

# WHAT PHILOSOPHY IS

## 80-100, FALL 2007

### GENERAL COURSE INFORMATION

*Time:* Monday and Wednesday 9:30–10:20 AM

*Room:* Margaret Morrison A14

### INSTRUCTOR

*Name:* David Gray

*Office:* Baker Hall 143

*Email:* [degray@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:degray@andrew.cmu.edu)

*Office Hours:* Wednesday and Thursday 10:30–12:00 PM or by appointment

### TEACHING ASSISTANTS

*Name:* Daniel Malkiel

*Office:* Baker Hall 161A

*Email:* [dmalkiel@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:dmalkiel@andrew.cmu.edu)

*Office Hours:* TBA

*Name:* Ruth Poproski

*Office:* Baker Hall 143

*Email:* [rpoprosk@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:rpoprosk@andrew.cmu.edu)

*Office Hours:* Monday 12:30–1:30 PM

### RECITATION INFORMATION

SECTION I: Malkiel

*Time:* Friday 11:30–12:20 PM

*Room:* CFA Building 212

SECTION K: Poproski

*Time:* Friday 1:30–2:20 PM

*Room:* Baker Hall A54

SECTION J: Malkiel

*Time:* Friday 12:30–1:20 PM

*Room:* Porter Hall 226A

SECTION L: Poproski

*Time:* Friday 2:30–3:20 PM

*Room:* Porter Hall A19D

### REQUIRED TEXTS

*Philosophy for the 21st Century.* Edited by Stephen M. Cahn. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Lewis Vaughn. *Writing Philosophy: A Student's guide to Writing Philosophy Essays.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Handouts will occasionally supplement these.

## COURSE DESCRIPTION

“Wonder is the feeling of a philosopher,” said Aristotle, “and philosophy begins in wonder.” In this course, we will explore some of the fundamental problems that have engaged philosophers for thousands of years and read the various solutions they propose. While their approaches will perhaps be more rigorous than you are used to, the problems they address should not be. For as long as there have been people, adults and children (*especially* children) have asked these questions. You have undoubtedly asked some of them yourself.

There is no simple and precise definition of the subject-matter for philosophy, as it covers many different disciplines. For this course, we will look at five branches within philosophy and some basic problems they each address. The first we will study is ethics, which concerns questions of right and wrong. Then we will move into theology and some problems (invariably involving the existence of God) it addresses. Following that, we will briefly consider whether we are free in determining our actions or if they are just the results of colliding atoms, and what implications this problem of metaphysics may have in ethics. The fourth discipline we will cover is epistemology, examining whether we can know if the world actually exists, leading to a more general question concerning the nature of knowledge itself. Finally, we conclude with aesthetics. In particular, we will focus on two questions: Are artistic judgments merely subjective? Can “art” even be defined?

In class discussion and recitation, students are encouraged to present and critically examine their own views on these issues. While these problems may initially appear obscure and possibly unsolvable, our responses to them profoundly shape our lives and how we understand ourselves and our place in the world.

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

By the end of this term, I expect that you will be able to

- Describe those problems troubling philosophers that we cover in class,
- Clearly articulate the arguments that attempt to solve these problems,
- Critically evaluate these arguments, and
- Communicate all the above through both verbal and written discourse.

Each course requirement and assignment is designed with these objectives in mind.

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Weekly Assignments	= 25%
First Paper	= 25%
Second Paper	= 25%
Final Exam	= 25%

Philosophy is a full-contact sport. However, we will wrestle with arguments and not attack those advocating them. In order that you seriously digest the material, ***attendance is***

**required** and I will encourage class participation. You are allowed three absences, including from recitations, no questions asked. Please note, however, these are not vacation days, they are for illness, job interviews, and other emergencies. Each additional absence results in 2 points deducted from your final grade. All written work must be done independently, unless otherwise noted. Students are expected to be familiar with the university policies on cheating and plagiarism. If you have any questions, please ask; do not assume.

## COURSE OUTLINE

August 27: Course Introduction.

### PART I – ETHICS

August 29: Plato, *Euthyphro*, pp. 13–24.

August 31: Recitation: Lewis Vaughn, *Writing Philosophy*, Chapter 1, pp. 3–20.

September 3: No Class.

September 5: Ruth Benedict, “Anthropology and the Abnormal” (handout).

James Rachels, “The Challenge of Cultural Relativism”, pp. 594–602.

September 7: Recitation: Lewis Vaughn, *Writing Philosophy*, Chapter 2, pp. 21–42.

September 10: David Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (handout).

James Rachels, “Subjectivism in Ethics” (handout).

September 12: Plato, *Republic* (handout).

Ayn Rand, “Value Yourself” (handout).

James Rachels, “Egoism and Moral Skepticism”, pp. 603–609.

September 14: Recitation: Lewis Vaughn, *Writing Philosophy*. Chapter 3, pp. 43–54.

September 17: Jeremy Bentham, “The Principle of Utility” (handout).

Robert Nozick, “The Experience Machine”, pp. 580–581.

September 19: John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism*, pp. 575–579.

E.F. Carritt, “Criticisms of Utilitarianism” (handout).

September 21: Recitation: Lewis Vaughn, *Writing Philosophy*, Chapter 4, pp. 55–84.

September 24: Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals* (handout).

September 26: Michael Walzer, “Political Action: The Problem of Dirty Hands” (handout).

September 28: Recitation: Lewis Vaughn, *Writing Philosophy*, Chapter 5, pp. 85–95.

### PART II – THEOLOGY

October 1: Saint Anselm, “The Ontological Argument”, pp. 24–25.

Immanuel Kant, “Critique of the Ontological Argument”, pp. 27–28.

William L. Rowe, “Why the Ontological Argument Fails”, pp. 32–35.

October 3: Saint Thomas Aquinas, “Five Ways to Prove the Existence of God”, pp. 35–36.

Michael Martin, “The Cosmological Argument”, pp. 37–39.

October 5: Recitation: Lewis Vaughn, *Writing Philosophy*, Chapter 6, pp. 96–102.

**First paper topic handed out.**

October 8: David Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, Parts II, V, and XI, pp. 40–42, 50–52, 67–71.

October 10: Richard Swinburne, “Why God Allows Evil”, pp. 72–81.

October 12: Recitation.

**Rough draft of first paper must be brought to recitation on October 12.**

October 15: *Genesis* 22: 1–14 (handout).

Søren Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling* (handout).

October 17: Friedrich Nietzsche, “The Death of God” (handout).

**First paper due at 11:59:59 PM on October 17.**

October 19: No Recitation.

## INTERLUDE ON FREE WILL

October 22: Peter Van Inwagen, “The Incompatibility of Free Will and Determinism”, pp. 420–427.

October 24: Harry G. Frankfurt, “Alternative Possibilities and Moral Responsibility”, pp. 414–420.

October 26: Recitation.

## PART III – EPISTEMOLOGY

October 29: René Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, pp. 101–109.

October 31: G.E. Moore, “Proof of an External World”, pp. 137–139.

November 2: Recitation.

November 5: Ludwig Wittgenstein, *On Certainty*, pp. 140–151.

November 7: Edmund Gettier, “Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?”, pp. 161–162.

November 9: Recitation.

November 12: Alvin I. Goldman, “Discrimination and Perceptual Knowledge”, pp. 163–175.

November 14: Robert Nozick, “Knowledge and Scepticism”, pp. 176–188.

November 16: Recitation.

## PART IV – AESTHETICS

November 19: David Hume, *Of the Standards of Taste*, pp. 813–823.

Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, pp. 823–832.

**Second paper topic handed out.**

November 21: No Class.

November 23: No Recitation.

November 26: Morris Weitz, “The Role of Theory in Aesthetics”, pp. 777–783.

November 28: George Dickie, “Defining Art”, pp. 784–787.

November 30: Recitation.

**Rough draft of second paper must be brought to recitation on November 30.**

December 3: Arthur Danto, “The End of Art”, pp. 788–798.

December 5: Leo Tolstoy, *What is Art?* (handout).

Voltaire, “The Good Brahmin” (handout).

**Second paper due at 11:59:59 PM on December 5.**

December 7: Recitation.

**December TBA: Final Exam.**

## EXPLANATION OF ASSIGNMENTS

Reading: Philosophy texts are not textbooks or novels. Unlike these, they present sophisticated arguments that attempt to justify a particular position or point-of-view. Hence, you need to do more than merely peruse the readings: you must endeavor to understand the author’s position and how the author justifies it. In some cases, this may take multiple readings to accomplish. However, reading assignments are relatively short so that this is feasible. In addition, it is good to take notes while reading, so that you can remember the author’s main points. For the more difficult readings, questions will be provided to help guide you in this. Finally, feel free to bring questions to class. This material is hardly obvious and, despite a tremendous amount of scholarship, it still challenges the most intelligent of people.

Class Participation: Class attendance and participation is very important in understanding and retaining the class material. As noted above, attendance is required and I will do my best to encourage class participation. I recognize that not everybody is comfortable speaking in class, and so only repeated class absences will lower your grade. Nevertheless, active class participation can increase your final grade if you are in a borderline situation.

Weekly Assignments: Every Wednesday—*sans* the weeks a paper topic is out—a short (1–2 page) writing assignment will be assigned and due the following week. Writing assignments will involve composing either an analytic summary of an extended argument from the text *or* a position paper where you are asked to take a position on an issue and build an argument to support it. These assignments will give you some prefatory experience for writing your two papers. Late assignments will be accepted, but with a penalty. Your lowest assignment score will be dropped and your overall assignment grade will be curved based on the highest and median overall assignment scores in this class.

Films: Throughout the term, I will be showing several films exploring the subject matter we are covering in the course. You are required to attend two of these and complete a short write-up concerning those films. These two write-ups will count as part of the weekly assignment portion of your grade. You are encouraged to attend additional movies, completing their write-ups for extra credit. The movie schedule will be handed out once it is finalized.

Papers: Communicating your ideas, and those of others, is the most essential skill you can learn in college. I will provide you opportunities to train this skill in the form of two medium length (5–6 page) papers. These papers will assess your ability to

- Reconstruct and critically evaluate important philosophical arguments and

- Construct a reasoned argument in support of a considered position or claim.

The weekly assignments will also help develop these abilities. The particular format and topics of each paper will be announced and discussed in class. I will provide you with some tips for writing a philosophy paper and a sample rubric so you are familiar with the grading criteria and can anticipate how your papers will be graded. Late papers will be accepted, but with a penalty. Paper grades will not be curved.

*Final Exam:* There will be one final exam in this course, which will test your overall comprehension of the course material. In particular, there will be

- Short answer questions (6–7 sentences), where you are provided a few lines from the reading and its author, and you must answer a question concerning this passage (approx. 50%), and
- Longer answer questions (4–5 paragraphs), where you are asked to compare and contrast the positions of two or more author's on some philosophical issue (approx. 50%).

***Everything on the final exam will consist of material explicitly presented and discussed in class, so take good class notes.*** We will discuss the final exam more in class towards the end of the term. Final exam grades will not be curved.

## REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS

I recognize that most students are human beings with occasional human problems associated with human finitude. Illness, family emergencies, job interviews, Other Professors, etc. . . will inevitably lead to legitimate conflicts over your time. If you expect that you will be missing class, be unable to turn in an assignment on time, or take the final exam at the assigned time, please notify me (either in class or via email) **in advance** and we can agree on a reasonable accommodation. Arrangements after the fact will only be made in extraordinary, documented circumstances.

## CHALLENGING AN ASSIGNMENT GRADE

I also recognize that I and your TAs/graders are human too: mistakes will occasionally occur when grading your papers. Therefore, you have **one week** after an assignment is handed back to challenge its grade. To do so, you must return the assignment plus a clearly written explanation of your reason for challenging the grade to whomever graded it. We will promptly and seriously consider all such challenges and meet with you, if necessary, to resolve them. Assignments without a written explanation will not be considered. After one week, no challenges will be accepted, except in extraordinary, documented circumstances. Of course, if you are not satisfied with your grade, but recognize that it was not due to a fault in the grading, I encourage you to talk with either myself or your TA/grader to learn how to improve on future assignments.

## EXTRA CREDIT

Opportunities for extra credit will be provided at my discretion. If provided, extra credit will only count towards your overall assignment grade. It will also only be factored in once the curve has already been determined. If there are any community lectures, documentaries, television specials, news reports, web content, etc...on topics related to course material, please bring them to my attention. I may provide extra credit opportunities for the class based upon them.

## A NOTE ON CLASSROOM COURTESY

Classes begin on the half-hour. Students are expected to be seated by that time and to remain seated until the class is dismissed. If you must leave before the class ends because of a medical appointment, or similar commitment, notify me before class begins and sit near the door. Students who leave without providing such notice and have not suddenly taken ill will be expected to file a drop form and not to return.

## PLAGIARISM – THE SHORT NOTE

**pla·gia·rism** (plā'jē-rīz'ēm) *n* 1: a piece of writing that has been copied from someone else and is presented as being your own work. 2: the act of plagiarizing; taking someone's words or ideas as if they were your own.

Plagiarism is bad. Do not do it. It amounts to lying, cheating, and stealing. Anyone caught doing it can fairly assume that they will not pass this course.

To encourage proper citing of sources, **turnitin.com** will be used for submitting each of your assignments. A separate handout on this process will be provided.

## PLAGIARISM – THE LONG NOTE

It is the individual student's responsibility to be aware of the university policies on academic integrity, including the policies on cheating and plagiarism. This is available online at: **<http://www.cmu.edu/policies/documents/Cheating.html>** and in the section on "University Policies" of *The Word: Undergraduate Student Handbook*.

Students who plagiarize face serious sanctions at both the course level, and the university level. At the course level, faculty members have significant discretion to determine the sanctions that are appropriate to individual cases of cheating and plagiarism. Within the Philosophy Department, it is customary for professors to give plagiarized assignments a failing grade and, when appropriate, fail students for the course. Additionally, a letter may be sent to the Dean of Students indicating that the student in question has submitted plagiarized material and received a course-level sanction. Plagiarism is also a violation of the community standards of Carnegie Mellon University. As such, allegations of plagiarism may be brought before a University Academic Review Board, which will determine whether

community standards have been violated and level additional sanctions, if appropriate. Although this body also has significant discretion over the sanctions that it levels, plagiarism can result in academic probation, suspension, and even expulsion.



# GENERAL INFORMATION FOR WRITING A SUCCESSFUL PHILOSOPHY PAPER

## STRATEGY

- Sometimes you will be asked to do a **short analytical summary** of the argument in some text. The purpose of this is to take a longer argument from a reading and condense it down to a concise statement of
  - The main conclusion of the text's argument,
  - The set of premises or reasons that are offered as support for that conclusion, and
  - How those premises are supposed to support or entail the conclusion.

In most disciplines, you will inevitably find it necessary to explain the arguments and positions of others. However, a analytic summary is **not** a book report. The challenge is to ascertain the essential elements of the author's argument (i.e., the premises, conclusions, and the inferences from the former to the latter) and not be distracted by the inessential parts (e.g., author digressions, elaborate introductions, examples not essential to the argument, and other rhetorical devices).

- Other times you will be asked to do a **short position paper** on some contentious issue. The purpose of this is to building a reasoned argument in support of a particular claim or conclusion. You should
  - State concisely your central claim and then
  - Demonstrate how this conclusion is supported or entailed by reasons (premises) that are plausible in their own right or difficult to deny.

A good paper, no matter the subject matter, typically involves making a reasoned argument for some claim. You probably have some experience with this from high school and college writing courses, and so this should not be too foreign.

- As indicated on the syllabus, a typical philosophy paper requires that you
  - Reconstruct and critically evaluate important philosophical arguments and
  - Construct a reasoned argument in support of a considered position or claim.

As such, a typical philosophy is usually an extended position paper that involves providing brief analytical summaries of the positions that you are either supporting, critiquing, developing, or however addressing.

As with analytic summaries, the crucial challenge is **staying focused** when describing the relevant aspects of the position or theory you are assessing. You do not need to provide a comprehensive outline of the position you are addressing. Instead, just present the particular aspects that you will be addressing in your paper. For instance, say a thinker provides five separate arguments for a position, and you want to argue that two of these are bunk. Then present only those two arguments, and do so in

sufficient detail such that it will be clear later where precisely you disagree with the thinker. Briefly mention that there are other arguments (without going into them) you do not address in either your introduction or conclusion. Any more than this will only distract the reader and waste precious space.

## ESSENTIALS

- **Use the first person singular!** I know that in high school, you were repeated told to never do this. I hate to burst your bubble, but this is horrible advice. Without it, your reader can easily become confused over whether a statement reflects your position or someone else's. Furthermore, do not try and pull the royal “we” or the “this author” line as a substitute. Human beings are reading your papers, not (as of yet) robots.
- **Keep your introductions simple, direct and to the point.** I am sure that in high school you also learned some ridiculous “umbrella” (or whatever) approach to writing papers, where your introduction is supposed to express some sweeping generalities before you narrow in on your paper's thesis. Once again, this is bad bad bad! Starting your paper with such a banality as “Since the dawn of time, man has feared death. . .” adds nothing of substance to your discussion. (I cannot believe it, but for a professional conference, I reviewed a paper with this very introduction! I almost rejected it on the spot, but decided to give the author the benefit of the doubt. However, the author never rose above the trivial drivel with which the paper began.) Sweeping statements also suggest that you are unsure about what to say, and are looking for a way to fill up space. (In Montana, we call it bulls–t.)

Instead, just jump right in to your topic. In many cases, you'll only need a sentence or two to introduce your topic, and then you can give your thesis. For instance:

According to X, blah blah blah. This position, however, is challenged by Y, who claims bleh bleh bleh. In this paper, I will argue that Y's argument fails to seriously challenge X's position.

For the size and scope of the papers you will be writing in this course, such a three sentence introductory paragraph is perfectly acceptable. Right away, your reader knows two important things: (1) What your paper is about and (2) What your paper will argue for. This is precisely what an introduction ought to convey.

- **Keep the rest of your paper simple too.** The point of a philosophy paper is to convince your reader of something. This is virtually impossible if your sentences run on for 5 lines and your paragraphs are longer than a page. Aesthetically, the writing appears cluttered and jumbled, and more than likely the content will be as well. When sentences and paragraphs get long, think seriously about how to break them up into smaller components. (I'd rather read a Hemingway than a Steinbeck any day.) Also, keep your language as simple as possible. Avoid excessive jargon, esoteric words, neologisms, and polysyllabic overload. If you must use technical language (and sometimes you will), be sure to explain what it means. Finally, be sure to use transitional language, so the connection between paragraphs and sentences are clear. This will convey

to the reader where you are in your paper’s overall argument. I care about the ideas you are trying to express, not the pretty words you use to do so.

- **Use quotations wisely and sparingly.** A terrible thing to see is a paper that is just a string of quotations—even if they are all the relevant ones. This shows laziness and little attempt to make the material your own. Yes, if you attribute something to a person you are discussing, you need to back it up with evidence. Paraphrasing (with an appropriate citation) will usually do the trick. This shows that you have read the material *and* have taken the time to understand it. Only directly quote a passage if that passage will play an important role in your paper (e.g., you will be referring back to it throughout the rest of the paper) or if its simplicity is such that paraphrasing would be impossible.
- **Finally, check out how your paper “sounds”.** Once you think you are finished with your paper, read it aloud or to some friends. If things do not sound right, they will not read right either. Just because you are doing philosophy does not mean that what you are doing should be incomprehensible to normal people.

## FORMATTING

- Give your paper an appropriate title. If its clever and witty, so much the better.
- Make sure the paper is the appropriate length. I realize that sometimes is necessary to write a longer paper, and that is acceptable; just keep in mind that a longer paper is not always a better paper. If you are over the paper length, odds are you are including lots of extraneous junk; if you are under, odds are you are not fully developing your argument.
- All papers should be typed, double-spaced, employ a 12pt “Times New Roman” font, and possess 1 inch margins.
- Please cite material in footnotes. Use {author, article/book title, page number} style citations. For instance: “Better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied”.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Mill, *Utilitarianism* from Cahn, p. 576.

# PHILOSOPHY PAPER GRADING RUBRIC

	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
<b>CONTENT</b>				
<b>Argument</b>				
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 be or plausibly true.	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.
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.

<b>Understanding</b>	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 the textual support is appropriate.	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 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 between the parts are clear and highly accurate.	The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are fairly accurate.	The parts identified are not the correct and/or relevant ones. The connections between the parts are completely inaccurate.
	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 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.
<b>Evaluation</b>	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 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.
<b>Creation</b>				
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 really worth writing about.	The thesis is totally irrelevant.
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.
<b>STYLE</b>				
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 rhetorical 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 (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 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.	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 in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a description of the steps in argument.	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 as a description of the steps in argument.	Only the topic is introduced, with no description of the paper. Or, the paper is described inaccurately.	
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 a larger issue or problem. Or the paper explains what further work may need to be done in this area.	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.	

PHILOSOPHY 80-135 GRADING SHEET					
(Please see Philosophy Paper Grading Rubric for detailed descriptions of each criteria)					
STUDENT:					
TOTAL SCORE:					
GRADER:					
		Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
CONTENT					
Argument	-	40	37	34	
Understanding	-	20	18	16	
Evaluation	-	5	4.5	3	
Creation	-	10	9	7	
STYLE					
Clarity	-	10	8.5	7	
Organization	Introduction	3	2.5	2	
	Body	4	3.5	3	
	Conclusion	3	2.5	2	
TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS					
Title	-	1	0.5	0	0
Length	-	3	2	1	0
Formatting	-	1	0.5	0	0



# SETTING UP YOUR TURNITIN ACCOUNT

## 80-100

For this course your instructor will be using turnitin.com to check each of your assignments for their originality. For each assignment, you will be expected to submit a copy to turnitin (no hardcopies need be submitted). If you have trouble submitting please email a copy to your instructor or section TA.

Before you can turn anything in, you must set up an account on turnitin and get it connected to this course. This is a relatively painless process so don't be scared. Of course, you are a CMU student, which means you should already be friendly with technology and have already hacked into this website and are capable of making it do your bidding. On the other hand, if computers frighten you then you just may wish to reconsider your choice in colleges. I hear the Amish are quite welcoming this time of year with their green bean casseroles and whatnot.

Regardless, follow these simple instructions in order to begin your journey on the path of originality:

1. Get a computer with Internet access.
2. Open up a web browser and go to: <http://www.turnitin.com>.
3. Look at the top right of the webpage and click on NEW USERS.
4. On the next screen, select that you are a STUDENT from the pull down menu, and then click the NEXT button.
5. On the next screen, enter the following information based on what section you are in:

Turnitin class ID (sections I and J only):	<u><b>1947323</b></u>
Turnitin class ID (sections K and L only):	<u><b>1947326</b></u>
Turnitin class enrollment password:	<u><b>plato</b></u>

And click the NEXT button.

6. On the next screen, enter your ***andrew email address (or whatever email address you actually check)*** and click the NEXT button.
7. On the next screen, make up a password (***and write it down! No serious, write it down right now! Just write it here:*** \_\_\_\_\_) and enter it into the two fields and then click the NEXT button.
8. On the next screen, select a “secret question” from the pull down menu and then type the answer in the field provided. Then click the NEXT button.
9. On the next screen, enter your (real) first name and last name. Then click the NEXT button.


10. On the next screen, pretend you read and understand everything there, or (like your instructor) just skip it and click on I AGREE – CREATE PROFILE.
11. On the next screen it should say yippy, you are done. And so you are. Ignore the instructions it gives you—you do not need to turn anything in (yet).

## TURNING IT IN WITH TURNITIN

### 80-100

Now that you have set up your turnitin account (see the previous handout on this), you are now ready to submit your highly original assignments. Please note that you are expected to submit all assignments via the turnitin website by their respective due date/time in order to avoid a late penalty. Turning in a hardcopy in class is not required as long as the assignment has been successfully submitted to turnitin.

In order to turn in your first analytical summary, please follow these monkey-approved instructions:

1. Finish the assignment. Make sure it is all in a *single* text file (acceptable formats are MS Word, WordPerfect, PostScript, PDF, HTML, RTF, and plain text) on a computer.
2. Find a computer with Internet access and somehow put your papers file on it.
3. Open up a web browser and go to: <http://www.turnitin.com>.
4. Look at the top of the webpage and enter your email address and password (which you had better have written down) and then click on LOGIN.
5. On the next screen, click on 80-100.
6. On the next screen, click on the submit icon (  ) next to where it has the name of the assignment you wish to turn in.
7. On the next screen, for SUBMISSION TITLE enter “My Assignment” (or “Plato Approved” or something else witty and clever). Then click the CHOOSE FILE button to find the location of the assignment’s file on the computer. Then click the SUBMIT button.
8. On the next screen, make sure this is the file you wish to submit and then click YES, SUBMIT.
9. On the next screen it should say zip-a-dee-doo-dah and that you are done. And yes you are. Congratulations.

If any problems occur when trying to submit, please email a copy of your assignment to your instructor or section TA. They can then submit it for you. If you cannot do this before class, then you must submit a hardcopy in class to avoid a late penalty.