Memorandum in Support of Either PHIL 210 or the PHIL 210-211 Sequence Meeting the General Education, Group III: Symbolic Systems Requirement

Depending upon how high the ASCRC sets the minimally acceptable substantive criteria for meeting the new Group III Symbolic Systems requirement, either Deductive Logic (PHIL 210) standing alone or Deductive Logic (PHIL 210) and Applied Logic (PHIL 211) meet—indeed, meet *paradigmatically*—the “Criteria” and “Learning Goals” that are set forth in the new Group III Symbolic Systems requirement. There is no reasonable justification for not including one of these two options in this new requirement (which, no doubt, is why the PHIL 210-211 sequence is included under the “Foreign Languages/Symbolic Systems” competency requirement of the present General Education framework).

The language appended to “Group III: Modern and Classical Languages or Symbolic Systems” indicates that “students may substitute a symbolic system sequence required by their major and approved by ASCRC.” This requirement cuts against the very purpose of the General Education requirements, which is to develop in students a broad range of competencies that their majors might not develop alone. The ultimate question is what reasonably satisfies a Symbolic Systems requirement, and courses in logic clearly do. As things now stand, however, our logic courses are whipsawed by your obiter dictum. Either PHIL 210 alone substantively satisfies the Symbolic Systems requirement, in which case your “major” but not “sequence” requirement is achieved, or PHIL 210 and PHIL 211 substantively satisfy the requirement, in which case your “sequence” but not “major” requirement is achieved. Yet, neither one of these requirements goes to the heart of the matter, namely, what courses, and at what level of competence, satisfy the requirement.

We look forward to addressing the ASCRC subcommittee to respond to questions or concerns that it might have with respect to this Symbolic Systems submission.