

GRC 362E (38400) • SQUARING THE VIENNA CIRCLE

= C L 323 (33975), EUS 347 (36610), PHL 354 (43095); TTH 1100am-1230pm BUR 337

Katherine Arens

Department of Germanic Studies

k.aren@mail.utexas.edu, ph 232-6363

Office: Burdine 320; Office hours TTh 9:30-10:30 and by appointment

Description

Today's Anglo-American Analytic Philosophy grows out of the tradition of Logical Positivism/Logical Empiricism as it evolved in the circles around Wittgenstein in England after the Second World War, and it positions itself over and against Continental Philosophy. That positioning, however, obscures how Wittgenstein and the group that Viktor Kraft, the first historian of the Vienna Circle of Logical Positivism, took over a much broader cultural project that is echoed in the work of twentieth-century theorists and philosophers from Walter Benjamin through Ernst Cassirer's *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. Just as significant, the Vienna Circle's work parallels today's philosophy of science as practiced by figures like Bruno Latour.

This class will combine perspectives from philosophy and the history of philosophy to undertake a project in "historical epistemology": it will trace how Logical Empiricism actually came into being out of a set of methodological arguments about the philosophy of science and hermeneutics that were widespread in the late nineteenth century (and which find their echoes in figures as diverse as Nietzsche and Heidegger). The new genesis narrative we will trace reverberates with problems of forced migration and emigration, as a generation of theorists and philosophers were forced out of continental Europe and to the US and Great Britain by the Nazis. And in order to find their feet, these émigrés took up new projects and redefined their work for new audiences, offering a set of cases of culture transfer -- cases where philosophical logics responded directly, if tacitly, to politics and culture.

No background in philosophy is required for this course, and all readings will be available in English on the class blackboard site. Background reading on the history of science will ground our readings of primary texts, and each student will be responsible for evolving a semester project in writing a specific philosopher or project into a new kind of intercultural history of ideas.

Class Readings will include (all in excerpts):

Ludwig Wittgenstein, *The Blue and Brown Books*

Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*

Windelband, *History of Philosophy*

Rickert, *The Limits of Concept Formation in Natural Science*

Wilhelm Dilthey, *The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences*

Husserl, *The Idea of Phenomenology*

Cassirer, *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences*

Benjamin, Exposés from *The Arcades Project*

Viktor Kraft, *The Vienna Circle*

Janik/Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna*

Friedrich Stadler, *The Vienna Circle*

Feyerabend, *Against Method*

Essays by Carnap, Neurath

Assignments:

- Daily readings, due on the day indicated on the syllabus
- Three one-page précis (analysis of individual texts) = 3 x 10% of grade = 30% of grade
- Group project (on Part 4 of syllabus) = 10 % of grade
- Historical epistemology project (5-6 pp. paper) = 25% of grade
- One semester project, done in stages = 35% of grade.

Katherine Arens

Syllabus, Spring 2011

NOTE: Most texts are available as PDFs on the class BlackBoard site; a few were ordered and/or put on PCL reserve. See the complete bibliography appended to this syllabus to

Part 0. Preliminaries

Week 1: 18, 20 January

Tuesday

Introduction to the course

Some Terminological Assistance:

More credible:

- <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/vienna-circle/>
- <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-unity/>

More readable:

- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vienna_Circle
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Empiricism>
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Analytic_philosophy
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unity_of_science
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logical_positivism

NOTE: The Stanford Encyclopedia is considered a credible reference; Wikipedia can be spotty, but sometimes has stuff that isn't elsewhere. Get into the habit of looking up terminology as you read, and especially of looking up biographies.

Thursday

The Problem of Historical Epistemologies: The Class Method

Bachelard, *Formation of the Scientific Mind*, "Foreword," Chapters 1, 2, & 3, p. 17-80 (esp. 1-32)

OPTIONAL: Jürgen Renn, "Historical Epistemology and the Advancement of Science." Preprint 16. Berlin: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 1996. Passim (= "read around in").

•**AMUSING OPTION:** Philip Kitcher: Epistemology without History is Blind <http://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/workshops/en/HistoricalEpistemology/Session6.html>

PART 1: NINETEENTH-CENTURY AND EARLY TWENTIETH-CENTURY ROOTS

Week 2: 25, 27 January

Tuesday

The Two Cultures of Philosophy: Continental and Analytic

Critchley, *Continental Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction*, Chapter 3: "Spectacles and Eyes to See With"

Thursday

The "Linguistic Turn": First Iteration

Nietzsche: *On the Genealogy of Morals*, all (esp. "Day One," 449-492)

Week 3: 1, 3 February

Tuesday

The New Philosophy of Science

Mach, *Analysis of the Sensations*, 1-45

Précis 1 due: One chapter/section of either Mach or Nietzsche

Thursday

The Psychology of Idealism

Dilthey, *The Formation of the Historical World*, esp. 101-142

Week 4: 8, 10 February

Tuesday

Academic Philosophy: From the Perspective of the Philosophy of Science

Windelband, *History of Philosophy*, Part VII: The Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century, 623-681

Thursday

Rickert, *The Limits of Concept Formation*, 1-110 esp. 1-60).

PART 2: THE FIRST HEIRS: MOVING TOWARD THE VIENNA CIRCLE

Week 5: 15, 17 February

Tuesday *Read one of the following:*
Husserl. *The Crisis of European Sciences*, Intro -23
Husserl, *The Idea of Phenomenology*, all

Thursday Benjamin, Exposés from the *Arcades Project*
••Have you signed up for a group project book yet? DO SO.

Week 6: 22, 24 February

Tuesday Cassirer, *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences*, 1-86 (esp. 1-55)
Précis 2 due: Any essay

PART 3: ORIGIN MYTHS

Thursday **Four Versions of the Vienna Circle: A Case Study**
Richardson. "Introduction"
Kraft, *The Vienna Circle*, all (passim)

Week 7: 1, 3 March

Tuesday Stadler, *The Vienna Circle*, 1-68 and charts
Stadler, "The Vienna Circle: Context, Profile, and Development"

Thursday No organized class: instructor in Salzburg; use this time to finalize (or organize)
your group work on the Wittgenstein texts

PART 4: Wittgenstein: Reality and Myth

Week 8: 8, 10 March

Tuesday **Wittgenstein I**
Wittgenstein, *The Blue and Brown Books*, "Blue Book," 1-74; ""Brown Book,"
77-122
Précis 2 due: Any essay

Thursday **Two Scholarly Wittgensteins**
Grayling, *Wittgenstein: A Very Short Introduction*
Stern, "Wittgenstein, the Vienna Circle, and Physicalism"

March 12–20 Spring break.

Week 9: 22, 24 March

Tuesday **Presentations of Class Wiki Pages: Four Mythical Wittgensteins**
Janik/Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna*
Waugh, *The House of Wittgenstein*
Edmonds and Eidinow, *Wittgenstein's Poker*
Monk, *Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius*
••**GROUP PROJECT DUE ON WIKI PAGE:** Please read all four before class
starts, so that we can discuss the Wittgenstein industry.

Thursday **Class Presentations (continued from Tuesday, if necessary)**
Class Topic: intro to library research in philosophy (preparation for final paper)

Week 10: 29, 31 March

Tuesday **Wittgenstein II**
Wittgenstein, Excerpts from *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, in *Wittgenstein
Reader*, 1-31

Thursday Wittgenstein, "Thinking," in *Wittgenstein Reader*, 111-125
Heidegger, "What Calls for Thinking?," in *Basic Writings*, 341-367
An amusing aside (optional): Critchley, *Continental Philosophy*, Chapter 6: "A Case Study in Misunderstanding: Heidegger and Carnap "

PART 5: The Vienna Circle

Week 11: 5, 7 April

Tuesday **The Origin Myth, and Seminal Texts**
Hahn, Neurath, Carnap. "The Scientific Conception of the World" (AKA the "Vienna Circle manifesto")
Galison, "Constructing Modernism"
••CONSULTATION ON FINAL PAPER DUE: topic specification

Thursday no class: instructor at MALCA; start your bibliography and remember that your short paper is due on Tuesday.

Week 12: 12, 14 April

Tuesday Carnap, "Empiricism, Science, and Ontology."
••SHORT ESSAY PAPER DUE

Thursday Neurath, Bohr, Dewey, Russell, Carnap, Morris, *Encyclopedia and Unified Science*, 1-75 (especially Neurath)

Week 13: 19, 21 April

Tuesday Frege, "On Sense and Reference"

Thursday Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, 1-34

Week 14: 26, 28 April

Tuesday Feyerabend, *Against Method*, Introductions - 53

Thursday Neurath, *Foundations of the Social Sciences*, 1-51
••BIBLIOGRAPHY DUE

PART 6: ARCHE-TELOS

Week 15: 3, 5 May

Tuesday **From Where, to Where: Assessments of Scholarly Myths**
Uebel, "On the Austrian Roots of Logical Empiricism"
Richardson. "Logical Empiricism, American Pragmatism, and the Fate of Scientific Philosophy in North America."

Thursday Last Class Day

**FINAL PAPER DUE AT OFFICIAL UNIVERSITY FINAL EXAM DATE:
Thursday, May 12, 2:00-5:00 pm**

ASSIGNMENTS:

- Three one-page précis (analysis of individual texts) = 3 x 10% of grade = 30% of grade
Instructions appended.
- Group project (on materials for Part 4 of syllabus) = 10 % of grade
Janik/Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna* (intellectual history, situating ideas)
Waugh, *The House of Wittgenstein* (political biography)
Edmonds and Eidinow, *Wittgenstein's Poker* (group bio & intellectual history)
Monk, *Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius* (biography and work)

This is a group project using the class Wiki site: <<http://wikis.la.utexas.edu/austria/>>. The class will break into four groups, each of which is responsible for presenting one of the four books on Wittgenstein listed above. That presentation will be a critical book review that does a resume' of the book's contents (in no more than 500 words, total), and then assesses its point of view and effectiveness. The book groups (which will be formed on the wiki site on a signup sheet) should divvy up the chapters for commentary, with each individual writing the summary of separate parts (with necessary quotations and citations, and the author of each subsection); a group meeting will probably be necessary to finish the task -- the introduction and conclusion of the presentation, which should be joint work. March 3 class is devoted to some of this time.

The project will be graded liberally to account for the dynamics of group work. Any project with a readable account of the contents and an assessment of its point of view and possible effectiveness for its readership will get full credit; missing pieces, unintelligible work, plagiarized work, vague or incomplete work will lose points.

- Historical epistemology project = 25% of grade

This project is a short (5-6-page) paper done according to the format below, and addressing one of the following two topics:

Topic 1: Hahn, Neurath, Carnap. "The Scientific Conception of the World" (AKA the "Vienna Circle manifesto") compared with Galison, "Constructing Modernism." The goal of this comparison is to assess the "Vienna Circle Manifesto" from the optic offered by Galison, who makes the case for the meaning of *Aufbau/Construction* from the essay's title in historical context. Is Galison's work useful to understanding the Manifesto?

Topic 2: Wittgenstein, "Thinking," in *Wittgenstein Reader*, 111-125, compared with Heidegger, "What Calls for Thinking?," in *Basic Writings*, 341-367. The goal of this comparison is a technical comparison of what "thinking" means in the two essays. What does the use of the term tell us about each thinker?

The paper you will write is an essay: a well-constructed argument about two texts, with little or no research involved. Thus you need to start with a clear thesis statement and introductory paragraph (indicating the overall direction of your argument and how you will argue it), in proper format. Be sure you do more than summarize your points at the end -- make sure you *conclude* about where your argument takes you.

FORMAT

- Double spaced, 1 inch margins all round.
- 11 or 12-point type, Arial, Geneva, Times or Times New Roman

- Your name and a page number on EVERY PAGE (top right or bottom center or right -- use "header" or "footer"). Pages must be stapled together.
- All citations (footnotes or endnotes, and bibliography) must be in Chicago Style. Is this a mystery? See < <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/students/citing/index.html> > for general information or < <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/noodlebib/> > to use Noodlebib. That means you have some decisions about the relation of notes to in-text citations and to the bibliography.
- One semester project, done in stages = 35% of grade.
 - This project is a formal research paper (12-15 pp. in length, in Chicago style) on a topic of your choice related to the Vienna Circle and its context. Due at the official exam time, as indicated on the syllabus. The work will be done in phases:
 - 1) consultation with professor on topic (in person or by email) = 5% of grade
 - 2) bibliography of 6-10 items on the topic, with a description of how you found the items (i.e. what professional databases you used in searching them out. No more than 2 of the items may be on-line- only or reference sources (e.g. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy); you are expected to use legitimate secondary literature (principally articles in professional journals) = 10 % of grade
 - 3) Finished paper = 20% of grade (further grading rubric to be distributed)

Format for Précis

There is a difference between a text's facts and the strategy used to present those facts. A "précis" (*pray-see*) reflects this difference. It is designed to reflect the structure of a text's argument, not just a set of notes on the text's contents. A précis is one typed page long.

No matter what type, a précis has three sections:

1) A statement about the text's **FOCUS**. This is the main issue that the text addresses.

****You write** a concise statement (1-2 sentences) of that focus.

Likely alternatives:

- issues or problems
- representative concerns of a group, or its interlocked set of beliefs
- institutions/systems
- events and their characteristics or repercussions

E.G.: "The structure of the mind and how it relates to behavior in the social world."

What not to do: Do not include journalistic commentary, or examples, or evaluations -- just state what the topic is.

2) A statement of **LOGIC** and **GOAL** (its **Intent**), which will introduce a **CHART WITH HEADINGS** encompassing the text's data in two parallel columns of notes (usually with page references to the reading).

****You write** a sentence describing the logic pattern (E.g., "By examining the sources of _____, the author shows the consequences of _____"; "In order to _____, the text correlates the _____ and _____ of social behaviors.")

Typical verbs indicating such logic: compare, contrast, link causally, cause, follow from . . .

****After that, you write** two column headings creating classes of information which the author systematically correlates with each other. Under these headings, you typically add three or four examples which fit the content of the text into its form.

Typical categories of information:

- characteristics of a model, role, event
- stages in an event or process
- sources, conditions, or restrictions on a contexts
- participants or interest groups
- effects, impact, consequences
- goals, purposes to be realized.

3) A paragraph (ca. 3 sentences) indicating the **IMPLICATIONS** of or **CONCLUSIONS ABOUT** the information pattern. This is **not** a description of the information pattern or focus, but rather an extension of the covert statement implied by the information and pattern. **That is**, what is this text/précis *good for*, especially as seen from the outside? In setting the argument up this way, what is being hidden, asserted, or brushed aside? What is new or old-fashioned about the correlations made? Who would profit most by this arrangement?

Analytic, Synthetic, and Interpretive Précis: Three Rhetorical Genres

While the précis format given on the previous page applies to all types of analysis, it may nonetheless be used for several other purposes, reflecting different purposes for the writer and reader.

An *analytic précis* aims at recreating the focus, strategy/goal (intent), and information of *one particular text*. You, as the writer, intrude only at the level of evaluation (in the implications). Your job is to present and assess the claims made by a particular text as text-generated criteria, and then to specify the (outside) contexts in which those claims are valid, dangerous, useful, etc.

A *synthetic précis* sets up a comparison/contrast between two (or more) texts. Its focus is the/an issue shared by the two texts. However, it is up to you, the writer, to specify (as the strategy/goal statement) on which grounds and to what end the comparison will be carried out. The information pattern will be drawn from the text; the implication is again provided by you, in terms of "why do this comparison."

An *interpretive précis* uses one text to read another (applies one systematic strategy to a text). That is, you pretend to be the writer of one text, and read another as s/he would; at the conclusion, you step out of the role-play, and evaluate the relation between the two points of view. It places a still higher burden on you as writer: you must specify the focus (the interpretive issue that the précis will address, and the strategy/goal of how you will explicate that issue -- all before you start. The information pattern will often be arranged as an "issue/example" format, with the issues drawn *systematically* (i.e., in recognizable form) from the strategy text and the examples *also systematically* drawn from the text to be interpreted. An interpretation will not be successful if either text is treated willfully (e.g., against the spirit of its internal organization). Your implication is, again, directed at explaining why you bothered to set up this interpretation this way -- what it is good for.

[A *creative précis* exists, as well-- usually as an outline for an original essay. The writer uses it as an organizer for rhetorical strategy and for information generally drawn from many sources, without particular address to the argumentation of those sources.]

How do I turn these into essays, and what kinds of essays are they?

An analytic précis turns into something like a good book review or proposal evaluation -- the introduction introduces the central issue and the rhetorical tactic that the source text (issue, or party) uses, together with the writer's goal of bothering to explain these. The body of the paper fleshes out the execution of the text's logic, and presents interim evaluations that set up the big evaluation that is the conclusion of the piece.

A synthetic précis resolves a conflict in the favor of one party or another, or shows how the two positions are totally compatible (despite their seeming differences in terminology). The introduction for its essay version must state the basis for the comparison, and the strategy through which the comparison is stated. It will end with a hint as to why this comparison is illustrative or important. The body of the paper must contain a balanced presentation of comparable points (each comparison introduced in terms of the more general overview). The conclusion must decide which side wins -- in terms of a stated set of outside needs/problems that the information addresses.

An interpretive précis applies a point of view to a text explicitly. The introduction to the essay version must state which systematic point of view will be applied to what issue (who you are playing, and why), why that point of view was chosen, how the point of view will be applied (strategy/goal of the evaluation), and hint at what the goal of the particular interpretation will be. The body of the paper must contain a running *dialogue* between the p.o.v. and the textual information -- it must move stepwise through the p.o.v. and re-interpret the text's data through that lens -- no matter your individual preferences as writer. You will therefore have two levels of critique in the paper: first, a decisive critique of one writer from the p.o.v. of the chosen role, and second, your suggestions about what bringing these two other voices together has achieved. You must interject a decisive critique of both p.o.v.'s as part of the work's final implications (only correctives can be hinted at as it goes along, or foreshadowings of a larger objection that will be dealt with in detail after the immediate analysis is concluded -- don't subvert the voice you're playing at being until you're through).

[A creative précis will set up an op/ed piece or any literary essay, like Robert Benchley's -- the writer is only responsible for the fictive universe set up by the précis, even in the implication. And the implications disappear -- there is no outside, except in the mind of the readers.]

COMPLETE BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS ORDERED (BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION BELOW):

Required (and on Blackboard site, so not really necessary to buy):

Wittgenstein, *The Blue and Brown Books*; ISBN 978-0061312113

Recommended:

Richardson & Uebel, eds. *Cambridge Companion to Logical Empiricism*; ISBN 978-0521796286

Alexander Waugh, *The House of Wittgenstein*; ISBN 978-0307278722

Viktor Kraft, *The Vienna Circle*; ISBN 978-0806530826

Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna*; ISBN 978-1566631327

BOOKS ON ELECTRONIC RESERVE IN BLACKBOARD OR ONLINE (CLASS EXCERPTS; SOME EXCEPTIONS NOTED)

Gaston Bachelard. *The Formation of the Scientific Mind: A Contribution to a Psychoanalysis of Objective Knowledge*. Trans. Mary McAllester Jones. Manchester: Clinamen Press, 2002.

Rudolf Carnap. "Empiricism, Science, and Ontology." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 4 (1950): 20-40. Reprinted in the Supplement to *Meaning and Necessity: A Study in Semantics and Modal Logic*, enlarged edition (University of Chicago Press, 1956).
Online at: <<http://www.ditext.com/carnap/carnap.html>>.

Ernst Cassirer. *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences*. Trans. S. G. Lofts. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.

Simon Critchley. *Continental Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.

Wilhelm Dilthey. *The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences*. Selected Works, Vol. III. Trans. Rudolf A. Makkreel and John Scanlon. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2002.

••NOT SCANNED, ON RESERVE IN PCL: David Edmonds and John Eidinow. *Wittgenstein's Poker: The Story of a Ten-Minute Argument Between Two Great Philosophers*. New York: Ecco/HarperCollins, 2007.

Paul Feyerabend. *Against Method*. 3rd ed. London: Verso, 1993 (orig. 1975).

Gottlob Frege. "On Sense and Reference." 1892. Online at:
<http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/On_Sense_and_Reference>

Peter Galison. "Constructing Modernism: The Cultural Location of *Aufbau*." In: Ronald N. Giere and Alan W. Richardson, eds. *Origins of Logical Empiricism*. Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, XVI. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 1996. 17-44.

A. C. Grayling. *Wittgenstein: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001 [orig. 1988].

Hans Hahn, Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap. "The Scientific Conception of the World: The Vienna Circle." IN: Sahotra Sarkar, ed. *Science and Philosophy in the Twentieth Century: Basic Works of Logical Empiricism*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1996. 321-340.

Martin Heidegger. "What Calls for Thinking?" *Basic Writings*. Ed. David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row, 1977. 342-367.

- Edmund Husserl. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1970.
- Edmund Husserl. *The Idea of Phenomenology*. Trans. William P. Alston and George Nakhnikian. Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964.
- NOT SCANNED, ON RESERVE IN PCL: Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin. *Wittgenstein's Vienna*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996 [orig. 1973].
- Victor Kraft. *The Vienna Circle: The Origins of Neo-Positivism (A Chapter in the History of Recent Philosophy)*. Trans. Arthur Pap. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953.
- Ernst Mach. *The Analysis of Sensations, and the Relation of the Physical to the Psychical*. Trans. C. M. Williams. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1914.
- NOT SCANNED, ON RESERVE IN PCL: Ray Monk. *Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius*. New York: Free Press, 1990 UT ON RESERVE
- Otto Neurath. *Foundations of the Social Sciences*. IN: Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap, and Charles Morris, eds. *Foundations of the Unity of Science: Toward an International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*. Vol. 2, Nos. 1-9. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970. 1-51.
- Otto Neurath, Niels Bohr, John Dewey, Bertrand Russell, Rudolf Carnap, Charles Morris. *Encyclopedia and Unified Science*. IN: Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap, and Charles Morris, eds. *Foundations of the Unity of Science: Toward an International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*. Vol. 1, Nos. 1-10. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1955. vii-xii, 1-75
- Friederich Nietzsche. *Genealogy of Morals. Basic Writings of Nietzsche*. Ed. and trans., Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library, 1966. 449-599.
- Karl Popper. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Routledge, 1992 [1935 in German].
- Jürgen Renn, "Historical Epistemology and the Advancement of Science." Preprint 16. Berlin: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 1996.
- Alan W. Richardson. "Introduction: Origins of Logical Empiricism." In: Ronald N. Giere and Alan W. Richardson, eds. *Origins of Logical Empiricism*. Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, XVI. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 1996. 1-13.
- Alan W. Richardson. "Logical Empiricism, American Pragmatism, and the Fate of Scientific Philosophy in North America." In: Gary L. Hardcastle and Alan W. Richardson, eds. *Logical Empiricism in North America*. Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, XVIII. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2003. 1-24.
- Heinrich Rickert. *The Limits of Concept Formation in Natural Science: A Logical Introduction to the Historical Sciences*. Abridged ed. Trans. Guy Oakes. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009 [1986].
- Friedrich Stadler. "The Vienna Circle: Context, Profile, and Development." In: Alan W. Richardson and Thomas Uebel, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Logical Empiricism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 13-40.
- Friedrich Stadler. *The Vienna Circle: Studies in the Origins, Development, and Influence of Logical Empiricism*. Wien/New York: Springer Verlag, 2001 [1997 in German].

David Stern. "Wittgenstein, the Vienna Circle, and Physicalism: A Reassessment." In: Alan W. Richardson and Thomas Uebel, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Logical Empiricism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 305-331.

Thomas Uebel. "On the Austrian Roots of Logical Empiricism: The Case of the First Vienna Circle." In: Paolo Parrini, Wesley C. Salmon, and Merrilee H. Salmon, eds. *Logical Empiricism: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2003. 67-93.

••NOT SCANNED, ON RESERVE IN PCL: Alexander Waugh. *The House of Wittgenstein: A Family at War*. New York: Doubleday, 2008.

Wilhelm Windelband. *History of Philosophy, with Especial Reference to the Formation and Development of Its Problems and Conceptions*. 2nd ed. Trans. James H. Tufts. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914

Ludwig Wittgenstein. *The Blue and Brown Books: Preliminary Studies for the 'Philosophical Investigations.'* New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960.

Ludwig Wittgenstein. *The Wittgenstein Reader*. Ed. Anthony Kenny. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

OTHER INFORMATION:

CLASS AND CLASSROOMS:

Cell phones must be turned off in class; computers may be used only for note-taking. If a student uses electronic devices for non-class related activities and creates a disturbance s/he will be asked to leave for the remainder of that class.

ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE

- Academic Assistance is provided by the UT Learning Center, in Jester Center, Room A332A. It offers help with college-level writing, reading, and learning strategies. It is free to all currently enrolled students.
- See: <<http://www.lib.utexas.edu/services/assistive/policy.html>> for requesting help you need in using the main library (PCL) or the Fine Arts Library (for films).

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The University of Austin provides upon request appropriate academic accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. For more information, contact the Office of the Dean of Students at 471-6259, 471-6441 TTY. Any student with a documented disability who requires academic accommodations should contact the Service for Students with Disabilities as soon as possible to request an official letter outlining authorized accommodations. These letters must be given to your TAs to receive accommodations. See: <<http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/index.php>>.

SYLLABUS AND ASSIGNMENTS:

All requirements have been given to you in writing, in the package including this sheet. If you don't read it and miss something, it's not our problem. **NO LATE WORK ACCEPTED**; see the conditions for making up work for medical and other leaves are listed in the next section.

RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS AND OTHER ABSENCES

- Students can make up work missed because of a religious holiday as long as they provide the instructor with documentation **at least one week before** the holiday occurs.
- The same applies to official university obligations like Club or Varsity sports.

- Documentation from a physician is required for medical absence; arrangements for work to be made up must be made promptly, and in no case should the work be completed more than 2 weeks after the absence.
- Other absences (e.g. family events) must be arranged for at least TWO WEEKS IN ADVANCE and missed work must be turned in at the NEXT CLASS SESSION upon return.

CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

Cheating and other forms of scholastic dishonesty, including plagiarism, will be reported to the Dean of Students. Cheating on tests or plagiarism on papers is an F for the assignment, with no makeup possible. If you engage in any form of scholastic dishonesty more than once, you will receive an automatic F for the course.

If you are unsure about the exact **definition of scholastic dishonesty**, you should consult the information about academic integrity produced by the Dean of Students Office: http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/acint_student.php.

Plagiarism means using words or ideas that are not your own without citing your sources and without indicating explicitly what you have taken from those sources. If you are unsure about what constitutes plagiarism, consult:

<http://www.lib.utexas.edu/services/instruction/learningmodules/plagiarism/>

What does "**citing your sources**" mean? It means providing appropriate footnotes and bibliographic entries. See

<http://www.lib.utexas.edu/services/instruction/learningmodules/citations/>. To make correct citations, researchers often use bibliographic software like UT's "Noodlebib"

<http://www.lib.utexas.edu/noodlebib/> or Zotero <http://www.zotero.com>.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CHEATING:

The Student Judicial Services Website provides official definitions of plagiarism and cheating:

- Definitions of plagiarism and other forms of scholastic dishonesty, based on Section 11-802d of UT's *Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities*: http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/scholdis_plagiarism.php
- The University's Standard of Academic Integrity and Student Honor Code (from Chapter 11 of the University's *Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities*): http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/acint_student.php
- Consequences of scholastic dishonesty: http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/scholdis_conseq.php
- Types of scholastic dishonesty: unauthorized collaboration, plagiarism, and multiple submissions: http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/scholdis_whatish.php