

Term Information

Effective Term Spring 2014

General Information

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area Philosophy
Fiscal Unit/Academic Org Philosophy - D0575
College/Academic Group Arts and Sciences
Level/Career Undergraduate
Course Number/Catalog 3430
Course Title The Philosophy of Sex and Love
Transcript Abbreviation Phil Sex and Love
Course Description This course will explore both historical and contemporary philosophical perspectives on both sex and love.
Semester Credit Hours/Units Fixed: 3

Offering Information

Length Of Course 14 Week, 7 Week, 4 Week (May Session), 12 Week (May + Summer)
Flexibly Scheduled Course Never
Does any section of this course have a distance education component? No
Grading Basis Letter Grade
Repeatable No
Course Components Lecture
Grade Roster Component Lecture
Credit Available by Exam No
Admission Condition Course No
Off Campus Never
Campus of Offering Columbus

Prerequisites and Exclusions

Prerequisites/Corequisites Prereq: 3 credit hours in Philosophy or permission of instructor.
Exclusions

Cross-Listings

Cross-Listings

Subject/CIP Code

Subject/CIP Code 38.0101
Subsidy Level Baccalaureate Course
Intended Rank Sophomore, Junior, Senior

Quarters to Semesters

Quarters to Semesters

New course

Give a rationale statement explaining the purpose of the new course

Philosophy 3430 will contribute to the University's strength in sexuality studies and fill a significant gap in the Department's curricular offerings by exploring the uniquely philosophical issues that arise in connection with sex and love.

Sought concurrence from the following Fiscal Units or College

Womens, Gender, and Sexuality Studies; Sexuality Studies Program

Requirement/Elective Designation

The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

Content Topic List

- Philosophical Analysis of Love
- Philosophical Analysis of Sex
- Moral and Political Implications of Sex

Attachments

- Philos 3430 Syllabus.pdf.docx
(Syllabus. Owner: O'Keeffe, Susan B)
- Sexuality Studies Concurrence.pdf
(Concurrence. Owner: O'Keeffe, Susan B)
- WGSS Concurrence.PDF
(Concurrence. Owner: O'Keeffe, Susan B)

Comments

- There is a reference to "quarter" in the syllabus that should be changed to "semester," otherwise approved. *(by Heysel, Garrett Robert on 05/21/2013 08:22 PM)*

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	O'Keeffe, Susan B	05/21/2013 07:01 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Hubin, Donald Clayton	05/21/2013 07:04 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Heysel, Garrett Robert	05/21/2013 08:22 PM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Nolen, Dawn Jenkins, Mary Ellen Bigler Vankeerbergen, Bernadette Chantal Hogle, Danielle Nicole Hanlin, Deborah Kay	05/21/2013 08:22 PM	ASCCAO Approval

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SEX AND LOVE
Philosophy 3430
Spring 2014

INSTRUCTOR: Alison Duncan Kerr

OFFICE: 214 University Hall
OFFICE HOURS: XXXX
OFFICE PHONE: 614.292.3663

EMAIL: kerr.150@osu.edu
LOCATION: XXXX
TIME: XXXX

I. REQUIRED TEXTS

Plato, *Symposium* (any edition will be acceptable)

Jean-Paul Sartre, *No Exit* (any edition will be acceptable)

Alan Soble & Nicholas Power, eds., *The Philosophy of Sex: Contemporary Readings, 5th Edition* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2008)

The books are available at the university bookstore. Several articles will also be available on *Carmen*. You are encouraged to print these articles out in order to read them. You must bring a copy of the article with you to class on the day it is being discussed. In addition to the assigned readings, you should read the “Savage Love” column each week to provide some extra material for discussion.

II. COURSE WEBSITE: <https://carmen.osu.edu>

III. COURSE DESCRIPTION

What is sex? When we want to have sex, what is it that we actually want? Why do we want sex? What are the moral, social, and physical issues concerning sex? Is adultery immoral? What are sexual perversions? Ought sex be related to love?

What is love? To answer this question properly requires that we think hard about definitions, historical discussions, and implications of love. Is love essential to a flourishing human life? How do parental love, sibling love, friendship love, erotic love, and romantic love differ? And, what do they have in common?

This course will explore both historical and contemporary philosophical perspectives on both sex and love. Most people spend surprisingly little time actually *thinking* through issues concerning sex and love despite the fact that they play such a fundamental role in our lives. A central aim of this course is to provide students with the theoretical tools to explore the longstanding philosophical concept of love that is so central to human life. This course will strengthen students’ critical thinking skills as well as their ability to read and write about moral and social/political philosophy.

IV. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Your final grade is determined on the basis of participation during class, pop quizzes, two exams, and a final paper. These requirements will be weighed as follows:

Participation and Attendance — 10%

You are expected to attend every class, to have read the assigned readings before class, and to bring your textbook, articles, and your syllabus with you to every class. This class is intended to be significantly discussion-oriented. Poor attendance will adversely affect your participation grade, but (good) participation in class will improve your participation grade. The quality, not just the quantity, of your participation is most important. I will call on students to answer specific questions about the assignments.

Regular, punctual attendance is expected; participation in class discussion is strongly encouraged. Regular failure to attend, participate, or bring the day's assigned readings to class will result in a failing participation grade. **Failure to attend at least 75% of classes (without a valid medical excuse) will result in an automatic failing grade in the course.**

CLASSROOM ETIQUETTE: Cell phones should be silenced; I reserve the right to answer any phone that rings during class. Texting is absolutely forbidden; anyone caught texting will be asked to leave class immediately and will be considered absent for that class.

Reading Quizzes — 15%

There will be some number of pop quizzes, always given in the first few minutes of class. These pop quizzes are designed to test whether you have done the assigned reading. I will offer a make-up quiz only with a *documented* excuse. At the end of the course, the lowest quiz grade will be dropped.

Two Exams — 50%

There will be two exams; each exam is worth 25% of your final grade. Both exams will include two portions. One portion will be done in class—a standard short answer, multiple choice, and fill-in-the-blank exam. The second portion will be a take-home essay, that you have 48 hours to complete, that must be 3-5 pages, typed and double-spaced, with 1-inch margins, and 12-point font.

The Essay — 25%

The essay should philosophically analyze the arguments made in at least one of the articles or books we've read in class. You are responsible for choosing your own topic; you are highly encouraged to do this in close consultation with me. This paper should be between 10-12 pages. This paper should be typed and double-spaced, with 1-inch margins and 12-point font.

V. RUBRIC

For an explanation of what is expected from your essay assignments (both exams and the essay), see the attached rubric developed by Carnegie Mellon University's Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence.

VI. EXPECTATIONS

In general, I expect that you will not interfere with your classmates' ability to learn in the classroom. I expect you to show courtesy and respect to me and to your fellow classmates. While class is in session, please do not send text messages, surf the internet, make or answer phone calls, read things unrelated

to the course, listen to headphones, etc. Please try your best to arrive on time for class. If you work or have some other obligation that will regularly cause you to miss class or come in more than fifteen minutes late, I highly recommend that you drop this course.

For discussion to be productive, everyone must participate and must be respectful of others. People might feel passionate or sensitive about particular topics that we will discuss. I will try hard, and I ask all of you to try hard, to be sensitive and respectful of each other's feelings. Being respectful, however, is not the same as accepting the views of others uncritically. I respect all of the thinkers whose work we will read this quarter. But, I will be prepared to criticize all of their arguments, and I would do it to their faces if they were here. This is a philosophy class, the sort of environment where we should subject each other's ideas to the same critical scrutiny to which we subject our own ideas. We owe it to each other to point out what we think are flaws in the arguments other people put forward. To do less than that is to patronize them; it is to assume that they can't face the truth, or can't think rigorously. Of course there may be some issues about which, in the end, we think that people can reasonably disagree. But in order to find out which issues those are, we must be ready to pursue the discussion—to do some philosophy.

That said, if you find that you are uncomfortable with the content or tone of the discussion, please let me know as soon as possible.

Pep Talk: There is no doubt—philosophy is hard. You will find yourself grappling with ideas and language that are likely to seem quite obscure on the first read. My suggestion is to give the article a quick skim and then go back and read it a second time slowly. This process might sound incredibly time-consuming, but you will find that the ideas sink in much more deeply, and this will save you time and energy in the end.

VII. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. The term “academic misconduct” includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee (Faculty Rule 3335-5-487). For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct <http://studentlife.osu.edu/csc/>.

VIII. DISABILITIES SERVICES

Students with disabilities that have been certified by the Office for Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs. The Office for Disability Services is located in 150 Pomerene Hall, 1760 Neil Avenue; telephone 292.3307, TDD 292.0901; <http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu/>.

IX. READINGS: We will be reading many of the following articles. I will confirm what the next class's reading will be at the end of each class. I reserve the right to make changes to the assigned readings, the order, or the due dates of assignments. You must have a copy of the reading with you in class on the day it is being discussed.

(I) LOVE

1. WHAT IS LOVE?

Thomas Merton, "Love and Need: Is Love a Package or a Message?"

Jonathan Franzen, "Liking Is for Cowards. Go for What Hurts."

David Foster Wallace, *This is Water*

Plato, *The Symposium*

Jean Paul Sartre, *No Exit*

Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, "The Woman in Love"

Robert Kraut, "Love De Re"

Arthur Schopenhauer, "The Metaphysics of the Love of the Sexes"

2. THE MORAL AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF LOVE: MARRIAGE

Emma Goldman, "Marriage and Love"

Cheshire Calhoun, "In Defense of Same-Sex Marriage"

Claudia Card, "Against Marriage and Motherhood"

Bryan Weaver and Fiona Woollard, "Marriage and the Norm of Monogamy"

(II) SEX

1. WHAT IS SEX?

Greta Christina, "Are We Having Sex Now, or What?"

Thomas Nagel, "Sexual Perversion"

Robert Solomon, "Sex and Perversion"

Peter Singer, "Heavy Petting"

Louise Collins, "Is Cybersex Sex?"

Alan Soble, "Masturbation, Again"

2. THE MORAL AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF SEX

Martha Nussbaum, "Objectification"

Bonnie Mann, "Creepers, Flirts, Heroes and Allies: Four Theses on Men and Sexual Harassment"

Martha Nussbaum, "'Whether from Reason or Prejudice': Taking Money for Bodily Services"

Catharine MacKinnon, "Pornography, Civil Rights, and Speech"

Nancy Bauer, "Pornutopia"; Ann Barnhill's comments on "Pornutopia"

Sandra Bartky, "Feminine Masochism and the Politics of Personal Transformation"

(III) ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Troy Jollimore, *Love's Vision*

Raja Halwani, *Philosophy of Love, Sex, and Marriage: An Introduction*

Robert M. Stewart, *Philosophical Perspectives on Sex and Love*

Harry Frankfurt, "The Dear Self"

Bennett W. Helm, *Love, Friendship, and the Self: Intimacy, Identification, and the Social Nature of Persons*

Hichem Naar, "A Dispositional Theory of Love"

Irving Singer, *Philosophy of Love: A Partial Summing-Up*

X. TENTATIVE SCHEDULE (ACCORDING TO EACH WEEK OF THE SEMESTER)

Jan 6: What is Love? (Merton, Franzen)

Jan 13: What is Love? (Wallace, Plato)

Jan 20: What is Love? (Plato, Sarte)

Jan 27: What is Love? (Sarte, de Beauvoir)

Feb 3: What is Love? (Kraut, Schopenhauer)

Feb 10: Moral and Political Implications (Goldman, Calhoun); **Exam**

Feb 17: Moral and Political Implications (Card, Weaver/Woollard)

Feb 24: What is Sex? (Christina, Nagel)

March 3: What is Sex? (Solomon, Singer); Paper prep; Catch-up

March 10: Spring Break

March 17: What is Sex? (Collins, Soble)

March 24: Moral and Political Implications (Nussbaum); **Paper Due**

March 31: Moral and Political Implications (Mann, Nussbaum)

April 7: Moral and Political Implications (MacKinnon, Bauer, Barnhill)

April 14: Moral and Political Implications (Bartky); Catch-up/Review

April 21: Finals Week; **Exam**

	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
CONTENT				
Argument				
Thesis	A clear statement of the main conclusion of the paper.	The thesis is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.	The thesis is present, but must be uncovered or reconstructed from the text of the paper.	There is no thesis.
Premises	Each reason for believing the thesis is made clear, and as much as possible, presented in single statements. It is also clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. If there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are clear, and made in single statements. The premises which are taken as given are at least plausibly true.	The premises are all clear, although each may not be presented in a single statement. It is also pretty clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. If there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are clear. The premises which are taken as given are at least plausibly true.	The premises must be reconstructed from the text of the paper. It is not made clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. There are no sub-arguments, or, if there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are not made clear. The paper does not provide sub-arguments for controversial premises. The plausibility of the premises which are taken as given is questionable.	There are no premises—the paper merely restates the thesis. Or, if there are premises, they are much more likely to be false than true.
Support	The premises clearly support the thesis, and the author is aware of exactly the kind of support they provide. The argument is either valid as it stands, or, if invalid, the thesis, based on the premises, is likely to	The premises support the thesis, and the author is aware of the general kind of support they provide. The argument is either valid as it stands, or, if invalid, the thesis, based on the premises, is likely to be or plausibly true.	The premises somewhat support the thesis, but the author is not aware of the kind of support they provide. The argument is invalid, and the thesis, based on the premises, is not likely to be or plausibly true.	The premises do not support the thesis.

	be or plausibly true.			
Counter-Arguments	The paper considers both obvious and unobvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, and provides original and/or thoughtful responses.	The paper considers obvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, and provides responses.	The paper may consider some obvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, but some obvious ones are missed. Responses are non-existent or mere claims of refutation.	No counter-examples, counter-arguments, or opposing positions are considered.
Understanding				
Text	The paper contains highly accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text. The paper uses appropriate textual support for these.	The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly accurate and precise, and has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices.	The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly accurate, but not precise, and the textual support is inappropriate.	The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is inaccurate and/or has no textual support.
Ideas	The paper contains a highly accurate and precise description of the issue or problem, along with a careful consideration of possible alternatives or solutions. The paper contains relevant examples, and indicates the salient issues the examples highlight.	The description of the problem or issue is fairly accurate and precise, and possible alternatives or solutions are considered. Examples are given, but similar examples may have been better.	The description of the problem or issue is fairly accurate but not precise, and possible alternatives or solutions are either not considered, or ill-described. Examples are given, but it is not made clear how they are relevant.	The description of the problem or issue is inaccurate, and possible alternatives or solutions are not considered, and examples are not provided.
Analysis	The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections	The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the	The paper breaks the argument, issue, or problem into parts, but some parts may be missing or unclear. The connections	The parts identified are not the correct and/or relevant ones. The connections between the parts are completely inaccurate.

	between the parts are clear and highly accurate.	parts are fairly accurate.	between the parts are somewhat accurate.	
Synthesis	The paper successfully integrates all relevant parts from various places into a coherent whole. The connections between the parts are clear and insightful.	The paper integrates most relevant parts from various places into a mostly coherent whole. The connections between the parts are generally clear.	The paper integrates some parts from various places into a somewhat coherent whole. The connections between the parts are somewhat unclear.	The parts to be integrated are not clear and/or relevant. The connections between the parts are unclear.
Evaluation				
Argument	The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking for adherence to various standards (validity, soundness, etc.), and checking for informal fallacies. The paper suggests how the argument could be made better according to the appropriate standard.	The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking for adherence to various standards (validity, soundness, etc.), and checking for informal fallacies.	The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking only the truth of the premises and/or the conclusion, and does not check for informal fallacies.	The paper evaluates the argument in question by whether the author agrees or disagrees with the conclusion or a premise.
Position	The paper evaluates the position in question by checking for support in an argument and internal consistency, and by exploring unmentioned plausible alternatives.	The paper evaluates the position in question by checking for support in an argument and internal consistency.	The paper evaluates the position in question by considering its plausibility.	The paper evaluates the position in question by whether the author agrees or disagrees with it.
Creation				
Thesis	Thesis is original, interesting, and relevant.	The thesis is interesting and relevant.	The thesis is slightly off-topic, obviously true (or false), or not	The thesis is totally irrelevant.

			really worth writing about.	
Examples	Examples are original, relevant, insightful, and well-used.	Examples are original, relevant, and well-used.	Examples are unoriginal, only somewhat relevant, and/or not well-used.	Examples are missing, irrelevant an/or misused.
Alternative Positions	Previously unmentioned alternative positions are explored.	Alternative positions are explored.	Alternative positions are mentioned but not explored.	Alternative positions are ignored.
STYLE				
Clarity	All sentences are complete and grammatical. All words are chosen for their precise meanings. All new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained. Good, clear examples are used to illuminate concepts and issues. Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang.	All sentences are complete and grammatical. Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts and theories are explained. Examples are clear. Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang.	A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. New or unusual terms are not well-defined. Key concepts and theories are not explained. Examples are not clear. Information (names, facts, etc.) is mostly accurate. Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang.	Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. The author does not acknowledge that key words have precise meanings. Information (names, facts, etc.) is inaccurate. Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang.
Organization				
Introduction	Thesis is clear, and contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with minimal fanfare. It is made clear how	Thesis is contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with little fanfare. It is generally clear how the paper will get to this conclusion, not	Thesis is not contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with too much fanfare. The flow of the paper is described as an outline, and not	Only the topic is introduced, with no description of the paper. Or, the paper is described inaccurately.

	the paper will get to this conclusion, not in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a concise summary of the steps in argument.	in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a description of the steps in argument.	as a description of the steps in argument.	
Body	It is very easy to follow the argument. It is made explicit which claims are being used as premises, and how these premises are supposed to support the thesis. New premises are each introduced in new paragraphs or sections. If there are sub-arguments, it is made explicit which argument is the main one, and which are the secondary ones.	It is generally easy to follow the argument. It is clear which claims are being used as premises, and how these premises are supposed to support the thesis. Usually, new premises are introduced in new paragraphs or sections. If there are sub-arguments, it is clear which argument is the main one, and which are the secondary ones.	It is somewhat difficult to follow the argument. It is somewhat unclear which claims are being used as premises, and/or how these premises are supposed to support the thesis. Separate premises are lumped together in the same paragraphs or sections. If there are sub-arguments, it is not clear which argument is the main one, and which are the secondary ones.	It is impossible to follow the argument. It is completely unclear which claims are being used as premises. It is completely unclear how the premises are supposed to support the thesis. Premises are discussed randomly, or not at all. There seem to be many arguments, and it is completely unclear which is the main one.
Conclusion	The paper uses the conclusion to tie up loose ends. For example, the paper considers objections to the argument to which it is acknowledged there is no space or expertise to respond. Or, the paper briefly considers the implications of the acceptance of the conclusion for a larger argument, or for	The paper uses the conclusion to tie up some loose ends, but combines this with a restatement of the introduction.	The conclusion is merely a restatement of the introduction.	The conclusion is missing.

	a larger issue or problem. Or the paper explains what further work may need to be done in this area.			
--	---	--	--	--

O'Keeffe, Susan

From: Moddelmog, Debra
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:33 AM
To: Hubin, Don; Bystydzienski, Jill
Cc: D'Arms, Justin; 'Alison Kerr (kerr.150@osu.edu)'; Taschek, William; O'Keeffe, Susan; blackburn.99@osu.edu
Subject: RE: New Philosophy Course Concurrence Request

Dear Don,

Professor Mollie Blackburn and I, co-directors of the Sexuality Studies program, give our concurrence to the addition of Philosophy 3430 (Philosophy of Sex and Love) to the OSU curriculum. It should be a course that a variety of our undergraduate Sexuality Studies minors and majors will be interested in taking, and since the focus of the course is on sex and sexuality, we can also make it one of our central courses (rather than an elective), which will give the course more visibility to both advisers and students. Please keep us apprised of the fate of the course; when it is formally approved, we will start advertising it to our students.

Thanks for letting us know about this course. We're delighted to add Philosophy to the many departments that contribute courses to the interdisciplinary program in Sexuality Studies.

On behalf of us both,

Debra

Professor of English
Co-Director, Sexuality Studies Program
Director, Diversity and Identity Studies Collective at OSU (DISCO)
Ohio State University
421 Denney Hall
164 W. 17th Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210-1370
<https://sexualitystudies.osu.edu>
<https://disco.osu.edu>

From: Hubin, Don
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 2:58 PM
To: Bystydzienski, Jill; Moddelmog, Debra
Cc: D'Arms, Justin; 'Alison Kerr (kerr.150@osu.edu)'; Taschek, William; O'Keeffe, Susan
Subject: New Philosophy Course Concurrence Request

Hi Jill and Debra,

The Philosophy Department is proposing a new course, Philosophy of Sex and Love (3430), which we hope to be able to schedule for next spring. Because of the timing, we are not, at this time, seeking GE status for the course, though that might be something we'll pursue later. We would very much appreciate it if Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

and the Sexuality Studies Program would review the attached syllabus and send a note of concurrence for the course. (As I understand it, an email note is sufficient for these purposes.)

We don't envision this course being a large one but it is, we believe, an important addition to OSU's strength in sexuality studies. We have many courses that address different aspects of human sexuality; this one will contribute to that range of courses by addressing the uniquely philosophical aspects of sex and love.

As we are coming up on a deadline, I'd very much appreciate it if you could provide your response soon if that's possible.

Best,

Don

P.S. to Jill: Sending this message reminded me that I still owe you a response to your request about the Elizabeth Gee speaker. I'll send that later this afternoon, along with my apologies for the delay.



Donald C. Hubin

Professor & Department Chair

College of Arts & Sciences, Department of Philosophy

350 University Hall, 230 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210-1365

614-292-2510 (Office)

hubin.1@osu.edu

<http://philosophy.osu.edu/people/hubin>

O'Keeffe, Susan

From: Bystydzienski, Jill
Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:33 PM
To: Hubin, Don; Moddelmog, Debra
Cc: D'Arms, Justin; Alison Kerr; Taschek, William; O'Keeffe, Susan; blackburn.99@osu.edu
Subject: RE: New Philosophy Course Concurrence Request

Don,

I just heard back from the WGSS Undergraduate Studies Committee which reviews all requests for course concurrences. They gave concurrence to Philosophy 3430 - Philosophy of Sex and Love. We all look forward to the addition of this course to the ASC curriculum.

Best,
Jill

From: Hubin, Don
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:55 PM
To: Moddelmog, Debra; Bystydzienski, Jill
Cc: D'Arms, Justin; Alison Kerr; Taschek, William; O'Keeffe, Susan; blackburn.99@osu.edu
Subject: Re: New Philosophy Course Concurrence Request

Thanks Debra.

Don

Sent from my phone; please forgive typos & terseness.

----- Reply message -----

From: "Moddelmog, Debra" <Moddelmog.1@osu.edu>
To: "Hubin, Don" <Hubin.1@osu.edu>, "Bystydzienski, Jill" <Bystydzienski.1@osu.edu>
Cc: "D'Arms, Justin" <darms.1@osu.edu>, "Alison Kerr" <kerr.150@osu.edu>, "Taschek, William" <taschek.1@osu.edu>, "O'Keeffe, Susan" <okeeffe.10@osu.edu>, "blackburn.99@osu.edu" <blackburn.99@osu.edu>
Subject: New Philosophy Course Concurrence Request
Date: Fri, May 17, 2013 9:33 am

Dear Don,

Professor Mollie Blackburn and I, co-directors of the Sexuality Studies program, give our concurrence to the addition of Philosophy 3430 (Philosophy of Sex and Love) to the OSU curriculum. It should be a course that a variety of our undergraduate Sexuality Studies minors and majors will be interested in taking, and since the focus of the course is on sex and sexuality, we can also make it one of our central courses (rather than an elective), which will give the course more visibility to both advisers and students. Please keep us apprised of the fate of the course; when it is formally approved, we will start advertising it to our students.