese</i> 121 (3):329 - 356.
(5) Perry, John (2009). Directing intentions. In Joseph Almog & Paolo Leonardi (eds.), <i>The Philosophy of David Kaplan</i> . Oxford University Press. pp. 187--201.	(5) Kripke, Saul A. (2008). Frege's theory of sense and reference: Some exegetical notes. <i>Theoria</i> 74 (3):181-218.
(6) Lewis, David.(1980). Index, Context, and Content. in Stig Kanger and Sven Ohman (eds.), <i>Philosophy and Grammar</i> , Dordrecht: Reidel, pp. 79–100. Reprinted in David Lewis, 1998, <i>Papers in Philosophical Logic</i> , Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 21–44.	(6) Predelli, S. (1996). Never put off until tomorrow what you can do today. <i>Analysis</i> 56 (2):85-91.
(7) Perry, John (1979). The problem of	(7) Heck, Richard (2002). Do demonstratives have senses? <i>Philosophers' Imprint</i> 2 (2):1-33.
	(8) May, Robert (2006). Frege on indexicals. <i>Philosophical Review</i> 115 (4):487-516.
	(9) King, Jeffrey C. (2001). Remarks on

<p>the essential indexical. <i>Noûs</i> 13 (December):3-21.</p> <p>(8) Lewis, David (1979). Attitudes de dicto and de se. <i>Philosophical Review</i> 88 (4):513-543</p>	<p>the Syntax and Semantics of Day Designators. <i>Noûs</i> 35 (s15):291 - 333.</p> <p>(10) Kripke, Saul A. (2011). The First Person. In <i>Philosophical Troubles. Collected Papers Vol I</i>. Oxford University Press.</p> <p>(11) Peacocke, Christopher (1981). Demonstrative thought and psychological explanation. <i>Synthese</i> 49 (2):187-217.</p> <p>(12) Stalnaker, Robert C. (1981). Indexical belief. <i>Synthese</i> 49 (1):129-151</p> <p>(13) Chapter Three of <i>The Inessential Indexical</i> by Cappelen and Dever.</p> <p>(14) Babb, Matthew (2016). The Essential Indexicality of Intentional Action. <i>Philosophical Quarterly</i> 66 (264):439-457.</p> <p>(15) Speaks, Jeff (2017). A puzzle about demonstratives and semantic competence. <i>Philosophical Studies</i> 174 (3):709-734.</p>
--	---

Nilanjan Bhowmick

PhD and MPhil Course (2017-18)

Environmental Ethics: Reflections on Some Concerns

It can be said with some certainty that recent human activity has drastically upset the balance of the natural environment and furthermore stands to negatively affect the future of the planet. Environmental ethics as a philosophical discipline has developed and evolved in not only clarifying and analysing concepts related to the pursuit of morality in the environmental sphere but also in seeking responses to ethical problems and challenges resulting from specific human activities that have presented themselves as a threat to the environment and life as we know it. This course intends to firmly focus on some ideas and themes that emerge when environmental ethics is confronted with some such problems. The course will examine select issues associated with climate change and increased human populations. In addition to these, some arguments for the protection of a rapidly diminishing wilderness and the problems that arise herewith will be identified and assessed.

The course will be rigorous and intends to cover many arguments and concerns in the time allotted. Students will be assigned readings for each class and will be expected to participate actively in class discussions and debates and supplement these with case studies wherever possible. They will have to attempt writing one book review and one essay in addition to two term papers.

The course will begin with a general introduction to environmental ethics.

Introduction

Dale Jamieson, *Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 2008

Climate Change

Readings

- Stephen M. Gardiner, "A Perfect Moral Storm: Climate Change, Intergenerational Ethics and the Problem of Moral Corruption," *Environmental Values* 15, (2006), pp. 397-413
- J. Timmons Roberts and Bradley C. Parks "A "Shared Vision"? Why Inequality Should Worry Us," in *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*, eds. Karen O'Brien, Asunción Lera St.Clair and Berit Kristoffersen, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, pp. 65-82.
- Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, "Its Not My Fault: Global Warming and Individual Moral Obligations," *Climate Change: Essential Readings*, eds. Stephen M. Gardiner, Simon Carey, Dale Jamieson and Henry Shue, OUP, Oxford, New York, 2010, pp. 332-346.

Review of Amitav Ghosh's *The Great Derangement: Climate Change and the Unthinkable*, Allen Lane, USA and Canada, 2016.

Discussion on the connection between climate change and ethics

Environment and Population

Readings

- Robin Attfield, "Saving Nature, Feeding People and Ethics," *Environmental Values* Vol. 7, No. 3 (August 1998), pp. 291-304.
- Clark Wolf, "Population, Development and the Environment," *Environmental Ethics: What Really Matters, What Really Works*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. 267-274.
- Elizabeth Cripps, "Population and Environment," *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental Ethics*, eds. Stephen Gardiner and Allen Thompson, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 380-390.

Discussion on Derek Parfit, "Overpopulation and the Quality of Life" *Applied Ethics*, ed. Peter Singer, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986, pp. 145-164

Essay on deep ecological perspectives on population

Wilderness

Readings

- Robert Elliot, "Faking Nature," *Environmental Ethics*, ed. Robert Elliot, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, 76-88
- Michael P. Nelson, "An Amalgamation of Wilderness Preservation Arguments," *The Great New Wilderness Debate*, eds. J. Baird Callicott and Michael P. Nelson USA: University of Georgia Press, 1998, pp.154-98
- Ramchandra Guha, "Radical Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique," *Applied Ethics: A Multicultural Approach*, eds. Larry May and Shari Collins Sharratt, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1994, pp. 123-133.

Discussion on Bill McKibben's *The End of Nature*, USA: Random House, 1989.

Presentation on ecocentrism, the wilderness idea and morality

Critical Issues in Physicalism

Course Instructor: Dr R. M. Singh

Physicalism as the view that all reality is either physical or supervenes on the physical is also regarded as the leading orthodoxy in philosophy of mind. However, in the recent times serious objections have been raised about the truth of physicalism. The present course aims at examining some of the most influential arguments against physicalism and assess the extent to which such arguments offer a serious challenge. An attempt would also be made, in this course, to investigate whether physicalists have been able to satisfactorily address these challenges or not.

Essential Readings:

Stoljar, Daniel. 2015. "Physicalism", The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (Winter 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), forthcoming URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/physicalism/>>.)

Papineau, David. 2015. "Naturalism", The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/naturalism/>>.)

Melnyk, Andrew. 1997. "How to Keep 'Physical' in Physicalism", *The Journal of Philosophy*, 94(12): 622-37.

Wilson, Jessica. 2006. "On Characterizing the Physical", *Philosophical studies*, 131:61-99.
DOI 10.1007/s11098-006-5984-8 131:1

Dasgupta. S. 2014. "The Possibility of Physicalism", *Journal of Philosophy*. 111(9): 557-92.

Goff. P. 2017. *Consciousness and fundamental reality* (Chapters 1-5). New York: Oxford University Press.

Debates in Media Ethics (2017-18)

Dr. Reetu Jaiswal

This course will discuss prevalent issues in the field of media ethics. The sections are to provide some theoretical framework that can be used to analyze one's own position on the discussed problem.

1. Gordon, A. David, John Michael Kittross, et.al. *Controversies in Media Ethics*. Second Edition. New York: Longman, 1999. (Ch. 1, 2, 7, 12,13)
2. Kieran, Mathew. *Media Ethics*. London: Routledge, 1998. (Ch. 12, 13).
3. Ward, Stephen J. A. *Ethics and the Media: An Introduction*. (Ch. 2, 3, 4 & 6). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
4. Thornham, S. *Feminist Film Theory : A Reader* (Ch. 1 & 5). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.

Further Readings

1. Fortner, Robert, S., P. Mark Fackler (editors). *The Handbook of Global Communication and Media Justice*, vol. 1, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2011.
2. Belsey, Ruth and Ruth Chadwick. *Ethical Issues in Journalism and the Media*. London: Routledge, 1992.
3. Wilkins, Lee and Renita Coleman. *The Moral Media: How Journalists Reason About Ethics*. London: LEA Publishers, 2005.
4. Silverstone, Roger. *Media and Morality: On the Rise of the Mediapolis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- 5.
6. Etzioni, Amitai. "A Liberal Communitarian Approach to Security Limitations on the Freedom of the Press." *William & Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 22, no. 4 (2014): 1141-1181.
7. Fenton, Natalie, ed. *New Media, Old News: Journalism & Democracy in the Digital Age*. New York: Sage Publications, 2010.
8. Foster, Gwendolyn Audrey. *Disruptive Feminisms: Raced, Gendered, and Classed Bodies in Film*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
9. Gilmore, Eamon. "Democratization and New Media." *Irish Studies in International Affairs* (Royal Irish Academy) 23 (2012): 5-12.

10. Wilkins, Lee. "Paying for Journalism: An Ethics-Based and Collaborative Business Model." In *Media Ethics and Justice in the Age of Globalization*, edited by Shakuntala Rao and Herman Wasserman, 80-99. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Supervisor Specific Course
(Ranjan Kumar)
Supervisor: Dr. Reetu Jaiswal

1. Harding, Sandra. “‘Strong Objectivity’ and Socially Situated Knowledge.” In *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women’s Lives*, 138-163. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. 1991.
2. Haslanger, Sally. “Feminism and Metaphysics: Unmasking Hidden Ontologies.” *APA Newsletter on Feminism and Philosophy* (Spring 2000): 192-196.
3. Chaudhari, Shohini. *Feminist Film Theorists: Laura Mulvey, Kaja Silverman, Teresa de Lauretis, Barbara Creed*. London & New York: Routledge, 2006. chapter 5.
4. Mulvey, Laura. “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” in Thornham, S. *Feminist Film Theory : A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.
5. आर्य, साधना; निवेदिता मेनन; जिनी लोकनीता (संपादक) । नारीवादी राजनीति: संघर्ष एवं मुद्दे। नई दिल्ली : दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय। 2015. अध्याय १ एवं २.

“Perception” : Ślokaṽrtika and Nyāya-bindu

Primary Readings :

1. Hattori, M. *Dignāga on Perception. Being the Pratyakṣapariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya* (Harvard Oriental Series 47), Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press , 1968.
2. Gangopadhyaya, Mrinalkanti. *Vinītadeva's Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā*. Translated by Gangopadhyaya. Indian Studies: Past & Present, 1971, Aphorism 1-14.
3. Sastri, Srinivas. *Ācāryadharmmottaraviracitā Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā*. Translated by Sastri. Meerut: Sahitya Bhandar, 1975, Aphorism 3-21.
4. Jha, Ganganath. *Ślokaṽrtika: Translated from the Original Sanskrit with Extracts from the Commentaries “Kāśikā” of Sucarita Miśra and “Nyāyaratnākara” of Pārtha Sārathi Miśra*. Delhi: Sri Satguru, 1983 (reprint; first published in Calcutta, 1900). Aphorisms 1, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 32, 33, 40-3, 50-2, 58-60, 76-80, 82-86, 108, 112, 117-20, 123-25, 132, 136-38, 143, 145-49, 175, 176, 205, 206, 215, 216, 221, 236, 242, 245-50, 253, 254.

Secondary Readings :

- 1.. Dunne, John. *Foundations of Dharmakīrti Philosophy*. Boston: Wisdom Publications. 2004.
2. Bhatt, Govardhan.P. *The Basic Ways of Knowing*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.
3. Taber, John A. *A Hindu Critique of Buddhist Epistemology: Kumāṛila on Perception: The "Determination of Perception" Chapter of Kumāṛila Bhaṭṭa's Ślokaṽrttika*, Routledge, 2005.
4. Mookerjee, Satkari. *The Buddhist Theory of Universal Flux : an Exposition of the Philosophy of Critical Realism as Expounded by the School of Dignaga*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.
5. Matilal, B.K. *Perception : An Essay on Classical Indian theories of Knowledge*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Perspectives on Contemporary Indian Philosophy

Prof. Balaganapathi Devarakonda

The course intends to introduce the students to various perspectives of the contemporary Indian philosophy such as; the distinction between classical, modern and contemporary Indian philosophy, the myths and dogmas that were exploded, what is living and dead in Indian Philosophy, Indian philosophy in English etc. At the end of the course the student will be able to have an in depth understanding of some of the perspectives that were under discussion since the inception of Indian philosophy as an academic discipline to the contemporary times.

Essential Readings:

1. Datta D. M. India's Debt to the West in Philosophy. *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 6, No. 3, Oct., 1956, pp. 195-212.
2. Burt, E. A. What Can Western Philosophy Learn from India? *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Oct., 1955), pp. 195-210.
3. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, What is Living and What is Dead in Indian Philosophy. New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1976.
4. Schreiner, Peter. The Indianness of Modern Indian Philosophy as a Historical and Philosophical Problem. *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Jan., 1978, pp. 21-37.
5. Das Gupta SN. 'Dogmas of Indian Philosophy', in *Philosophical Essays*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982. pp. 208-33.
6. Daya Krishna. "Three Myths about Indian Philosophy" *Diogenes* 14 (55):89-103 (1966).
7. Bhattacharya, Kalidas. 'Traditional Indian Philosophy as Modern Indian Thinkers view it' in *Indian Philosophy: Past and Future*, Pappu, Rama Rao, SS. And R. Puligandla, eds Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982. pp.171-224.
8. Heehs, Peter. Shades of Orientalism: Paradoxes and Problems in Indian Historiography. *History and Theory*, Vol. 42, No. 2. May, 2003, pp. 169-195
9. Roy W. Perrett. Truth, Relativism and Western conceptions of Indian philosophy, *Asian Philosophy: An International Journal of the Philosophical Traditions of the East*, 8:1, 1998.19-29.
10. Bhushan, Nalini, and Jay Garfield, 2011. "Pundits and Professors: The Renaissance of Secular India" in Nalini Bhushan and Jay Garfield (eds) *Indian Philosophy in English: From Renaissance to Independence*. New York: OUP.
11. Ganeri, Jonardon. Contextualism in the Study of Indian Intellectual Cultures. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2008. 36. Pp.551-562.
12. Mohanty, J.N. On Matilal's Understanding of Indian Philosophy. *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 42, No. 3. Jul., 1992, pp. 397-406.
13. Pollock, S. Is There an Indian Intellectual History? Introduction to "Theory and Method in Indian Intellectual History" *Journal Indian Philosophy* (2008) 36:533-542
14. Raghuramaraju, A. Introduction to *Debates in Indian Philosophy: Classical, Colonial and Contemporary*. New Delhi: Oxford University publishers. 2006.

Further readings:

1. Panikkar, R. The Vitality and role of Indian Philosophy today. *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*, V (1978), p. 673-692.
2. Pappu, Rama Rao, SS. And R. Puligandla, eds *Indian Philosophy: Past and Future*, Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass, 1982.
3. Bhushan, Nalini, and Jay Garfield (eds) 2011. *Indian Philosophy in English: From Renaissance to Independence*. New York: OUP.
4. Anikeev, N. P. *Modern Ideological Struggle for the Ancient Philosophical Heritage of India*. Calcutta: Indian Studies: Past & Present. 1969.
5. Raghuramaraju, A. *Philosophy and India: Ancestors, predecessors*. New Delhi: Oxford University publishers.
6. Daya Krishna. *Indian Philosophy: A Counter Perspective*. (Revised & Enlarged edition) Delhi: Sai Satguru Publications. 2006.
7. Reipe, Dale. *The Philosophy of Indian and Its impact on American Thought*. Springfield: Charles Thomas publishers. 1970.
8. Devaraja, N.K. What Is Living and What Is Dead in Traditional Indian Philosophy. *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Oct., 1976), pp. 427-442.
9. Ganeri, Jonardon. *Philosophy in Classical India. The Proper work of Reason*. London: Routledge. 2001.
10. Mohanty, J.N. *Reason and Tradition in Indian Thought: An Essay on the Nature of Indian Philosophical Thinking*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1992.
11. Mohanty, J.N. On Matilal's Understanding of Indian Philosophy. *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 42, No. 3. Jul., 1992, pp. 397-406.
12. Dayakrishna, Three Conceptions of Indian Philosophy. *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Jan., 1965), pp. 37-51.
13. Dayakrishna, M.P. Rege, RD Dwivedi & Mukund Lath. (ed) *Samvad: A Dialogue between Two Philosophical Traditions*. Delhi: ICPR in association with Motilal Banarasidass. 1991.
14. Working Papers on Sanskrit Knowledge-Systems on the Eve of Colonialism I, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30(5), (2002); Working Papers on Sanskrit Knowledge-Systems on the Eve of Colonialism II, *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 33(1), (2005).
15. Mohanty, J.N. Philosophy in India, 1967-73. *The Review of Metaphysics*, Vol. 28, No. 1. Sep., 1974, pp. 54-84.
16. Anna-Pya Sjodin. Conceptualising Philosophical Tradition: A Reading of Wilhelm Halbfass, Daya Krishna, and Jitendranath Mohanty. *Philosophy East and West*, Vol 61, No.3. July 2011. Pp.534-546.

M Phil/Ph D 2017-18 Course by Prof Kanchana Natarajan

The Nature of Vidhi:
A study of Laugakshiu Bhaskara's Artha Samgraha,

M.Phil/Ph.D Optional Course

Biopolitics and Philosophy

Course Coordinator: Prof. P. Kesava Kumar

Biopolitics is a relation between power and determined form of life. It is a relation between life and politics. In modern times, biopolitics takes life as a site of both technological production and economic manipulation. In contemporary times, Foucault problematised the issue in relation to the techniques employed by institutions of modernity in the name of governmentality. This course on Biopolitics and Philosophy provides philosophical understanding of Biopolitics by exploring the essential writings of Michel Foucault, Giorgio Agamben, Roberto Esposito, Antonio Negri, Carl Schmitt, Jacques Ranciere in the ideological context of liberalism and fascism .

Hardt and Negri articulate biopolitics as the real subsumption of society under capital and consider biopolitical production constructs specific social relations and forms of life. Against the biopolitics of dominance, the philosophers argued for realization of the potential of affirmative biopolitics. The affirmative biopolitics—a biopolitics based upon a politics of life as opposed to a politics over life. The affirmative biopolitics fosters democratic , autonomous valences of the multitude and promotes more egalitarian and free subjects. Negri sees affirmative biopolitics in capacity for creativity in within living labour, and for Agamben it is form- of- life. Esposito presents critique of immunitary mechanisms that separate the individual from communal obligations.

Essential Readings

Campbell, Timothy and Adam Sitze (Eds), 'Introduction', *Biopolitics- A Reader*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2013

Lemke, Thomas. *Biopolitics- An Advanced Introduction*, New York; New York University, 2011

Foucault, M. Right of Death and Power over Life, in: Paul Rabinow(Ed.), New York, Pantheon, *The Foucault Reader*,1984, pp558-272

Foucault, Michel (1997) 'The Birth of Biopolitics', in: *Michel Foucault, Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, ed. by Paul Rabinow, New York: The New Press 1997, pp. 73-79.

Agamben, Giorgio. Biopolitics and the Rights of Man, Campbell, Timothy and Adam Sitze (Eds), *Biopolitics- A Reader*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2013 ,pp.152-160

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri. Biopolitical Production Campbell, Timothy and Adam Sitze (Eds) Durham: Duke University Press, 2013 ,pp. 215

Esposito- 'The Enigma of Biopolitics' in (Tr. Timothy Campbell) *Bios-Biopolitics and philosophy*, University of Minnesota Press, 2008, pp 13-43

Ranciere, Jaques . 'Ten theses on Politics ', 'Biopolitics or Politics', *Dissensus- On Politics and Aesthetics*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group pp, 27-44 and 91-96

Suggested Readings

Lemke, T. (2016): Rethinking Biopolitics: The New Materialism and the Political Economy of Life. In Wilmer, S. and Zukauskaitė, A. (eds.), *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political, and Performative Strategies*, New York: Routledge, 57-73

Campbell, Timothy. Bios, Immunity, Life- The Thought of Roberto Esposito, *Diacritics* 36.2: 2–22

Vernon W Cisney and Nicolae Morar (Eds) *Biopower- Foucault and Beyond*

Campbell, Timothy and Adam Sitze (Eds), *Biopolitics- A Reader*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2013

Agamben G (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Heller-Roazen D (trans). Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Sergei Prozorov, Simona Rentea (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Biopolitics*, 2016

Ph.D. Optional Paper
Communitarian Idea of Self

Introduction to Conceptions of Self

Liberal Conception of Self: John Rawls

Communitarian Philosophy

Communitarian critique of liberalism

Charles Taylor's life and works

Charles Taylor's conception of self and Modernity

Suggested Readings

Markate Daley (Ed.) *Communitarianism: A New Public Ethic*, California: Wordsworth Publishing Company, 1994

Sandel, Micheal. 1996. *Democracy's Discontent*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sandel, Micheal. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982 .

Dworkin, Ronald. [1978] 1984. "Liberalism." In *Liberalism and Its Critics*, ed. Michael Sandel. New York: New York University Press.

Taylor, Charles. 1985a. "Atomism." In *Philosophical Papers*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----, 1985b. "What's Wrong with Negative Liberty?" In *Philosophical Papers*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----, [1989] 1995. "Cross Purposes: The Liberal-Communitarian Debate." In *Philosophical Arguments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

-----, 1990. *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Walzer, Michael. 1983. *Spheres of Justice*. New York: Basic Books.

Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1981. *After Virtue*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.

Buchanan, Allen E. *Assesing Communitarain Critique of Liberalism*, ethics, Vol. 99, No.4 July (1989) Pp. 852-882