

PSY/SPM 311: Origins of Moral Thought

Fall 2016: TR, 8:30-9:50am, Stager 318

Professor: Joshua Rottman; **Office:** LSP 117

Phone: (717) 358-4874; **Email:** jrottman@fandm.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays and Wednesdays from 1:30-4:00pm, or by appointment

Course Description

How have humans acquired the capacity to make judgments about right and wrong? We will address this question on three different timescales – millennia (human evolution), centuries (modern history), and years (individual development) – to explore how morality has resulted from natural selection, how cultural and ecological shifts bring about new moral convictions, and how moral beliefs emerge during childhood. Readings will combine insights from psychology, anthropology, philosophy, economics, history, and biology in order to provide manifold perspectives on the genesis of morality.

Course Objectives

Our moral values define us, unite us, and give meaning to our lives. Being so near and dear to our hearts, we often take them to be self-evident. However, like other aspects of human nature, morality is a psychological phenomenon with a history that can be uncovered with scientific tools. In this course, we will explore how moral beliefs, far from being timeless truths, are products of biological and cultural evolution that are reliably developed in early childhood. The vantage point that we will attain by coming to view morality as a naturalistic phenomenon can deliver an elevated understanding of how to transcend our predispositions, if we wish, thus providing us with improved abilities to create a better future. By the end of the semester (provided regular attendance, active participation in class discussions, assiduous completion of all assignments, and adherence to all other class policies), you will attain and cultivate the skills needed to achieve the following objectives:

- **Understand** how particular moral beliefs and behaviors have emerged throughout human history.
- **Analyze** evidence critically when explaining, discussing, and writing about scientific findings and claims.
- **Synthesize** data and theory from a range of materials to construct innovative arguments.
- **Communicate** ideas by honing your abilities to confidently express evidence-based viewpoints.
- **Evaluate** previously accepted moral commitments to determine whether they are rationally justifiable.
- **Apply** knowledge from this course in deciding how to pursue moral aims for creating a better future.

Required Texts

- Bloom, P. (2013). *Just babies: The origins of good and evil*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Boehm, C. (2012). *Moral origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism, and shame*. New York: Basic Books.
- Additional material posted on Canvas (canvas.fandm.edu)

Important Dates

Sept. 12	Sept. 14	Sept. 28	Oct. 5	Oct. 7	Oct. 11
Progress Project due	Last day to add classes or withdraw without record	Last day to elect P/NP option	Day of Dialogue	First draft due for Position Paper #1	Fall break; no class
Oct. 28	Nov. 18	Nov. 24	Dec. 2	Dec. 9	Dec. 12–16
Final draft due for Position Paper #1	First draft due for Position Paper #2	Thanksgiving; no class	Last day to withdraw (with record)	Final draft due for Position Paper #2	Oral exams administered

Course Requirements and Grading

As detailed below, you will be assessed by your performance on the following assignments (100 points total):

Thoughtful Participation	Reading Journal	Progress Project	Position Papers 1st draft 2nd draft	Leading Discussion	Oral Exam	Extra Credit
15 pts.	10 pts.	5 pts.	5 pts. (x 2) 20 pts. (x 2)	10 pts.	10 pts.	Up to 2 pts.

Letter grades will be assigned as follows (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

A 93–100	A- 90–92	B+ 87–89	B 83–86	B- 80–82	C+ 77–79
C 73–76	C- 70–72	D+ 67–69	D 63–66	D- 60–62	F 0–59

Thoughtful Participation

The success of this course depends heavily on your contributions to class discussion, and (as research has convincingly shown) you will learn more effectively by actively participating in these discussions. You are expected to come to class prepared to discuss all of the readings critically and creatively, by making intelligent points and raising thought-provoking questions that touch upon elements ranging from specific critiques of a particular methodology to big-picture applications of a body of findings. **Your participation grade will primarily reflect the quality – rather than quantity – of your in-class comments**, including how well you respond to classmates and actively encourage their participation. To give everybody an equal opportunity to receive a full 15 points, I may sometimes refrain from calling on frequent participators. I will also frequently institute random cold calling, but I will typically provide you time to prepare for this. Side conversations during class are strongly discouraged and will result in penalties on your participation grade.

Please respect a diversity of opinions and questions, and aim to contribute constructively and considerately. You are expected to arrive on time and to bring all assigned readings with you. Of course, consistent attendance is necessary for you to have the opportunity to participate in class.

Grades for participation (which will be periodically updated on Canvas) will be earned according to this rubric:

- **A** = Reliably participates in thoughtful ways that reveal intellectual acuity and a deep engagement with the material. Always displays excellent preparation, having thought critically about all assigned readings and formulated discussion questions before class. Respectfully engages others and generously listens to their contributions, makes sophisticated connections, and consistently elevates the level of discussion.
- **B** = Regularly participates in discussion, but not always in a highly thoughtful or collaborative manner. Comes to class having completed all assigned readings, but does not have discussion questions in mind.
- **C** = Participates occasionally, but comments are infrequently insightful. Generally takes a passive rather than active role in discussions. Does not demonstrate evidence of having completed readings before class.
- **D** = Infrequently comes to class prepared and does not productively contribute to discussions.
- **F** = Almost never participates in discussions, is unprepared, and is not actively engaged during class.

Reading Journal

You are required to keep a detailed journal reflecting on the assigned readings. You should write approximately 250 words per class day, which can take the form of either bullet points or complete sentences. I will frequently call upon students to discuss their responses in class, so make sure you are prepared each day.

Each journal entry should integrate material from multiple readings. Possible content includes raising questions about particularly confusing aspects of the readings, remarking on applications to your life or the lives of others, noting contradictions or agreements between different readings, suggesting potential follow-up research, or critiquing methods or conclusions in the readings. **Do not summarize.**

Your full journal should be submitted by hard copy or electronically uploaded to Canvas on December 8. You will receive full credit for complete, thoughtful entries that demonstrate a sophisticated engagement with the readings (including a substantial amount of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation). Journals will receive only partial credit if they fail to meet these standards, or if they contain multiple missing entries.

Progress Project

For this assignment, you should take a step toward bettering the world. Reflect on the moral aim that is of utmost importance to you (e.g., reducing inequality, curtailing sexual abuse, or minimizing humanity's carbon footprint) and take a concrete action to further this aim (e.g., volunteer, donate to charity, or stop yourself from engaging in a bad habit). Your action does not need to involve a great deal of time or energy; I am only looking for a small step in the "right" direction. You should then write 750 words (± 250 words) reflecting briefly on what you did, detailing the barriers (psychological, societal, monetary, etc.) that may have prevented this aim from being achieved more fully, and proposing concrete changes that could be implemented to address flaws in human nature and/or cultural institutions to more fully bring about your desired aim. You should upload this to Canvas on September 12, with only your F&M ID number for identification (do not include your name).

Position Papers (2 total)

Both of your "Position Papers" should be 2,000 words in length (± 500 words), and should make abundant use of class readings to support or refute one of the following claims:

1. From infancy through adulthood, humans are naturally cooperative, generous, kind, and fair.
2. Morality is rooted in emotions, and positive moral outcomes cannot be achieved through reason alone.
3. One cannot understand the evolution of moral thought without also studying culture and development.
4. A child who grew up alone on an isolated desert island would never develop a moral sense.
5. There is often no single moral solution (e.g., being caring and being fair can be mutually incompatible).
6. Change (at both phylogenetic and ontogenetic levels) always leads to moral progress.
7. Moral beliefs are extremely flexible and culturally determined, and can be easily shaped by social pressures.
8. Across nearly all cultures and contexts (and excepting psychopaths), harm to others is considered immoral.
9. A person's private moral beliefs and attitudes have little to do with his/her public moral behaviors.
10. Understanding the origins of moral thought can illuminate the current political situation in the country.
11. *Choose your own adventure.* (You may submit a prompt of your own for approval.)

You will submit each of these papers in two phases to give you an opportunity to revise and improve them after receiving feedback. Your first submission of Position Paper #1 is due on October 7. I will provide comments by October 19, and your final submission is due on October 28. Your first submission of Position Paper #2 is due on November 18. I will provide comments by November 30, and your final submission is due on December 9. All submissions should be uploaded electronically to Canvas as Word documents, and first drafts should include only your F&M ID number for identification (do not include your name). You are responsible for making sure that you send correct and readable documents. If you would like to receive detailed feedback on the final version of your second paper, please "opt in" by adding a note in the Comments section on Canvas.

You may submit an introductory paragraph and/or an outline by email for ungraded feedback one week or more before the initial submissions are due. The final submissions should be accompanied by one-page cover letters that address how you have revised your paper based on feedback you received on your first submission.

All submissions will be graded according to the following rubric (a more detailed rubric will also be provided):

- **A** = A particularly excellent paper, which presents a delightfully insightful argument that thoroughly responds to the prompt by synthesizing material from a range of readings and class discussions. Demonstrates a strong grasp of the topic at hand, maintains a clear thesis, perceptively evaluates the strength of the supporting evidence, and acknowledges limitations of current scientific knowledge.
- **B** = Clearly responds to the prompt and synthesizes a range of material. Demonstrates a fairly strong grasp of the topic at hand, with only minor misconceptions. There is a thesis, although it is somewhat imprecise or inconsistent. Adequately evaluates the strengths and limitations of the supporting evidence.
- **C** = Presents a relevant argument that cursorily analyzes a limited range of readings, addressing each on its own terms rather than attempting synthesis or critical evaluation. The paper contains some prominent misconceptions about the topic. Neglects a full discussion of the strengths and limitations of the evidence.
- **D** = Struggles to address the prompt, does not present a clear thesis argument, and fails to consistently address relevant textual evidence. Provides only hints of understanding the relevant class material.
- **F** = Incomplete and unfocused. Displays minimal reflection and no evidence of understanding the topic.

Leading Discussion

You are required to lead discussion on an empirical paper, either individually or with a peer. You will first give a 5–10 minute lecture providing critical commentary, and then you will guide discussion for 20–30 minutes. At least three days in advance, you must submit three or more discussion questions to me by email. I encourage you to additionally set up a meeting to review your plans for leading discussion. You will be assessed on your mastery of the reading, on the quality of the questions that you formulate, and on your skills in moderating and encouraging class participation. You will be graded according to the following rubric:

- **A** = Provides insightful, high-level commentary about the assigned reading, and relates it to other course material in order to provide thorough analysis and synthesis of the findings. Asks thoughtful questions that consistently generate complex and lively conversations. Displays excellent engagement of the class.
- **B** = Provides some insightful commentary about the assigned reading, but does not successfully relate it to other class material. Poses some thoughtful questions to the class, but does not provide a broad framework for discussion. Inconsistently generates complex, lively conversations about the material.
- **C** = Merely summarizes the reading, and does not provide evidence of deep engagement with the methods and findings. Asks fairly basic questions that only occasionally produce complex or lively discussion.
- **D** = Provides only a cursory summary of the readings, and has difficulty engaging the class in discussion.
- **F** = Demonstrates a lack of preparation and fails to adequately discuss the reading or to engage the class.

Oral Exam

Your final assessment will require you to expand upon your Progress Project from the beginning of the semester. You will be asked to (a) expand upon on the obstacles involved in fully realizing the moral aim that is of utmost importance to you and (b) suggest solutions for overcoming these difficulties by leveraging or curtailing elements of human psychology and human environments that have been discussed in the course. Your treatment of these issues should be both practical and creative, and should draw heavily on empirical evidence. You may wish to read extra sources in addition to the ones that have been assigned.

You will give this 10-minute oral presentation during a one-on-one appointment that you will schedule during the reading period or the final exam period. After your presentation, I will ask you follow-up questions for an additional 5–10 minutes. You will be graded on your ability to synthesize and evaluate multiple readings, the success of your application of theory and evidence to a real-world issue that you are passionate about, and your skills at orally communicating this information. You may use notecards and/or a PowerPoint presentation.

Your grade will be determined according to the following rubric (a more detailed rubric will also be provided):

- **A** = Delivers a stellar presentation without inaccuracies or irrelevant information. Demonstrates a highly sophisticated understanding of course material, and successfully applies this to a real-world moral aim. Clearly delivers content in an organized and well-rehearsed manner. Insightfully responds to questions.
- **B** = Delivers a high-quality presentation with only minor inaccuracies. Presentation is generally well rehearsed, but is somewhat imprecise or inconsistent. Responds well to questions.
- **C** = Delivers an adequate presentation that contains several inaccuracies. There is evidence that the presentation has been rehearsed, but not to a suitable degree. Responses to questions are incomplete.
- **D** = Delivers an adequate presentation that contains many inaccuracies and often strays off topic. There is no evidence that the presentation has been rehearsed. Struggles to fully respond to questions.
- **F** = Fails to successfully complete the presentation.

Opportunities for Extra Credit

You may earn up to 2 extra credit points during the course of the semester through any combination of the below. Additional bonus opportunities may also arise, providing the potential to earn even more extra credit.

- Each time you email a relevant news article (accompanied by a brief description of its relevance), you will earn 0.25 extra credit points. You may be called upon to describe the major findings during class.
- Each time you email a brief description of a relevant talk that you attended, you will earn 0.25 extra points.
- Each time you visit the Writing Center for help on a paper, you will earn 0.25 extra credit points.

Appealing Grades

If you receive a grade that is inconsistent with what you believe you should have earned, you have a week to set up an appointment with me to appeal your grade. When scheduling this appointment, you must submit a written statement explaining your case. After one week has passed, all grades will be considered final.

Policy on Late Assignments

You will lose one point for every day that an assignment is late. In extreme cases when unexpected and unavoidable circumstances prevent you from completing an assignment on time, please inform me as soon as possible, and I will use my discretion to determine whether to waive or attenuate the late penalty.

Policy on Electronic Devices

In order to maximize your success and minimize the possibility for distractions, **you may not use ANY electronic devices during class.** Research has indicated this will be likely to enhance your learning. Exceptions will be granted for students with compelling reasons for using a laptop or other device to take notes (if this is the case, please speak with me privately).

Academic Integrity

I take academic honesty **very** seriously. You risk severe consequences by committing acts of plagiarism (i.e., representing someone else's work as your own), cheating, falsification, impersonating, or other similar offenses, including facilitating another student in committing an act of academic dishonesty. Penalties for these offenses will be carefully assessed on a case-by-case basis, and may include receiving a failing grade in the course or expulsion from F&M. Please refer to the Franklin & Marshall College Catalog for additional details.

Disability Accommodations

Academic accommodations are available for students who require them. Please schedule an appointment with me immediately to discuss any accommodations for this course that have been supported by appropriate documentation and approved by the Office of Disability Services. I will keep all information confidential.

Communication

Email is generally the best way to reach me. Unless I announce otherwise, I will respond within 24 hours. I will also be available to talk in my office during the times listed at the top of the syllabus, by appointment, and anytime when my door is open. I encourage you to take advantage of this, particularly in cases when you need further clarity on an assignment or when course material has made you uncomfortable in any way. Because this class involves discussions of sensitive topics, it may trigger a stress response or lead to uncomfortable emotional reactions. While mild discomfort can often be a positive indication of personal and intellectual growth, please come speak to me immediately if you experience (or anticipate experiencing) more severe forms of distress. If any issues arise that have the potential to interfere with your success in the course, please be in touch with me as soon as possible. I value open communication, and I invite you to be frank with me.

Other Tips

This class will be intensive. You will be expected to consistently keep up with all of the readings and to assimilate and synthesize a lot of difficult material. This will often require spreading readings out across several days preceding each class session and re-reading some material after class. I am here to help you succeed, and I urge you to come talk to me about concerns or confusions regarding the course material and assignments. Your fellow students can also be great resources; reaching out to them can be a fun and collaborative way to learn. Additionally, please feel free to take advantage of the many other resources that Franklin & Marshall has to offer! For example, the Writing Center (located on the second level of Diagonthian Hall) can assist you with writing and other academic skills, and Counseling Services (located in College Square) offers free initial consultations and emergency visits to support your wellbeing.

Semester Schedule

*Components of this schedule are subject to change; please check Canvas regularly for updates.
Please bring hard copies of all required readings to class with you each day.*

Date	Lecture Topic	Reading Assignments (to be completed before each class)
Part 1: The Roots of Generosity and Cooperation		
9/1	What is morality?	<i>Course syllabus.</i>
9/6	Ontogenetic and cultural origins of morality	Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 1–31). Schmidt, M.F.H., & Tomasello, M. (2012). Young children enforce social norms. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> , 21, 232–236. Norenzayan, A. (2014). Does religion make people moral? <i>Behaviour</i> , 151, 365–384.
9/8	Phylogenetic origins of morality	Boehm, C. (2012). <i>Moral origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism, and shame</i> (pp. 89–131). Melis, A.P., Warneken, F., & Hare, B. (2010). Collaboration and helping in chimpanzees. In <i>The mind of the chimpanzee</i> (pp. 265–281). de Waal, F. (2011, November). Moral behavior in animals. <i>TED</i> . [bit.ly/1hWB2IO]
9/13	Explaining altruism through game theory	Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 70–82). Ridley, M. (1997). <i>The origins of virtue</i> (pp. 52–66). Rand, D.G., & Nowak, M.A. (2013). Human cooperation. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i> , 17, 413–425.
9/15	Nice guys don't always finish last	Krebs, D. (2010). Born bad? Evaluating the case against the evolution of morality. In <i>Human morality and sociality</i> (pp. 13–30). Frank, R.H., et al. (1993). The evolution of one-shot cooperation: An experiment. <i>Ethology and Sociobiology</i> , 14, 247–256. Kenward, B., & Dahl, M. (2011). Preschoolers distribute scarce resources according to the moral valence of recipients' previous actions. <i>Developmental Psychology</i> , 47, 1054–1064.
9/20	Consequences of moral deviance	Boehm, C. (2012). <i>Moral origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism, and shame</i> (pp. 36–74 and pp. 149–178).
9/22	DEBATE #1: Is it selfish to be unselfish?	
Part 2: Implications of Reputations		
9/27	Reputation is everything	Boehm, C. (2012). <i>Moral origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism, and shame</i> (pp. 293–314). Sperber, D., & Baumard, N. (2012). Moral reputation: An evolutionary and cognitive perspective. <i>Mind & Language</i> , 27, 495–518.
9/29	Looking good and being good	Blake, P.R., et al. (2014). The developmental origins of fairness: the knowledge-behavior gap. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i> , 18, 559–561. Shaw, A., et al. (2014). Children develop a veil of fairness. <i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: General</i> , 143, 363–375. Jordan, J.J., et al. (2016). Uncalculating cooperation is used to signal trustworthiness. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> , 113, 8658–8663.
10/4	The moral power of eyes and tongues	Boehm, C. (2012). <i>Moral origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism, and shame</i> (pp. 239–246). Leimgruber, K.L., et al. (2012). Young children are more generous when others are aware of their actions. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 7, e48292. Feinberg, M., et al. (2014). Gossip and ostracism promote cooperation in groups. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 25, 656–664.
10/6	The benefits of shame and honor	Jacquet, J., et al. (2011). Shame and honour drive cooperation. <i>Biology Letters</i> , 7, 899–901. Nowak, A., et al. (2016). The evolutionary basis of honor cultures. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 27, 12–24.
10/13	Honor and violence	Nisbett, R.E. (1993). Violence and U.S. regional culture. <i>American Psychologist</i> , 48, 441–449. Appiah, K.A. (2010). <i>The honor code: How moral revolutions happen</i> (pp. 137–172).
10/18	Second-party and third-party punishment	Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 82–100). Goodwin, G.P., & Gromet, D.M. (2014). Punishment. <i>WIREs: Cognitive Science</i> , 5, 561–572. Cushman, F. (2015). Punishment in humans: From intuitions to institutions. <i>Philosophy Compass</i> , 10, 117–133.
10/20	DEBATE #2: Would invisibility cloaks negate all potential for moral behavior?	

Part 3: In and Out of Others' Shoes

10/25	Sympathy, empathy, and prosociality	Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 33–57). Vaish, A., et al. (2009). Sympathy through affective perspective taking and its relation to prosocial behavior in toddlers. <i>Developmental Psychology</i> , 45, 534–543. Stephan, W.G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. <i>Journal of Social Issues</i> , 55, 729–743.
10/27	Loyalty and ingroup favoritism	Boehm, C. (2012). <i>Moral origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism, and shame</i> (pp. 134–136). Misch, A., et al. (2016). I won't tell: Young children show loyalty to their group by keeping group secrets. <i>Journal of Experimental Child Psychology</i> , 142, 96–106. Buttelmann, D., & Böhm, R. (2014). The ontology of the motivation that underlies in-group bias. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 25, 921–927.
11/1	Coalitions, competition, and outgroup derogation	Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 101–130). Cikara, M., et al. (2011). Us and them: Intergroup failures of empathy. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> , 20, 149–153. Pierce, J.R., et al. (2013). From glue to gasoline: How competition turns perspective takers unethical. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 24, 1986–1994. Bloom, P. (2015, September). The dark side of empathy. <i>The Atlantic</i> . [theatlntc/1MO5gRO]
11/3	DEBATE #3: Should empathy be eliminated?	

Part 4: Moral Variability and What to Do About It

11/8	Explaining moral and political disagreements	Appiah, K.A. (2007). <i>Cosmopolitanism</i> (pp. 45–85). Janoff-Bulman, R. (2009). To provide or protect: Motivational bases of political liberalism and conservatism. <i>Psychological Inquiry</i> , 20, 120–128. Haidt, J. (2008, March). The moral roots of liberals and conservatives. <i>TED</i> . [bit.ly/1kZ3Ic]
11/10	Divergent moral values across cultures	Miller, J. G., & Bersoff, D. M. (1992). Culture and moral judgment: How are conflicts between justice and interpersonal responsibilities resolved? <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 62, 541–554. Buchtel, E. E., et al. (2015). Immorality east and west: Are immoral behaviors especially harmful, or especially uncivilized? <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i> , 41, 1382–1394.
11/15	Blaming those who do no harm	Tannenbaum, D., Uhlmann, E. L., & Diermeier, D. (2011). Moral signals, public outrage, and immaterial harms. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i> , 47, 1249–1254. Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D. A., & Cushman, F. (2012). Benefiting from misfortune: When harmless actions are judged to be morally blameworthy. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i> , 38, 52–62. Niemi, L., & Young, L. (2016). When and why we see victims as responsible: The impact of ideology on attitudes toward victims. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i> , 42, 1227–1242.
11/17	Disgust, taboos, and moral purity	Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 131–157). Harris, M. (1985). The abominable pig. In <i>Good to eat</i> (pp. 67–79). Rottman, J., & Kelemen, D. (2012). Aliens behaving badly: Children's acquisition of novel purity-based morals. <i>Cognition</i> , 124, 356–360.
11/22	Moral progress	Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 187–218). Broockman, D., & Kalla, J. (2016). Durably reducing transphobia: A field experiment on door-to-door canvassing. <i>Science</i> , 352, 220–224. Pinker, S. (2007, March). The surprising decline in violence. <i>TED</i> . [bit.ly/1xoq3IX]
11/29	Bridging the gap from descriptive to prescriptive morality	Nussbaum, M. (1999). Judging other cultures: The case of genital mutilation. In <i>Sex and social justice</i> (pp. 118–129). Greene, J. (2003). From neural “is” to moral “ought”: What are the moral implications of neuroscientific moral psychology? <i>Nature Reviews Neuroscience</i> , 4, 847–850. Joyce, R. (2011). Moral fictionalism. <i>Philosophy Now</i> , 82, 14–17. Harris, S. (2010, February). Science can answer moral questions. <i>TED</i> . [bit.ly/1mLbrvm]
12/1	DEBATE #4: Is cannibalism immoral?	
12/6	Further topics in moral psychology	T.B.A., based on a class vote (possibilities include: law, morality and religion, vegetarianism, conformity to norms, hypocrisy, moral learning, psychopathy, expansions of any topic above...)
12/8	Moral futures	Singer, P. (2013, March). The why and how of effective altruism. <i>TED</i> . [bit.ly/1ko7Qoo]