



## COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Code of course: **BA-ERA-IPH-S-21, MA-ERA-IPH-S-26**

Title of course: **Civil Disobedience and Resistance**

Lecturer: **Peter Kruger**

**General aims of the course:**

The aim of this course is to explore and critically interrogate the political philosophical concepts of civil disobedience and resistance and their relation to democratic thought in the western tradition.

**Level of course:**

introductory/intermediate

**Course Content:**

Civil disobedience first received academic attention in the 1960s. A liberal democratic conception thereof quickly emerged and became, for many ensuing decades, the standard conception. This is now changing, and new forms and understandings of civil disobedience and resistance have emerged. We will start by briefly looking at civil disobedience as conceived by the Civil Rights Movement and Martin Luther King, Jr., and then Rawls' theory thereof. After discussing what is worth retaining from these debates – and what is worth discarding – we will turn to more current, international and alternative (non-US-centric and non-mainstream liberal) frameworks from which to theorise disobedience and resistance.

**Course requirements, evaluation:**

1. Active participation in the course is a requirement. 2. One presentation based on course readings. 3. One course paper (1,500–2,500 words) – students can select the topics though must check this with me.

**Required readings:**

1. Aitchison, G. 2018. '(Un)Civil Disobedience' in *Raisons Politiques* 69(1): 5–12.
2. Bedau, HA. 1991. 'Introduction' in HA. Bedau (ed.): *Civil Disobedience in Focus*. London: Routledge, 1–12.
3. Brownlee, K. 2004. 'Features of a Paradigm Case of Civil Disobedience' in *Res Publica* 10: 337–351.
4. Celikates, R. 2015. 'Learning from the Streets: Civil Disobedience in Theory and Practice' in P. Weibel (ed.): *global aCtIVISm. Art and Conflict in the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 65–72.
5. CrimethInk. 2012. 'The Illegitimacy of Violence, the Violence of Illegitimacy'. Available at <https://crimethinc.com/2012/03/27/the-illegitimacy-of-violence-the-violence-of-legitimacy>
6. Fanon, F. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press. 79–93.
7. Gelderloos, P. 2007. *How Nonviolence Protects the State*. Cambridge: South End Press. 45–63.
8. King, ML, Jr. 2010 [1968]. *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* Boston: Beacon Press. 23–70.
9. Mills, C. 2005. 'Ideal Theory as Ideology' in *Hypatia* 20(3): 165–184.
10. Morreall, J. 1976. 'The Justifiability of Violent Civil Disobedience' in *The Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 6(1): 35–47.
11. Rawls, J. 1999 [1971]. *A Theory of Justice*, revised ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 319–343.
12. Scheurman, WE. 2015. 'Recent Theories of Civil Disobedience: An Anti-Legal Turn?' in *Journal of Political Philosophy* 23(4): 427–449.

**Suggested Readings:**

1. Balibar, É. 2015. *Violence and Civility*. New York: Columbia University Press.

2. Delmas, C. 2018. *A Duty to Resist: When Disobedience Should be Uncivil*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Levy, JT. 2014. 'There is No Such Things as Ideal Theory' in *Social Philosophy and Policy* 33(1–2): 312–333.
4. Lyons, D. 1998. 'Moral Judgment, Historical Reality, and Civil Disobedience' in *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 27(1): 31–49.
5. Scheurman, WE. 2018. *Civil Disobedience*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
6. Shelby, T. 2016. *Dark Ghettos: Injustice, Dissent, and Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
7. The Invisible Committee, 2015. *To Our Friends*, trans. R Hurley. South Pasadena: Semiotext(e).
8. Young, IM. 2001. 'Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy' in *Political Theory* 29(5): 670–690.

Code of course: **BA-ERA-IPH-S-5, MA-ERA-IPH-S-5**

Title of course: **Introduction to Epistemology**

Lecturer: **Jenő Pöntör**

**General aim of the course:**

The course provides an introduction to some of the main topics in epistemology.

Content of the course:

Topics included in the course are:

1. What is knowledge?
2. Sources of human knowledge.
3. Skepticism.
4. Theories of justification
5. Modern and contemporary anti-skeptical strategies.
6. Religious epistemology.

**Grading criteria, specific requirements:**

There are no specific requirements for this course. Students are expected to attend all meetings and must write an 5-8 page essay (in English or Hungarian) related to one of the discussed topics, chosen by the student.

**Required reading:**

1. Descartes, René, 1641, *Meditations* I, II, III.
2. Stroud, Barry, 1984, "The Problem of the External World". Originally published as ch. 1 in Barry Stroud: *The Significance of Philosophical Skepticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
3. Ryle, Gilbert, 1964, *Dilemmas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 94–95 (Counterfeit Coinage Argument).
4. Putnam, Hilary, 1981, "Brains in a Vat", in Hilary Putnam: *Reason, Truth, and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 1. 1–21.
5. Gettier, Edmund L., 1963, "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?", *Analysis*, 23 (6): 121–123.
6. Goldman, Alvin, 1967, "A Causal Theory of Knowing", <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/078a/d2b9117693dbab0739ab2001a25b10a5ef35.pdf>
7. Nozick, Robert, 1981, "Knowledge and Skepticism", in Jaegwon Kim and Ernest Sosa, (ed.): *Epistemology: An Anthology*, Blackwell, 2000
8. Van Cleve, James, 1979, "Foundationalism, Epistemic Principles, and the Cartesian Circle", in Jaegwon Kim and Ernest Sosa, (ed.): *Epistemology: An Anthology*, Blackwell, 2000.
9. Bonjour, Laurence, 1978, "Can Empirical Knowledge Have a Foundation?", in Jaegwon Kim and Ernest Sosa, (ed.): *Epistemology: An Anthology*, Blackwell, 2000.
10. Plantinga, Alvin, "Is Belief in God Properly Basic?", *Noûs* 15 (1981): 41–51.

**Suggested further reading:**

1. Stanford Encyclopaedia entry: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/skepticism/>
2. Stanford Encyclopaedia entry: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/knowledge-analysis/>
3. Stanford Encyclopaedia entry: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/contextualism-epistemology/>

- |  |
|--|
| 4. Stanford Encyclopaedia entry: <a href="https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justep-foundational/">https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justep-foundational/</a> |
| 5. Stanford Encyclopaedia entry: <a href="https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justep-coherence/">https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justep-coherence/</a>       |
| 6. Stanford Encyclopaedia entry: <a href="https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justep-intext/">https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justep-intext/</a>             |
| 7. Stanford Encyclopaedia entry: <a href="https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/reliabilism/">https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/reliabilism/</a>                 |

<b>A kurzus kódja(i): BA-ERA-IPH-L-5</b>
--

<b>A kurzus megnevezése: Science Fiction and Philosophy</b>
---

<b>A kurzus megnevezése angolul: Science Fiction and Philosophy</b>
---

<b>A kurzus előadója: Daniel Kodaj</b>
--

**Aim of the course:**

An introduction to philosophy through science fiction stories.

**Course homepage:**

<https://dkodaj.net/elte>

**Content of the course:**

Science fiction is an extremely successful genre with intimate ties to philosophy. Science fictions stories like Stanislaw Lem's *Solaris* or the *Black Mirror* series are often said to be philosophical, while philosophers often use science-fiction-flavoured thought experiments to argue about substantive philosophical issues. For example, David Lewis, in a paper called "The paradoxes of time travel", argued that there is no danger that a time traveller will shoot her own grandparents before she is born because there are two metaphysically distinct senses of "ability". Hilary Putnam imagined a scenario called "Brains in Vats" where we are bodiless brains hooked to a computer, and he claimed that we can disprove this hypothesis. Elsewhere, Putnam imagined a possible world where the chemical composition of water is completely different (it is "XYZ" instead of H<sub>2</sub>O), and he argued that such possibilities have important consequences for the nature of human language. The list goes on.

The course explores connections between science fiction stories and philosophy using science fiction stories. Among other things, we'll discuss time travel, free will, the reality of the external world, personal identity, and nonhuman intelligence. Does SF have anything substantive to say about these issues, does it support or undermine standard philosophical theories and arguments?

**Assessment:**

Term paper

**Schedule and readings:**

The reading list may change until September. I'm also open to adding students' favourite SF stories to the list.

1 Introduction

## 2 Time travel

David Lewis: The paradoxes of time travel

Ted Chiang: The merchant and the alchemist's gate

## 3 Free will and determinism

Peter van Inwagen: The Consequence Argument

Philip K. Dick: Minority report

## 4 Physicalism

Howard Robinson: From the Knowledge Argument to Mental Substance, ch.1.

Ted Chiang: Exhalation

## 5 Are we living in a simulation?

David Chalmers: Reality+, ch.5

Stanislaw Lem: The Futurological Congress

## 6 Can minds be downloaded?

David Chalmers: Reality+, ch.15

San Junipero (Black Mirror episode)

## 7 Artificial intelligence

Hilary Putname: The nature of mental states

Isaac Asimov: The bicentennial man

## 8 Personal identity

Daniel Dennett: Where am I?

PK Dick: Minority report

## 9 Alien minds

Donald Davidson: On the very idea of a conceptual scheme

Ted Chiang: Arrival

## 10 Quantum mechanics

Michael Lockwood and David Deutsch: The quantum physics of time travel

Greg Egan: Quarantine

### **Recommended readings:**

Susan Schneider (ed.): Science Fiction and Philosophy.

The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction

Code of course: **BA-ERA-IPS-S-16, MA-ERA-IPS-S-16**

Title of course: **Social and Political Equality and Non-Discrimination**

Lecturer: **Attila Mráz**

**General aim of the course:**

This course surveys some recent work in political, social and legal philosophy on specific forms of inequality, and ideals of equality. We aim to explore and evaluate various answers to three questions: (1) What is it exactly that makes discrimination wrong? (2) What are the fundamental requirements of social and political equality? (3) How is the requirement of non-discrimination related to fundamental requirements and ideals of social and political equality?

First, we will have a look at various types of discrimination—direct discrimination, disparate treatment, disparate impact, segregation etc. There is hardly any debate that these forms of discrimination are wrong. But there is considerable debate as to what makes them wrong. It is also heavily debated whether the same moral wrong characterizes all forms of discrimination, or instead, the concept of discrimination loosely holds together a set of very different moral wrongs—affronts to our dignity, equal social or political status, freedom, or even to our just economic shares or to a public interest in social change etc. In the first part of the course, we will explore these debates. A related question we will consider is, whatever makes discrimination wrong, why does it not make affirmative action wrong? No knowledge of law is assumed for this course. Yet, while discussing mostly philosophical texts, we will look at some legal examples of discrimination in order to have a better grasp of what discrimination is and to be in a position to understand and evaluate accounts of what is wrong about it.

Second, switching from wrongs of inequality to ideals of equality, we will explore ideals of social and political equality. We aim to clarify the following: What is the difference between moral equality, social equality, relational equality, political equality and democratic equality? What does each require, and how are they related? Which ones are reducible to which other ones? How do these foundational egalitarian ideals relate to more concrete social and political ideals such as gender equality, racial equality or economic / distributive egalitarianism? Finally, do requirements of non-discrimination respond adequately to any of these ideals? Can we explain the wrongs of discrimination with the help of these more foundational or concrete egalitarian ideals? In the second part of the course, we will focus on these questions, re-examining what we know about discrimination in light of recently formulated egalitarian ideals.

**Content of the course:**

Topics covered will include:

- What is the difference between direct discrimination, disparate treatment, disparate impact, indirect discrimination, and statistical discrimination? Philosophical theories of what they are and what is wrong about them.
- Affirmative action: what is it and when can it be justified?
- Segregation, inclusion, integration
- Theories of equality of opportunity
- Foundational theories of social and political equality
- The relationship(s) between moral, social and political equality
- The relationship between social and political equality, on the one hand, and non-discrimination as well as equality of opportunity on the other hand

- Inequalities and the limits of political authority: does a state have any authority over citizens whom it treats as social or political inferiors?

Some of the topics will cover more than one class.

### **1. Basic Concepts and Wrongs of Inequality: Discrimination, Indirect Discrimination, Segregation**

- Eidelson, Benjamin. (2015). *Discrimination and Disrespect*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Ch 1: “The Concept of Discrimination”, pp. 13–38.
- Fundamental Rights Agency [FRA] of the European Union (2018). *Handbook on European Non-Discrimination Law*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Excerpts from Ch. 2: “Discrimination Categories”, pp. 39–59.

#### Recommended:

- Khaitan, Tarunabh. (2015). *A Theory of Discrimination Law*. Oxford: Oxford UP. Ch 2: “The Essence of Anti-Discrimination Law”, pp. 23–44.

### **2. Discrimination and Expressive Harms**

- Hellman, Deborah. (2011). *When Is Discrimination Wrong?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Ch. 2: “Demeaning and Wrongful Discrimination”, pp. 34–58.

#### Recommended:

- Levy, Ron. (2002). Expressive Harms and the Strands of Charter Equality: Drawing out Parallel Coherent Approaches to Discrimination. *Alberta Law Review*, 40(2): 393–416. <https://doi.org/10.29173/alr1370>
- Anderson, Elizabeth S., & Pildes, Richard H. (2000). Expressive Theories of Law: A General Restatement. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 148(5), 1503–1575. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3312748>

### **3. Freedom, Social Change and Non-Discrimination**

- Moreau, Sophia. (2010). What Is Discrimination? *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 38(2), 143–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1088-4963.2010.01181.x>
- Hosein, Adam. (2015). Freedom, Sex Roles, and Anti-Discrimination Law. *Law and Philosophy*, 34(5), 485–517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10982-015-9232-2>

#### Recommended:

- Moreau, Sophia. (2013). In Defense of a Liberty-Based Account of Discrimination. In: Deborah Hellman & Sophia Moreau (eds.), *Philosophical Foundations of Discrimination Law* (pp. 71–86). Oxford: Oxford UP.

### **4. Affirmative Action**

- Lippert-Rasmussen, Kasper. (2020). *Making Sense of Affirmative Action*. Oxford: Oxford UP. Ch. 1: “What Is Affirmative Action?”, pp. 1–25.
- Alexander, Michelle. (2010). *The New Jim Crow. Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York—London: The New Press. “The Racial Bribe—Let’s Give It Back”, pp. 231–238.

Recommended:

- Pojman, Louis. (1998). The Case against Affirmative Action. *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 12: 97–115.
- Gutmann, Amy. (1998). Responding to Racial Injustice. In: K. Anthony Appiah & Amy Gutmann, *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race* (pp. 106–178). Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

**5. Indirect Discrimination, Statistical Discrimination**

- Hugh Collins & Tarunabh Khaitan. (2018). Indirect Discrimination Law: Controversies and Critical Questions. In Hugh Collins & Tarunabh Khaitan (eds.), *Foundations of Indirect Discrimination* (pp. 1–30). Oxford and Portland, OR: Hart Publishing.
- Kasper Lippert-Rasmussen. (2014). *Born Free and Equal: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Nature of Discrimination*. Oxford: Oxford UP. Ch. 2: “Indirect Discrimination”, pp. 54–78; Ch. 3: “Statistical Discrimination”, pp. 79–99.

Recommended:

- Kasper Lippert-Rasmussen. (2018). Indirect Discrimination, Affirmative Action and Relational Egalitarianism. In Hugh Collins & Tarunabh Khaitan (eds.), *Foundations of Indirect Discrimination* (pp. 173–196). Oxford and Portland, OR: Hart Publishing.
- Cook, Ryan. (2015). Discrimination Revised: Reviewing the Relationship between Social Groups, Disparate Treatment, and Disparate Impact. *Moral Philosophy and Politics*, 2(2), 219–244. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mopp-2014-0026>

**6. Equality of Opportunity**

- Rawls, John. (1999). *A Theory of Justice. Revised Edition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. § 11: “The Two Principles of Justice”, pp. 52–57; § 12: “Interpretations of the Second Principle”, pp. 57–65; § 14: Fair Equality of Opportunity and Pure Procedural Justice”, pp. 73–78.
- Freeman, Samuel. (2007). *Rawls*. London and New York: Routledge. Ch. 3, excerpt: “Fair Equality of Opportunity”, pp. 88–98.
- Mason, Andrew. (2004). Equality of Opportunity and Differences in Social Circumstances. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 54(216), 368–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0031-8094.2004.00358.x>

Recommended:

- Segall, Shlomi. (2013). *Equality and Opportunity*. Oxford: OUP.
- Fishkin, Joseph. (2014). *Bottlenecks: A New Theory of Equal Opportunity*. Oxford: OUP.
- Alexander, Larry. (1985). Fair equality of opportunity: Rawls’ (best) forgotten principle. *Philosophy Research Archives* 11: 197–207.
- Arneson, Richard J. (1999). Against Rawlsian equality of opportunity. *Philosophical Studies* 93(1): 77–112.

**7. Moral Equality, Social Equality, Political Equality, Democratic Equality, Relational Equality: A Conceptual and Normative Map**

- Wilson, James Lindley (2019). *Democratic Equality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP. Ch. 1: “Equality as a Social Ideal”, pp. 17–47; Ch. 2: “Political Equality”, pp. 48–72.

Recommended:

- Lippert-Rasmussen, Kasper. (2018). *Relational Egalitarianism: Living As Equals*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP. Ch. 1.1: “The Distributive Ideal of Justice”, Ch. 1.2: “The Relational Ideal of Justice”, Ch. 1.3: “Relational Egalitarianism: A Thumbnail Sketch of Its Recent History”, pp. 1–16.
- Rosanvallon, Pierre. (2013 [2011]). *The Society of Equals*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA—London, UK: Harvard UP. “Introduction: The Crisis of Equality”, pp. 1–11.
- Anderson, Elizabeth S. (1999). What Is the Point of Equality? *Ethics*, 109(2), 287–337. <https://doi.org/10.1086/233897>
- Scheffler, Samuel. (2015). The Practice of Equality. In: Fourie, C., Schuppert, F., & Wallimann-Helmer, I. (eds.). (2015). *Social Equality: On What It Means to be Equals* (pp. 21–44). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scheffler, Samuel. (2003). What Is Egalitarianism? *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 31(1), 5–39.
- Wolff, Jonathan. (1998). Fairness, Respect, and the Egalitarian Ethos. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 27(2), 97–122.
- Waldron, Jeremy. (2017). *One Another's Equals: the Basis of Human Equality*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Waldron, Jeremy. (2012). *Dignity, Rank and Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**8. Non-Domination: From Social to Political Equality**

- Kolodny, Niko. (2014). Rule Over None II: Social Equality and the Justification of Democracy. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 42(4): 287–336.
- Shapiro, Ian. (2012). On Non-Domination. *University of Toronto Law Journal* 62(3): 239–336. <https://doi.org/10.3138/utlj.62.3.293>

Recommended:

- Viehoff, Daniel. (2014). Democratic Equality and Political Authority. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 42(4): 337–375.
- Marie Garrau and Cécile Laborde (2015). Relational Equality, Non-Domination, and Vulnerability. In: Fourie, C., Schuppert, F., & Wallimann-Helmer, I. (eds.). (2015). *Social Equality: On What It Means to be Equals* (pp. 45–64). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pettit, Phillip. (1997). *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford—New York: Oxford University Press. Ch. 3: “Non-domination as a Political Ideal”. 80–109.
- Shapiro, Ian. (2016). *Politics against Domination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. Ch. 4: “Democracy against Republicanism”.
- Dyzenhaus, David. (2012). Reponse to Ian Shapiro’s “On Non-Domination.” *University of Toronto Law Journal* 62(3): 337–346. <https://doi.org/10.3138/utlj.62.3.337>

**9. Difference without Domination: From Political to Economic Equality**

- Allen, Danielle. (2020). A New Theory of Justice: Difference without Domination. In: Allen, D., & Somanathan, R. (eds.). (2020). *Difference without Domination: Pursuing Justice within Diverse Democracies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Recommended:



- Allen, Danielle. (2016). Toward a Connected Society. In: Earl Lewis and Nancy Cantor (eds.), *Our Compelling Interests: The Value of Diversity for Democracy and a Prosperous Society* (pp. 71–105). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

### **10. Status Equality and Economic Inequality**

- Scanlon, T. M. (2018). *Why Does Inequality Matter?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. Ch. 3: “Status Inequality”, pp. 26–39.

#### Recommended:

- Rawls, John. (1999). *A Theory of Justice. Revised Edition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. § 67: “Self-Respect, Excellence and Shame”, pp. 386–391.
- Arneson, Richard. (2007). Shame, Stigma, and Disgust in the Decent Society. *The Journal of Ethics* 11(1), 31–63.

### **11. Segregation, Inclusion, Integration**

- Elizabeth Anderson (2010). *The Imperative of Integration.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP. Ch. 5: “Democratic Ideals and Segregation”, pp. 89–111.
- Young, Iris Marion. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy.* Oxford: OUP. Ch. 6: “Residential Segregation and Regional Democracy”, pp. 196–235.

#### Recommended:

- Tommie Shelby (2014). Inequality, Integration, and Imperatives of Justice: A Review Essay. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 42(3): 253–285.
- Martin Luther King, Jr. (1991). The Ethical Demands for Integration. In: James M. Washington (ed.), *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (pp. 117–125). New York: Harper-Collins.

### **12. Inequality and the Limits of Political Authority**

- Tommie Shelby (2007). Justice, Deviance and the Dark Ghetto. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 32(2): 126–160.

#### Recommended:

- Tommie Shelby (2016). *Dark Ghettoes: Injustice, Dissent and Reforms.* Cambridge, MA—London, UK: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. Ch. 7: “Crime”, pp. 203–227.
- Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologiae* (A Summary of Theology), II–II. q. 60 a. 5.

#### **Grading criteria, specific requirements:**

- (1) Active participation in class
- (2) Short home assignments
- (3) A term paper of ca. 2500 words, based on a short topic proposal developed in consultation with (and approved by) the instructor.

#### **Required reading:**

See above.

**Suggested further reading:**

See also above.

Code of course: **BA-ERA-IPH-S-22, MA-ERA-IPH-S-27**

Title of course: **Political violence - The case of Color Revolutions and Gandhi's satyagraha**

Lecturer: **Stefan Rashkovski**

**General aim of the course:** The ultimate aim of this course is to facilitate the deep understanding of the phenomena of political violence and its disastrous consequences so that the future generations and decision makers can have the necessary awareness to make wiser choices and instead of repeating the old patterns that ultimately drove the world on the brink of a Third World War like it is now, will be able to make decisions and policies that will nurture peace and thus improve the lives of the people in the global society.

**Level of course:** introductory/intermediate

**Content of the course:** The fundamental idea of the course is to educate the students and improve their understanding of the nature of violence and its disastrous political effects. To that effect, the course adopts a twofold approach. First students will be provided with the necessary information and insights on the nature of violence and its usage and effects in politics. Through it, the students will become more familiar with this topics that will facilitate the necessary awareness about it, its ontological nature, manifestation, and consequences that will furthermore equip the students with the necessary thinking tools to discern or distinguish between a violent political action and a genuine non-violent political action. The second aspect of the twofold approach is Hegelian or teaching through thesis, antithesis and synthesis. In that direction, students will be shown an example of action of political violence (Color Revolution) that will be compared with a genuinely non-violent political action (Gandhi's satyagraha) and through the synthesis of both, the students will have the complete theoretical and practical understanding of what is an action of political violence and what is a genuinely non-violent political action.

**Topics included in the course are:**

1. Political violence, its nature and consequences
2. Political violence and coercion
3. Case study - The Colored Revolution in Republic of North Macedonia
4. Non-violent political action: Gandhi's satyagraha
5. Violent and non-violent civil movements

**Grading criteria, specific requirements:**

The students will be graded on the basis of attendance, homeworks and presentations made on the topics covered by the course.

**Required reading:**

1. G. Sharp. "How nonviolent struggle works". Boston: The Albert Einstein Institution, 2013.
2. G.M. Gallarotti. "Soft power: what it is, why it's important, and the conditions for its effective use". USA: Journal of Political Power, 2011.
3. 1. G. Sharp. "From dictatorship to democracy". USA: The Albert Einstein Institution, 2010.
4. 2. E. Chenoweth and M.J. Stephan. "Why Civil resistance works – The strategic logic of non-violent conflict". New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

5. 1. M.K. Gandhi. "Hind Swaraj or Indian home rule". India: Navajivan Publishing House, 1938.
6. 2. A. Roberts and T.G. Ash. "Civil resistance and power politics". USA: Oxford University Press, 2009.
7. 1. J. Gerlach. "Color Revolutions in Eurasia". New York: Springer, 2014.
8. 2. D. Lane. "Colored Revolution' as a Political Phenomenon - Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics". USA: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2009.

**Suggested further reading:**

- 1 P.K. Baev. "A Matrix for Post-Soviet 'Color Revolutions': Exorcising the Devil from the Details – International Area Studies Review". USA: Sage Publications, 2011.
- 2 Tilly, Charles. „The politics of collective violence”. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- 3 Thoreau, D. Henry. „Civil disobedience”. USA: Mozambook, 2001.
- 4 Weber, Marx. „Essays in Sociology”. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- 5 Weber, Marx. (translated by Vjerman Katunarić). „Government and politics”. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski I Turk, 1999.
- 6 Žižek, Slavoj. „Violence”. New York: Picador, 2008.

Code of course: **BA-ERA-IPH-S-1, MA-ERA-IPH-S-1**

Title of course: **Philosophy of Mind**

Lecturer: **Judit Szalai**

**Aim of the course:**

The course addresses fundamental issues in the contemporary philosophy of mind such as the mind-body relationship, consciousness, and intentionality.

**Level of course:** introductory/intermediate

**1. E. Schwitzgebel: The Unreliability of Naive Introspection**

<http://www.faculty.ucr.edu/~eschwitz/SchwitzPapers/Naive1.pdf>

**2. R. Descartes: *Meditations on First Philosophy* 1st Meditation**

<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/descartes/1639/meditations.htm>

**3. G. Ryle: *The Concept of Mind* Chapter 1**

<https://www.phil.uu.nl/~joel/3027/GilbertRyleDescartesMyth.pdf>

**4. T. Nagel: What Is It Like to Be a Bat?**

[https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross\\_fac/iatl/study/ugmodules/humananimalstudies/lectures/32/nagel\\_bat.pdf](https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/iatl/study/ugmodules/humananimalstudies/lectures/32/nagel_bat.pdf)

**5. D. Dennett: The Self as the Center of Narrative Gravity**

<https://ase.tufts.edu/cogstud/dennett/papers/selfctr.pdf>

**6. J. Searle: Minds, Brains, and Programs**

<http://et3r.ektf.hu/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/minds-brains-and-programs.pdf>

**7. D. M. Rosenthal: Two Concepts of Consciousness**

**8. T. Crane: The Unity of Unconsciousness**

<https://philpapers.org/rec/CRAIPA-4>

**9. J. Hohwy: The Experience of Mental Causation**

<https://philpapers.org/rec/HOHTCO>

**10. T. Crane: The Intentional Structure of Consciousness**

<https://philpapers.org/rec/CRATIS>

**11. T. Horgan and J. Tienson: The Intentionality of Phenomenology and the Phenomenology of Intentionality**

**12. S. Gallagher: Philosophical Conceptions of the Self: Implication for Cognitive Science**

<http://www.ummos.org/tics2000.html>

**Course requirements, evaluation:**

1) Active participation 2) Presentation 3) Seminar paper based on the presentation.