

EXPERTISE: ITS NATURE AND USES

Philosophy 576

Fall 2015

W 3:30-6:30pm

Cohen 493

Professor: Alexander Guerrero

Email: aguerr@upenn.edu

Office: Cohen 424

Office Hour: W 11am-12pm and by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is an examination of the idea of expertise and its applications in scientific, legal, moral, and political contexts. One aim of the course is to consider proposals regarding the nature of expertise. What makes someone an expert? What is the relationship between expertise and knowledge? What is the relationship between expertise and experience? When is expertise possible in some context of inquiry or knowledge?

For the non-experts (and that is all of us, in some context or other): how can we identify that someone is an expert? When is it permissible or obligatory to rely on the testimony of experts? How can we harness the value of expertise?

We will consider these general questions, but we will spend much of the course engaging with these general questions by looking at more contextually specific questions.

Are there moral experts? Is there something particularly troublesome about relying on moral testimony? Should there be bioethics experts with a role in medical decisionmaking and allocation decisions?

Who should be able to count as an expert for the purpose of legal proceedings? How should we determine if someone is an expert for the purposes of legal decisionmaking?

What is the nature of scientific expertise? Is science a value-free enterprise? How is democracy compatible with the existence of expertise? How should we incorporate scientific expertise into political decisionmaking?

We will consider all of these questions and others throughout the course.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Sandra Harding, ed., *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader* (2004)

Philip Kitcher, *Science, Truth, and Democracy* (2001)

All other readings will be made available on the course website.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

I. TALKING

(A) Come to class, be prepared, talk regularly. **(15% of grade)**

(B) In addition to that, each person taking the class for credit will be required to be a “commentator” on one of the readings for one of the meetings of the course. This role should be treated as if you were serving as a commentator for a conference (like one of the American Philosophical Association conferences) and you have been assigned a paper on which to comment. **(15% of grade)**

You will have no more than 7 minutes total for your comments and you will be expected to make a handout.

You need only offer as much description and summary as is necessary to understand your critical points (which might be focused entirely on one part of one argument), and you should see your role as offering critical commentary on an argument or claim made by the author of the relevant reading.

You will need to practice giving your comments so that they can fit in the allotted time, and you will need to meet with me and send me your handout at least one day in advance of the course meeting at which you will offer your comments.

II. WRITING

Undergraduates have two options:

Option One: (a) 2000-2500 word paper, due 10/30 **(30% of grade)**

(b) 2500-3000 word paper, due 12/11 **(40% of grade)**

Option Two: 7000-7500 word paper, due 12/18 **(70% of grade)**

Graduate students have one option:

7000-9000 word paper, due 12/18 **(70% of grade)**

Details will be provided in class.

ACCESSIBILITY

I want this class to be a great and educational experience for all of you, and all of you are entitled to equal access to educational opportunities at Penn. Disabled students are encouraged to speak with me if that would be helpful and to avail themselves of the services provided by the Office of Student Disability Services: <http://www.vpul.upenn.edu/lrc/sds/>

PLAGIARISM AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

You are expected to be familiar with and to abide by Penn’s policy on academic and intellectual integrity: <http://www.upenn.edu/academicintegrity/index.html>

PLAN FOR COURSE AND READINGS

Day	Topic	Reading
INTRODUCTION		
8/26	Motivation for the Course	Alvin Goldman, "Experts: Which Ones Should You Trust?," <i>Philosophy and Phenomenological Research</i> (2001) Plato, <i>Charmides</i> , 164c to end (176d)
I. EXPERTISE IN GENERAL		
9/2	Analyzing Expertise	A. Harry Collins and Robert Evans, <i>Rethinking Expertise</i> , Introduction, Chapter 1, Chapter 2 (2007) K. Anders Ericsson, "Introduction to Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance," in <i>The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance</i> (2006) Micheline T. H. Chi, "Two Approaches to the Study of Experts' Characteristics," in <i>The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance</i> (2006)
9/9	Relying on and Assessing Expertise	B. Douglas Walton, <i>Appeal to Expert Opinion: Arguments from Authority</i> (1997), Chapter 7, pp. 199-229 C. Harry Collins and Martin Weinel, "Transmuted Expertise: How Technical Non-Experts Can Assess Experts and Expertise," <i>Argumentation</i> (2011) D. John Hardwig, "Epistemic Dependence," <i>Journal of Philosophy</i> (1985), pp. 335-349 Elizabeth Anderson, "'Democracy, Public Policy, and Lay Assessments of Scientific Testimony,'" <i>Episteme</i> 8.2 (2011): 144-164.
II. EXPERTISE AND EXPERIENCE		
9/16	Standpoint Theory	E. Nancy Hartsock, "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism," in <i>The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader</i> (Ed. Sandra Harding, 2004) F. Sandra Harding, "Rethinking Standpoint

		<p>Epistemology: What Is Strong Objectivity?" in <i>Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader</i> (Ed. Sandra Harding, 2004)</p> <p>Susan Hekman, "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited," in <i>Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader</i> (Ed. Sandra Harding, 2004)</p> <p>Patricia Hill Collins, "Comment on Hekman's 'Truth and Method': Where's the Power?" in <i>The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader</i> (Ed. Sandra Harding, 2004)</p> <p>G. Alison Wylie, "Why Standpoint Matters," in <i>Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader</i> (Ed. Sandra Harding, 2004)</p>
9/23	Experience and Expertise	<p>H. Hubert Dreyfus, "How Far is Distance Learning from Education?" from <i>On the Internet</i> (2008)</p> <p>I. Evan Selinger & Robert Crease, "Dreyfus on Expertise: The Limits of Phenomenological Analysis," <i>Continental Philosophy Review</i> (2005)</p> <p>K. Andres Ericsson, "The Influence of Experience and Deliberate Practice on the Development of Superior Expert Performance," in <i>The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance</i> (2006) (Chap 38)</p> <p>J. Sarah McGrath, "Moral Knowledge and Experience," in <i>Oxford Studies in Metaethics</i>, Volume 6 (2011)</p>
III. EXPERTISE AND MORALITY		
9/30	Are there moral experts?	<p>Peter Singer, "Moral Experts," <i>Analysis</i> (1972): 115-117</p> <p>K. Sarah McGrath "Skepticism about Moral Expertise as a Puzzle for Moral Realism," <i>Journal of Philosophy</i> 108 (3):111-137 (2011)</p> <p>L. Julia Annas, "Moral Knowledge as Practical Knowledge," <i>Social Philosophy & Policy</i> 18 (2001) 236-256</p>
10/7	What is moral expertise like?	<p>M. Darcia Narvaez & Daniel Lapsley, "The psychological foundations of everyday morality and moral expertise," in <i>D.K. Lapsley & Power, C. (Eds.), Character Psychology and Character Education</i> (2005), pp. 140-165</p> <p>N. Julia Driver, "Moral expertise: Judgment, practice, and analysis," <i>Social Philosophy and Policy</i> 30 (1-2)</p>

		(2013), pp. 280-296 O. Justin Tiwald, “Xunzi on Moral Expertise,” <i>Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy</i> (2012)
10/14	What do Ethicists Do? Are Ethicists Moral Experts? Do They Need to Be?	P. Michael Lacewing, “Expert Moral Intuition and Its Development: A Guide to the Debate,” <i>Topoi</i> (2013), pp. 1-17 Q. Regina Rini, “Analogies, Moral Intuitions, and the Expertise Defence,” <i>Review of Philosophy and Psychology</i> 5 (2) (2014), pp. 169-181 R. George Agich, “What Kind of Doing is Clinical Ethics?,” <i>Theoretical Medicine</i> 26 (2005), pp. 7-24 David Casarett, Frona Daskal, and John Latos, “Experts in Ethics? The Authority of the Clinical Ethicist,” <i>Hastings Center Report</i> 28(6) (1998), pp. 6-11 Scot D. Yoder, “Experts in Ethics? The Nature of Ethical Expertise,” <i>Hastings Center Report</i> 28 (1998), pp. 11-19
IV. EXPERTISE AND LAW		
10/16	Experts in Legal Proceedings	S. Douglas Walton, <i>Appeal to Expert Opinion: Arguments from Authority</i> (1997), Chapter 6, pp. 167-198 T. Susan Haack, “Of Truth, In Science and Law,” <i>Brooklyn Law Review</i> (2008) U. Scott Brewer, “Scientific Expert Testimony and Intellectual Due Process,” in <i>The Philosophy of Expertise</i> (Ed. Evan Selinger and Robert Crease, 2006), pp. 111-158 Federal Rule of Evidence 702 and Notes: https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/rule_702 <u>Additional Reading:</u> Frye v. United States (1923) (excerpt) Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmaceuticals Inc. (1993) George Agich and Bethany Spielman, “Future of Bioethics Testimony: Guidelines for Determining Qualifications, Reliability, and Helpfulness,” <i>San Diego Law Review</i> , (1999)

V. EXPERTISE AND SCIENCE

10/21	What Makes Someone a Scientific Expert?	<p>Sven Ove Hansson, “Science and Pseudo-Science,” <i>Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i> (2014): http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pseudo-science/</p> <p>V. Massimo Pigliucci, “The demarcation problem: a (belated) response to Laudan,” in <i>Massimo Pigliucci & Maarten Boudry (eds.), Philosophy of Pseudoscience: Reconsidering the Demarcation Problem</i> (2013)</p> <p>W. Philip Kitcher, <i>Science, Truth, and Democracy</i> (2001), pp. 3-91</p> <p><u>Additional Reading:</u></p> <p>Carlo Martini, “Experts in science: a view from the trenches,” <i>Synthese</i> 191 (1) (2014), pp. 3-15</p> <p>Susan Haack, “Trial and Error: The Supreme Court’s Philosophy of Science,” <i>American Journal of Public Health</i> (2005)</p>
--------------	---	---

VI. BRINGING EXPERTISE INTO POLITICS

10/28	Democratic Science and Scientific Democracy	<p>X. Philip Kitcher, <i>Science, Truth, and Democracy</i> (2001), pp. 93-166, 181-201</p> <p>Y. Kyle Powys Whyte & Robert Crease, “Trust, Expertise and the Philosophy of Science,” <i>Synthese</i> 177 (3) (2010): 411-425.</p> <p>Michael Fuerstein, “Epistemic Democracy and the Social Character of Knowledge,” <i>Episteme</i> 5 (2008)</p>
11/4	Not just the Expert/Non-Expert problem: ignorance, its manufacture, and capture	<p>Jason Brennan, <i>Against Politics</i> (2015), excerpts</p> <p>Charles Mills, “White Ignorance,” in Shannon Sullivan Nancy Tuana (ed.), <i>Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance</i> (2007) pp. 11-38</p> <p>David Michaels, “Manufactured Uncertainty,” <i>Contested Science and the Protection of the Public’s Health and Environment</i>, in <i>Agnotology: The Making and Unmaking of Ignorance</i> (Ed. by Robert Proctor & Londa Schiebinger, 2008)</p>

		<p>Jon Christensen, “Smoking Out Objectivity: Journalistic Gears in the Agnotogenesis Machine,” in <i>Agnotology: The Making and Unmaking of Ignorance</i> (Ed. by Robert Proctor & Londa Schiebinger, 2008)</p> <p>2014 Data on Lobbying by Industry</p> <p>Kevin Leyden, “Interest Group Resources and Testimony at Congressional Hearings,” <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i>, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Aug., 1995), pp. 431-439</p>
12/2	Institutional Realities and Possibilities	<p>Z. Archon Fung, “Recipes for Public Spheres: Eight Institutional Design Choices and Their Consequences” <i>Journal of Political Philosophy</i>, Vol. 11, No. 3. (September 2003): 338-67</p> <p>Archon Fung, “Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance,” <i>Public Administration Review</i>, Vol. 66 (December 2006): 66-75</p> <p>AA. Heather Douglas, “Inserting the public into science,” in <i>Democratization of Expertise?</i> (2005): pp. 153-169</p> <p>Marie Collins Swabey, “Publicity and Measurement,” <i>Ethics</i> (1930)</p> <p>Andrew Popper, Gwendolyn McKee, Anthony Varona, Philip Harter, “An Introduction to Administrative Law,” <u>Administrative Law: A Contemporary Approach</u>, (2013), skip the cases</p>
12/9	Institutional Possibilities and the Possibility of Principled Choice of Experts	<p>Mark Warren on Citizens’ Assemblies (readings TBD)</p> <p>Guerrero on Lottocracy and Expertise (reading TBD)</p>