

Course description and syllabus, First-Year Seminar HONR 101C
THE ETHICS OF COMBAT: GREECE, ROME & JAPAN
“I reserve the right to adjust this syllabus as necessary”

Prof. Pedar W. Foss: 305E Harrison; Tel. x4601; pfoss@depauw.edu
Office Hours: **TR 10-12 in Julian 104**
Syllabus and teaching materials on Moodle: <http://moodle.depauw.edu>
Class: 8:20-9:50 T R; Julian 111

[Description] This course examines the ethics of combat—using historical examples ranging from ancient Greece and Rome to the world of feudal Japan. The purpose is to investigate what codes of conduct have operated in these societies with regard to: the prior justification for, immediate operation of, and after-the-fact assessment of, hostile action by individuals, groups, or states. After a segment that is concerned with Eastern and Western philosophical approaches to the question of conflict and war, we shall investigate historically and culturally specific case studies of combat presented through ancient literature and art, and through modern cinema. From Homer’s accounts of fighting in the *Iliad*, to the civil conflict of the Peloponnesian War and Euripides’ contemplation of war’s cost in the *Trojan Women*; to Roman law about declaring war, gladiatorial combat in the arena, or artistic presentations of imperial conquest; to Japanese samurai like Miyamoto Musashi involved in nationwide battles and individual duels ca. AD 1600, we ask: When have we fought, and for what reasons? Using what rules for behavior? With what effects upon non-combatants? How are such events and behaviors described in literature, history, and art? We also look at the physiological and psychological conditions and effects of combat: how do our brains and bodies operate under severe short-term stress and with what long-term repercussions? Beside three short papers that call for close readings of texts, ancient art, and film, there is a 10-week experiential project: Tuesday evening (8:10-9:00 pm) training in combat at a local *dojo*, taught by a martial arts master. Ultimately, in our literary, historical, and artistic investigations and our experiential and creative study, we consider how combat against ‘others’ cannot be considered outside of an internal struggle over mastery of one’s self.

[Grading] **NOTE: YOU MUST COMPLETE ALL REQUIREMENTS IN ORDER TO PASS THE COURSE**

Participation	40%	-- class participation:	%25
		-- Moodle forum:	%15
Written Expression	60%	-- literary analysis, w/draft (750 words)	%20
		-- artistic analysis (750 words)	%20
		-- cinematic analysis (1000 words)	%20

NOTE: THIS CLASS CAN EARN YOUR ‘W’ CERTIFICATION

[Participation]

• class participation: Be prepared, active, interested, involved, critical and imaginative. This grade includes **attendance** (5%), based on the straight percentage of classes you attend. Note: If you miss 11 or more classes, *you fail the course*. Two excused absences = one unexcused absence. Twice late for class = one unexcused absence. I evaluate participation weekly. Participation in the *dojo* training is included in this part of your grade. Training will occur in ten sessions at the All-American Karate Academy, 1021 Indianapolis Rd., Suite D (Tel. 765-655-1300) in Greencastle on 6, 13, 20, 27 Sept; 4, 11, 25 Oct, and 1, 8, 15 Nov. (29 Nov. will be a make-up date if necessary.). Wear light, comfortable, loose-fitting clothes. If you have any medical conditions that affect your ability to engage in high-level physical activity, please let me know so we can make accommodations.

Here is the **grading rubric for participation** in class:

'C' range: The student meets the basic requirements of participation. This student is usually prepared and participates once in a while but not regularly. This student's contributions relate to the texts and the lectures and offer a few insightful ideas, but do not facilitate a discussion. Failure to fulfill satisfactorily any of these criteria will result in a grade *below* a 'C'.

'B' range: This student participates consistently in discussion. This student comes to class well prepared and contributes quite regularly by sharing thoughts and questions that show insight and a familiarity with the material. This student refers to the materials discussed in lecture and shows interest in other students' contributions.

'A' range: This student is fully engaged and highly motivated. This student is well prepared, having read the assigned texts, and has thought carefully about the texts' relation to issues raised in class. This student's ideas and questions are substantive (either constructive or critical); they stimulate class discussions. This student listens and responds to the contributions of other students.

- **Moodle forum:** A continuing discussion of issues raised by the readings and films: their content, style, message and meaning, and how they inform each other. This is an open discussion, but participants must be polite; they should offer argument and cite specific evidence or examples instead of just offering opinions, and they should try to raise interesting questions as well as attempt to derive convincing answers. Students are encouraged to bring issues from the Moodle discussion into class time, and vice-versa. For ten readings or films throughout the term (marked by {**FORUM**} on the schedule), you will be asked to respond to prompts by posting reactions, questions, challenges, alternate hypotheses, or other kinds of discussion on the Moodle Forum. Here is the grading rubric for the Forum, graded on a scale of 1-20. Posts are due by 8:00 am on the day for which they are assigned.

0: No post

1-3 ('F' range): Token participation. No discernible effort.

4-11: Late post (after 8:00 am); '4-5' would have been a 'D'; '6-7' a 'C'; '8-9' a 'B'; '10-11' an 'A'.

12-13 ('D' range): Comments are largely filler; they repeat previous conversation without adding anything new; any questions offered are too vague and broad to be actionable; limited demonstration of how the readings, lectures or previous discussion have been digested and contemplated. No reference to specific sources or specific evidence; relies principally on negative evidence, opinion or speculation; rampant assumptions; prefers simple or easy answers and rhetorical questions.

14-15 ('C' range): offers occasional thoughtful question or insightful commentary; limited evidence for deep reading; adds little to discussion; sometimes moves discussion forward; tends toward assumptions, simplifications and generalizations; infrequent citation of specific evidence. Follows the crowd; does the work, tries to stay 'safe', but little else; inconsistent and often last-second participation.

16-17 ('B' range): Shows completion and integration of readings; often offers thoughtful questions or insightful commentary; often cites specific supporting evidence. Moves discussion forward but does not take it to a new level; assumptions and bias are not absent, but neither are they great obstacles. Tends to follow along with discussion, but sometimes sparks new tacks or brings in additional evidence. Interested in the issues, but not intellectually dedicated to them.

18-20 ('A' range): Careful, thoughtful questions, insightful comments, and consistent citation of specific supporting evidence. Takes what has been said, and then advances the discussion to a new level, or begins a new thread of discussion with clear, focussed questions that avoid assumption and limit bias. Not content with easy answers. Complex understanding and use of the readings are springboards to self-motivated investigation of essential problems. Often searches for additional evidence beyond the prescribed readings, from outside sources. Constantly demonstrates deep concern for the issues and evidence, not for showing off how smart s/he is.

[Written Expression]

To receive a 'W' certification:

You must receive a total of at least 13 out of 18 'W' points from the three Written Expression assignments listed above, according to the following 'criteria for six-point scoring guide for 'W' classes':

CRITERIA FOR SIX-POINT SCORING GUIDE FOR ‘W’ CLASSES, DEPAUW UNIVERSITYThe DePauw W-Center*Top-Half Criteria*

a) Central Idea: stated or clearly implied	6 pts: Competent overall; few, if any, minor deficiencies
b) Overall pattern of development: discernible beginning, middle, end	5 pts: Competent overall; only minor deficiencies (e.g., imbalanced development, some important assertions lack support)
c) Paragraph construction: discernible beginning, middle, end; generalizations are rare, but if present, supported with details or examples	4 pts: Marginally competent, but with deficiencies (idea only implied, a gap in development, repetitious sentence pattern)
d) Sentences: clear; words appropriate	
e) Mechanics: no or very few errors of spelling, punctuation, grammar	

Bottom-Half Criteria

a) Central Idea: merely suggested to absent	3 pts: Marginally incompetent; reaching for but not quite achieving competence; serious deficiencies (e.g., the central idea only vaguely suggested, assertions irregularly explained or illustrated)
b) Overall pattern of development: inconsistent to non-existent	2 pts: Definitely incompetent; major deficiencies
c) Paragraph construction: little discernible pattern; inconsistent, inappropriate, irregular or no details and examples; rampant generalization	1 pts: Critically incompetent; grave deficiencies
d) Sentences: clouding of meaning; non-sensical	
e) Mechanics: many or repeated errors of spelling, punctuation, or grammar	

General suggestions for analytic papers

Consider your audience to be an educated, interested, intelligent person familiar with intellectual ideas in general, but perhaps not with the particular issues you discuss. It is prohibitively difficult to write a decent paper in one draft. After writing a draft, set the paper aside for a while and then read it carefully. How would you criticize the paper if it were someone else's? Do the passages you cite in your footnotes really say what you claim they say? Does the paper do what your introductory paragraph says it will do? Does the paper make a coherent whole (making an outline could help determine this)? To help, we will work through the book: *Style: The Basics of Clarity and Grace*, by J.M. Williams.

A draft is *required* for all papers (draft worth 1/3; the final version 2/3).

- Analytical Papers (literary, artistic, and cinematic)

An analytical paper requires thoughtful and cogent analysis. Your analytic paper should flow from some claim you are making and for which you will argue. **Support your claim** with appropriate and well-organized **evidence**. When you present your view, consider what might plausibly be said against it and respond to this. When you criticize someone else's view, consider how that person might reply to your objections.

Begin your paper with a short paragraph stating exactly what you will do in the paper. Make sure that this description matches what you do in the body of the paper. Avoid introductory blather and high-flown phrases about the beauty of ancient culture, that Homer is a great poet, or other such empty observations. **ABSOLUTELY AVOID OVER-GENERALIZATIONS** (e.g., “in the past, people were more violent than they are now...”). Such generalizations simply cannot be proved, and are almost always useless. Get down to business and get to specifics right away.

Make sure it is clear throughout the paper how each part of your paper contributes to the goal that you have set for yourself. Your paper must present an argument logically developed. Each point should lead to the next. Be sure to work out the stages in the argument using clear transitional sentences. Often the transitions are clear to you and completely obscure to your readers. Help them out.

The argument must be bolstered by evidence such as quotations from an author, a simple reference to a passage of an author, or sometimes reference to a modern work of scholarship. **Refer your reader to the original evidence for what you say. You must cite your sources; be sure you know what 'plagiarism' means, and avoid it! See the Student Handbook for the rules and procedures governing Academic Integrity at DePauw.** Consult the book by Charles Lipson, *Doing Honest Work in College*, which you received when you entered DePauw.

Keep the paper clear, simple, direct, and precise. The material you are discussing is complicated and ambiguous enough. Be careful in your use of technical terminology, theoretical jargon, or words invented or used in non-standard ways by the authors whose views you are addressing. If your claim or argument depends in any way on technical terminology, you will need to explain the terms.

When you are presenting an opposing view, the tone of your paper should never be sarcastic or derogatory. Present an opposing view or possible objections to your thesis in the most plausible way possible. It is easy to argue against an absurd view. Your own argument will be much stronger if you deal successfully with a worthy opponent. The **grading rubric for writing** is:

'C' range: This paper meets the basic requirements of the assignment: it offers a thesis of some kind, it refers to some evidence to support its thesis, and it presents a few points in service of its argument. Any paper will fall below a 'C' if it lacks one or more of these features.

'B' range: This paper's thesis is clear; the argument is unified and coherent, with appropriate evidence in support of its points. The argument shows comprehension of the material and manifests critical thinking about the issues raised in the course. The paper is well written and carefully proofread.

'A' range: This paper is outstanding in form and content. The thesis is clear and insightful; it is original, or it expands in a new way on ideas presented in the course. The evidence presented in support of the argument is carefully chosen and deftly handled. The argument is not only unified and coherent, but also complex and nuanced.

NOTE! Back up your files! 'The computer/disk crashed' is not a suitable excuse. For every day one of the major assignments is late, 3 points (1/3 of a grade) are lost. (They are all graded on a 1-100 scale.)

Texts: course readings (on Moodle), and five textbooks:

- *The Iliad*, by Homer; Stanley Lombardo, transl., Hackett, 1997.
- *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character*, by Jonathan Shay, Scribner, 1994.
- *The Book of Five Rings*, by Miyamoto Musashi; W. S. Wilson, transl., Kodansha 2002.
- *Style: The Basics of Clarity and Grace*, by Joseph M. Williams, Pearson-Longman, 3rd edition, 2009.
- *Trojan Women*, A. Shapiro, transl, Oxford, 2009.

Films (7):

- Ford Coppola, *Apocalypse Now Redux*; Jarmusch, *Ghost Dog*; Kurosawa, *Seven Samurai*, *Yojimbo*; Mamet, *Red Belt*; Okamoto, *Sword of Doom*; Spielberg, *Munich*.

SCHEDULE All Readings and Films are to be done by the day they are listed on the schedule. The schedule follows a number of rubrics, within overall segments, that shall ask questions, organize and frame our exploration of the issues, and which are meant to spark debate both in class and on the Moodle Forum. Days marked by FORUM require that you post a response on the Moodle Forum; Days marked by TRAINING take place in the dojo from 8:10-9:00 (10 weeks total). ASSIGNMENTS are listed so; PLEASE SUBMIT ALL ASSIGNMENTS AS PDF FILES TO THE MOODLE SITE.

day readings

PROLOGUE: TWO WARRIORS

- 1 R, 25 Aug **Reading 01:** the duel of Miyamoto Musashi and Sasaki Kojiro on Ganryu Island (W.S. Wilson, *The Lone Samurai*, 17-61). **Question:** No-one goes into battle empty of hand, mind, or soul; what do you think those two men 'carried' to that island? **FORUM 1**
- 2 T, 30 Aug **Reading 02:** Leonidas at Thermopylae (Herodotus, *Histories* 7.132-239). **Writing Reading 1:** Williams, Preface and Ch. 1. **Question:** From your reading in Herodotus' Histories, please identify as many different ethical dilemmas as you can in that account. How does the Father of History/Father of Lies identify and characterize 'good guys' and 'bad guys,' and why? **FORUM 2**

SEGMENT 1: SOME PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 3 R, 1 Sept **Rubric 1:** “The best is neither war nor faction - they are things we should pray to be spared from - but peace and mutual good will” (Plato, *Laws*, 628c). Is it best to avoid combat altogether? Is it *possible*? **Reading 03:** selections from Plato, in G. M. Reichberg, H. Syse and E. Begby, *The Ethics of War: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Blackwell 2006) 18-30; **Writing Reading 2:** Williams, Ch. 2 (start to 'Elegant Options').
- 4 T, 6 Sept **Rubric 2:** “War compels men to be just and temperate, whereas the enjoyment of good fortune and the leisure which comes with peace tend to make them insolent.” (Aristotle, *Politics* 7.14). Does training to fight lead to a courageous and ethical character? **Reading 04:** selections from Aristotle, in G. M. Reichberg, H. Syse and E. Begby, *The Ethics of War: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Blackwell 2006) 31-46; **Writing Reading 3:** Williams, Ch. 2 ('Elegant Options' to the end). **Film:** Akira Kurosawa, *Seven Samurai* **FORUM 3**
- 5 R, 8 Sept **Rubrics 3-4:** “To this war of every man, against every man, this is also a result; that nothing can be unjust.” (Thomas Hobbes, *The Leviathan*); “Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of another, always at the same time as an end, and never simply as a means...” (Immanuel Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*). What is the natural state of humankind? Is conflict inevitable? **Reading 05:** Thomas Hobbes, *The Leviathan*, chs. 13-14; **Reading 06:** Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals* (L. Pojman, *Moral Philosophy: a reader*, 2003, 3rd ed.) 203-210. **Writing Reading 4:** Williams, Ch. 3.
- 6 T, 13 Sept **Rubric 5:** “No one has won praise who has pursued the glory of courage by treachery and cunning; for nothing can be honorable from which justice is absent.” (Cicero, *On Duties* 1.62). How does “how you behave,” as a habit created training, matter? **Reading 07:** N. Sherman, *Stoic Warriors* (Oxford 2005) 2-17, 42-63; **Reading 08:** Cleary, *Training the Samurai Mind* (Boston 2008) 79-96. **Film:** David Mamet, *Red Belt*. **TRAINING 1**

SEGMENT 2: PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY

- 7 R, 15 Sept **Rubric 6:** “There is nothing morally superior about the sheepdog, the warrior, but he does have one real advantage. Only one. And that is that he is able to survive and thrive in an environment that destroys 98 percent of the population.” (D. Grossman, *On Combat*, 183). How does the nervous system react to the stress of combat, and why do some thrive while others flee? **Reading 09:** D. Grossman, *On Combat* (PPCT 2004) 2-49. **DRAFT OF LITERARY ANALYSIS DUE (Plato's Laches)**

- 8 T, 20 Sept **Rubric 7:** “Learn it until you forget it.” (Bruce Lee). “What perceptual distortions occur during combat, and how are they countered by training? **Reading 10:** D. Grossman, *On Combat* (PPCT 2004) 51-122. **FORUM 4 TRAINING 2**
- 9 R, 22 Sept **Rubric 8:** “Feel shame before one another in hard battles. Of men who know shame more survive than die.” (Homer, *Iliad* 15.562-63). **Writing Reading 5:** Williams, Ch. 4. **CLASS INCLUDES A LIBRARY SESSION ON RESEARCH RESOURCES.**

SEGMENT 3: STRATEGIES AND MORALITIES

- 10 T, 27 Sept **Rubric 9:** “Consider yourself lightly; consider the world deeply.” (precept no. 1, Miyamoto Musashi, *Book of Five Rings*). **Reading 11:** Musashi, *The Book of Five Rings* (W. S. Wilson, Kodansha 2002) 32-91. **FINAL VERSION OF LITERARY ANALYSIS DUE (Plato's *Laches*).**
- 11 R, 29 Sept **Rubric 10:** “Make the heart of truth your Way.” (the emptiness, Miyamoto Musashi, *Book of Five Rings*). **Reading 12:** Musashi, *The Book of Five Rings* (W. S. Wilson, Kodansha 2002) 93-148. **Film:** Akira Kurosawa, *Yojimbo* **CLASS INCLUDES A PRESENTATION BY HENRY DAMBANEMUYA ('13), WHO RECENTLY ATTENDED AN INTERNATIONAL SUMMIT ON CONFLICT MINERALS IN THE CONGO.**
- 12 T, 4 Oct **Rubric 11:** “The Mind is Emptiness.” (epilogue, Miyamoto Musashi, *Book of Five Rings*). **No Reading.** Examine the paintings of Miyamoto Musashi, and respond to the Forum: <http://web.archive.org/web/20070707073253/http://www.kampaibudokai.org/MusashiArt.htm> **FORUM 5 TRAINING 3 CLASS INCLUDES A SESSION ON CHINESE CALLIGRAPHY AND BRUSH PAINTING BY PROF. SHERRY MOU.**
- 13 R, 6 Oct **Rubric 12:** “Even if there are a hundred positions, you win with just one.” (Yagyu Munemori) **Reading 13:** Yagyu Munemori, *Martial Arts: the Book of Family Traditions* (Thomas Cleary, transl, Tuttle, 2005) 1-57. **TRAINING 4**
- 14 T, 11 Oct **Rubric 13:** “If you do not know first the set forms of the ancients, you will have nothing on which to base your later studies.” (Issai Chozanshi). **Writing Reading 6:** Williams, Chs. 5-6. **TRAINING 5**
- 15 R, 13 Oct **Rubric 14:** “It is the secret of holding the sword with Nothing in your hands.” (W.S. Wilson). **Reading 14:** I. Chozanshi, *The Demon's Sermon on the Martial Arts* (W. S. Wilson, Kodansha 2006) 9-32, 89-128. **DRAFT OF ARTISTIC ANALYSIS DUE (of a work by Musashi)**

FALL BREAK

SEGMENT 4: MORALITIES AND STRATEGIES

- 16 T, 25 Oct **Rubric 15:** “It is best to run.” (No. 36 in the anonymous tract *The Thirty-Six Strategies*; Cleary, *Japanese Art of War*, 91). How do you balance duty, expediency, and strategy? **Reading 15:** archaic Greek poems by Tyrtaeus, 10-12, and Archilochus 1, 4, 5, 13, and 114; **Writing Reading 7:** Williams, Ch. 7. **TRAINING 6**
- 17 R, 27 Oct **Rubric 16:** “These very Greeks are wont to wage war against one another in the most foolish way, through sheer perversity and doltishness” (Herodotus, *Histories* 7.9). **Reading 16:** Cleary, *Training the Samurai Mind* (Boston 2008) 97-108. **FORUM 6**
- 18 T, 1 Nov **Rubric 17:** “It should be evident to all that one fights on the side of justice.” (Onasander, *The General*). When can killing be publicly sanctioned and when it is privately necessary? What

does that do to the collective and individual soul? **Writing Reading 8:** Williams, Ch. 8.

Film: Steven Spielberg, *Munich*. **FORUM 7 TRAINING 7**

- 19 R, 3 Nov **Rubric 18:** “There’s more security in flinging lies than fighting hand to hand.” (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13.12-13). **Reading 17:** Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 12.217-13.590 (Lapiths v. Centaurs; Ajax v. Ulysses). **FINAL VERSION OF ARTISTIC ANALYSIS DUE (of a work by Musashi).**
- 20 T, 8 Nov **Rubric 19:** “Win beforehand.” (Yamamoto Tsunetomo, *The Hagakure*, 153). Is accepting death the best way to stay alive? **Reading 18:** *The Hagakure* (W.S. Wilson, Kodansha 2002, 9-43, 153-64); **Film:** Jim Jarmusch, *Ghost Dog: the Way of the Samurai*. **FORUM 8 TRAINING 8**
- 21 R, 10 Nov **Rubric 20:** “There is no such thing as doing right or wrong when there is freedom.” (Bruce Lee, *The Tao of Jeet Kune Do*, 16). What is the connection between being right and being correct? **Reading 19:** B. Lee, *Tao of Jeet Kune Do* 14-19, 70-73; **Reading 20:** Yagyu Munemori, *Martial Arts: the Book of Family Traditions* (Thomas Cleary, transl, Tuttle, 2005) 68-90.

SEGMENT 5: COSTS

- 22 T, 15 Nov **Rubric 21:** “Don’t Mean Nothin’” (anonymous soldier). What if your commanders are more painful to you than the enemy? **Reading 21:** Homer, *The Iliad*, books 1, 3, 4; **Reading 22:** J. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, xiii-38. **Film:** Francis Ford Coppola, *Apocalypse Now Redux*. **FORUM 9 TRAINING 9**
- 23 R, 17 Nov **Writing Reading 9:** Williams, Ch. 9; **Reading 23a:** Homer, *The Iliad*, books 15-17. **CLASS INCLUDES A CONVERSATION WITH JONATHAN SHAY, AUTHOR OF ‘ACHILLES IN VIETNAM,’ RECORDED AT DEPAUW IN 2009.**
- 24 T, 22 Nov **Rubric 22:** “For me, there’s no return to my home country,” (Homer, *Iliad*, 18.113). What happens when your best friend is killed? **Reading 23b:** Homer, *The Iliad*, books 18-19; **Reading 24:** J. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, 39-75. **DRAFT OF CINEMATIC ANALYSIS DUE (your choice of films seen).**

THANKSGIVING

- 25 T, 29 Nov **Rubric 23:** “There can be no courtesy between us,” (Homer, *Iliad*, 22.312). After going bezerk, can one recover one’s humanity? **Reading 25:** Homer, *The Iliad*, books 20-24; **Reading 26:** J. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, 77-99. **Film:** Kihachi Okamoto, *Sword of Doom*. **TRAINING 10**
- 26 R, 1 Dec **Rubric 24:** “These are the results of that unhappy war.” (Euripides, *Suppliants*). What drives the mistreatment of non-combatants? How powerful can the voices of victims be? **Reading 27:** Euripides, *Trojan Women*. **FORUM 10**
- 27 T, 6 Dec **Rubric 25:** “And I advise that one should kill him whom one has conquered.” (2nd-c AD tombstone of the gladiator Urbicius). When there are no rules to constrain deadly behavior, are they spontaneously generated by participants? **Reading 28:** M.J. Carter, “Gladiatorial Combat,” *Classical Journal* 102.2 (2006/07) 97-114.
- 28 R, 8 Dec **Rubric 26:** “Tu, Romane, memento: hae tibi erunt artes—pacisque imponere morem; parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.” **Discussion Day:** “Why We Fight”. **FINAL VERSION OF CINEMATIC ANALYSIS DUE (your choice of films seen)**

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, PLEASE FEEL FREE TO ASK ME ANYTIME.
--

“DePauw University is committed to providing equal access to academic programs and University administered activities and reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities, in compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act and Amendments (ADAAA). Any student who feels she or he may need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability or learning challenge is strongly encouraged to contact Pamela Roberts, Coordinator of Academic Success and Student Disability Services, for further information on how to receive accommodations and support. Academic Success and Student Disability Services is located in Harrison Hall, 302 A, 765-658-6267. It is the responsibility of the student to share the letter of accommodation faculty and staff members. Accommodations will not be implemented until the faculty or staff member has received the official letter. Accommodations are not retroactive. It is the responsibility of the student to discuss implementation of accommodations with each faculty and staff member receiving the letter.”