Introduction to Political Philosophy

80-135, Summer I 2007

Course Information

Time: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday 12:00–1:20 PM
Room: Scaife Hall 212

Instructor

Name: David Gray
Office: Baker Hall, 143
Email: degray@andrew.cmu.edu
Office Hours: Immediately following class or by appointment

Required Texts

Aristotle. *The Politics and the Constitution of Athens*. Revised Student Edition. Edited by Stephen Everson. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

John Locke. *Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by C.B. Macpherson. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1980.

John Stuart Mill. *Utilitarianism and On Liberty*. Second Edition edited by Mary Warnock. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003.

John Rawls. *A Theory of Justice*. Revised Edition. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1999.

Handouts will comprise the bulk of the remaining reading material.

Course Description

"Justice", says the philosopher John Rawls, "is the first virtue of social institutions.... Laws and institutions no matter how efficient and well-arranged must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust." Certainly it is difficult to overstate the important of justice in evaluating our laws and other political institutions. However, there remains the question of precisely what it is that justice demands. This invites serious consideration of how we ought to organize and structure society, which is a (if not the) fundamental issue in political philosophy.

In this course, we will undertake an analysis of some extremely influential theories of justice in political philosophy. We will explore how the contestations between these theories frame most present-day political debates concerning controversies such as affirmative action, disability rights, and gay marriage. In class discussion, students are encouraged to present and critically examine their own views on these controversies. With an emphasis on both theory and practice, we shall witness not only how political theory informs political practices but also how these practices inform the theory.

Course Objectives

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

- Describe the theories of justice covered in class,
- Clearly articulate the arguments that attempt to justify these theories,
- Critically evaluate these arguments,
- Compare and contrast the application of these theories to real-life politics, 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

Quizzes = 25%
First Paper = 20%
Second Paper = 25%
Final Exam = 30%

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 two absences, no questions asked. Please note, however, these are not vacation days, they are for illness and 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

May 21: Course Introduction.

Part I – The Utilitarian Liberal Tradition

May 22: Jeremy Bentham, *Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Chapters I and IV, pp. 17-22, 41-43.
John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism*, Chapter II (Paragraphs 1–10, 18–19, 23–25), pp. 185–190, 194–196, 199–202.

May 23: John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism*, Chapter V, pp. 216–235.

May 24: John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, Chapters I and III, pp. 88–98, 131-146.

May 25: John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, Chapter IV, pp. 147–162.

May 28: No Class.

May 29: Dahlia Lithwick, "Condemn-Nation: This was your land, but now it's my land" (handout).
Kelo v. City of New London, Justice Stevens' Ruling and Justice O'Connor's Dissent (handout).

First paper topic handed out.

Part II – The Negative Liberal Tradition

May 30: John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* (Sections 1-73), pp. 7–40.

May 31: John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* (Sections 87-91, 95–99, 119–131, 134–142, 149), pp. 46–49, 52–53, 63–68, 69–75, 77–78.

June 1: Milton Friedman, *Free to Choose*, "Created Equal", pp. 128–149 (handout). F.A. Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty*, "Equality Value, and Merit", pp. 85–102 (handout).

June 4: Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, pp. 149–164, 167–182 (handout).

First paper due at 11:59:59 PM on June 4.

June 5: Richard Posner, "Selling Babies" (handout).
Kyle Wood, "Brief on *In the Matter of Baby 'M'*" (handout).
Elizabeth Anderson, "Is Women's Labor a Commodity?" (handout).

Part III – The Egalitarian Liberal Tradition

June 6: Thomas Scanlon, "When does Equality Matter?" (handout).

June 7: Ronald Dworkin, *Sovereign Virtue*, "Does Equality Matter?", pp. 1–7 (handout).
Ronald Dworkin, *Sovereign Virtue*, "Justice, Insurance, and Luck", pp. 320–325, 331–350 (handout).

June 8: Ronald Dworkin, *Sovereign Virtue*, "Justice and the High Cost of Health", pp. 307-19 (handout).
Malcolm Gladwell, "The Moral Hazard Myth: The bad idea behind our failed health-care system" (handout).
Ezekiel Emanuel and Victor Fuchs, "Getting Covered: Choose a plan everyone can agree on" (handout).

June 11: John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Chapter I (Sections 1–6), pp. 3–30.

June 12: John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Chapter II (Sections 11–14, 17), pp. 52–78, 86–93.

June 13: John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Chapters III (Sections 20, 22, 24–26) and IV (Section 40), pp. 102–105, 109–112, 118–139, 221–227.

June 14: John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Chapters V (Sections 41, 47–48) and VII (Section 68), pp. 228–234, 267–277, 392–396.

June 15: John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Chapter IX (Sections 79, 83–87), pp. 456–464, 480–514.

June 18: Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, pp. 213–231 (handout).

June 19: Richard Bernstein, "Racial Discrimination or Righting Past Wrongs?" (handout).
Michael Kinsley, "*Bakke* to the Drawing Board" (handout).
Dahlia Lithwick, "Frank Admissions: The court finally talks serious about race" (handout).
Michael Brus, "Proxy War: Liberals denounce racial profiling. Conservatives denounce affirmative action. What's the difference?" (handout).
Ronald Dworkin, *A Matter of Principle*, "Bakke's Case: Are Quotas Unfair?", pp. 293–303 (handout).
Michael Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, "The Case of Affirmative Action"

pp. 135–147 (handout).

Second paper topic handed out.

Part IV – Challenges to Liberalism

June 20: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Books II (Chapters 1–3) and X (Chapters 1–3) (handout).
Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book X (Chapter 9), pp. 3–7.
Aristotle, *The Politics*, Books VIII (Chapter 1) and I (Chapters 1–7, 12–13), p. 195, 11–19, 27–30.

June 21: Aristotle, *The Politics*, Books III (Chapters 1, 3–4, 6–12) and VII (Chapters 1–3, 13–14), pp. 61–63, 64–68, 69–80, 166–171, 184–188.

June 22: Bob Ryan, "Sorry, Free Rides Not Right" (handout).
Tom Kite, "Keep the PGA on Foot" (handout).
Assorted Letters to the Editor from *The New York Times* (handout).
William Saletan, "The Beam in Your Eye: If steroids are cheating, why isn't LASIK?" (handout).
PGA Tour, Inc. v. Casey Martin, Justice Scalia's Dissent (handout).

June 25: Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, "The Virtues, the Unity of a Human Life and the Concept of a Tradition", pp. 204–225 (handout).
Michael Walzer, *Spheres of Justice*, pp. 6–10, 86–91, 312–314 (handout).

June 26 Michael Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, pp. 1–24, 175–183 (handout).
Michael Sandel, *Public Philosophy*, "Morality and the Liberal Ideal", pp. 147–155 (handout).

June 27 John Rawls, *Political Liberalism*, pp. 3–15, 29–35, 144–158 (handout).
Michael Sandel, *Public Philosophy*, "Political Liberalism", pp. 211–247 (handout).

Second paper due at 11:59:59 PM on June 27.

June 28 Michael Kinsley, "Abolish Marriage: Let's really get the government out of our bedrooms" (handout).
John Finnis, "What's Wrong With Homosexuality?" (handout).
Stephen Macedo, "Homosexuality and the Conservative Mind" (handout).
Robin West, "Universalism, Liberal Theory, and the Problem of Gay Marriage" (handout).

June 29: 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 most intelligent 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 do 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.

Quizzes: Throughout the term, there will be in-class and take-home quizzes to assess your understanding of the reading and what we have covered in class. Generally, an *in-class quiz* will consist of three or four fill-in-the-blank questions and one or two short answer (4–5 sentences) questions that ask you to reconstruct a short argument discussed in class. The frequency of these quizzes will be in inverse proportion to the class' overall participation and they will not be announced in advance. A *take-home quiz* will involve writing *either* a short (1 page) analytic summary of an extended argument from the text *or* a short (1 page) position paper where you are asked to take a position on an issue and build an argument to support it. I will provide you with some tips for doing these take-home quizzes, so you can anticipate how they will be graded. Your lowest in-class quiz *and* lowest take-home quiz scores will be dropped. Your overall quiz grade will be curved based on the highest and median overall quiz scores in this class.

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 pages) 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 assigned analytical summaries and position papers (see the section on Quizzes above) will also help develop both of 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. 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

- Fill-in-the-blank questions, similar to those from in-class quizzes, to assess your knowledge of general terminology (approx. 10%),
- Short answer questions (6–7 sentences), where you are provided a few lines from the reading and its author, and you must explain the significance of this passage within that author's philosophical theory (approx. 45%), 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 or political

debate (approx. 45%).

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, Other Professors, etc... will inevitably lead to legitimate conflicts over your time. If you expect that you will be missing class or be unable to turn in an assignment on 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 with 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 quiz grade. It will also only be factored in once the overall quiz 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 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′jĕ-rĭz′ĕm) *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, as it is an affront to the very spirit of a course on ***JUSTICE***.

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 you) 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 defending 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".[1]

[1] Mill, *Utilitarianism*, p. 188.

Philosophy Paper Grading Rubric

	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 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.

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 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 paper breaks the argument, issue, or problem into parts, but some parts may be missing or unclear. The connections between the parts are somewhat 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 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 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.
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 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
80-135

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 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 dont 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:

Turnitin class ID:	**1898512**
Turnitin class enrollment password:	**plato**

   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
80-135

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 80-135.
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 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.