

OCT 04 2007

# REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO USE W-DESIGNATION

LSC # \_\_\_\_\_  
Action \_\_\_\_\_

COVER SHEET: Request for Approval to Use W-Designation

## TYPE I. PROFESSOR COMMITMENT

- (x) Professor Bradley Rives
- (x) Phone 7-5613 Email rives@iup.edu
- (x) Writing Workshop? (If not at IUP, where? when? May 16-17 w/ Robert Yagelski)
- (x) Proposal for one W-course (see instructions below)
- (x) Agree to forward syllabi for subsequently offered W-courses?

## TYPE II. DEPARTMENT COURSE

- ( ) Department Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_
- ( ) Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_
- ( ) Course Number/Title \_\_\_\_\_
- ( ) Statement concerning departmental responsibility
- ( ) Proposal for this W-course (see instructions below)

## TYPE III. SPECIFIC COURSE AND SPECIFIC PROFESSOR(S)

- ( ) Professor(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ( ) Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_
- ( ) Course Number/Title \_\_\_\_\_
- ( ) Proposal for this W-course (see instructions below)

## SIGNATURES:

Professor(s) Bradley Rives

Department Chairperson Sherrill J. Beggs

College Dean A. Ann 10/19/07

Director of Liberal Studies Thuy Helen 10/19/07

## COMPONENTS OF A PROPOSAL FOR A WRITING-INTENSIVE COURSE:

- I. "Writing Summary"--one or two pages explaining how writing is used in the course. First, explain any distinctive characteristics of the content or students which would help the Liberal Studies Committee understand your summary. Second, list and explain the types of writing activities; be especially careful to explain (1) what each writing activity is intended to accomplish as well as the (2) amount of writing, (3) frequency and number of assignments, and (4) whether there are opportunities for revision. If the activity is to be graded, indicate (5) evaluation standards and (6) percentage contribution to the student's final grade. (See Summary Chart of Writing Assignments.)
- II. Copy of the course syllabus.
- III. Provide samples of writing assignments that are given to students that include instructions and evaluation criteria. (Single copies of longer items, if essential to the proposal, may be submitted to be passed among LSC members and returned to you.)

**Please number all pages.** Provide one copy to Liberal Studies Committee.

**Before you submit:** Have you double-checked your proposal against "The Liberal Studies Committee's Most Frequently Asked Questions"?

Received

OCT 09 2007

Liberal Studies

## Summary Chart for Writing Assignments\*

<b>A. Writing Assignments</b>					
Assignment Title	# of Assignments	# of total pages	Graded (Yes/No)	Opportunity for Revision (Yes/No)	Written Assignment represents what % of final course grade
Content Summary	10	10	Yes	No	30%
Short Analysis Paper	2	8	Yes	No	30%
Term Paper	1	8	Yes	Yes	30%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>90%</b>

### **B. Examinations (Complete only if you intend to use essay exams/short answers as part of the required number of pages of writing.)**

Exams	Approx.% of exam that is essay or short answer	Anticipated # of pages for essay or short answer, or approx. word count	Exam constitutes what % of final course grade
1.			
2.			
3.			
<b>Totals</b>			

*\*Total writing assignments should contain at least 5000 words (approximately 15-20 typed pages) in two or more separate assignments; written assignments should be a major part of the final grade—at least 50% or more.*

## **Writing Summary—PHIL 481: Human Nature (Brad Rives)**

PHIL 481: Human Nature is proposed as a “W” course. (Note that PHIL 481 is our “special topics” designation. Courses other than “Human Nature” offered as PHIL 481 in the future will not be designated “W” without approval.) Students will be drawn from a variety of majors, although I expect approximately half of the students to be philosophy majors or minors. The course has no prerequisites. Class size is limited to 25.

There will be three categories of writing assignment in this course: content summaries, analysis papers, and a term paper.

### **1. Content Summaries**

Content summaries are short (1-page) writing assignments due the day the class is to discuss a particular reading assignment. The assignments are based on questions that I provide, which are designed to focus the students’ reading and writing and to help them cull what is essential from what is not. The primary goal of these assignments is to get the students to charitably reconstruct the main arguments in the material assigned. As a result of having to prepare these summaries, students are more likely to understand the subsequent lecture, and to be in a position to critically engage with the material. These papers also greatly enhance the quality of in-class discussions. Throughout the semester students will write ten summaries, which will count toward 30% of the final grade.

### **2. Analysis Papers**

Analysis papers are longer (4-page) writing assignments in which students must move slightly beyond mere exegesis and begin to critically analyze and evaluate authors’ arguments and positions. The goal of these papers is to provide students an opportunity, before they write their term papers, to move beyond a mere summary of an argument and to begin to articulate and defend claims of their own. Students will write two analysis papers, which will count toward 30% of the final grade.

### **3. Term Paper**

The final term paper is the longest (8-page) writing assignment, in which students will be asked to synthesize material they have learned, critically analyze and reflect upon arguments related to their topic, and develop and defend a thesis of some kind. As part of their defense, students will be required to provide objections to either their thesis or their arguments in support of their thesis, and then offer potential responses to these objections. For this assignment, students will submit a draft that will receive feedback from me, as well as from a peer. Students will therefore also be asked to provide critique of another’s work, which should help focus their own writing, as well as offering the chance to learn about another philosophical topic. The term paper will count toward 30% of the final grade.

In sum, 90% of the assessment will be based upon writing assignments, as follows:

- Weekly One-Page Content Summaries: 30%
- 2 short analysis papers (4 pages): 30%
- 1 long term paper (8 pages): 30%

## PHIL 481: Human Nature, Spring 2008

**Instructor:** Dr. Brad Rives

Office: Sutton 443

Office Phone: 357-5613

Office Hours: M 2-4, T/Th 2-3:30, and by appointment or chance.

Email: [rives@iup.edu](mailto:rives@iup.edu)

**Course Description:** This course is an advanced introduction to theoretical and empirical approaches to mind, free will, morality, and religious belief. Questions we'll consider include: Are humans immaterial beings housed in material bodies, or are we ultimately physical beings? Are we free to choose how our lives unfold, or is human choice an illusion? Are human beings inherently good, or are we naturally disposed towards violence? Are religious beliefs in some sense biological, or are they purely cultural? More generally, is human cognition largely determined by our genetic endowment, or is it largely determined by culture and experience? Readings will be drawn from both classical and contemporary sources, and emphasis will be placed on the extent to which traditional philosophical issues are illuminated by empirical research in biology, psychology, and neuroscience.

### Course Objectives:

- A. To acquaint students with some of the classical and contemporary philosophical literature on the nature of the mind, free will, morality, and religious belief.
- B. To acquaint students with the various ways in which philosophical theories of mind, free will, morality, and religious belief interact with, and are informed by, the relevant empirical sciences.
- C. To assist students in becoming more effective writers.
- D. To foster the development of intellectual courage and determination in the articulation and defense of an original philosophical view.

### Course Requirements:

Summary Papers	1 each week (10 total)	30% of grade
Short Analysis Papers	Paper 1 by end of Week 6 Paper 2 by end of Week 12	30% of grade
Term Paper	Due May 7 <sup>th</sup>	30% of grade
Peer Edit	TBA	5% of grade
Participation	Throughout the semester	5% of grade

**Summary Papers:** Each week (excluding the week of the mid-term) you must turn in a one-page paper that focuses on a question that will be distributed in class. Each class session I will provide you with a question for the next session's reading assignment. Papers should be typed, double-spaced, and in a standard font with standard margins. Your two lowest paper grades will be dropped. This means that you must turn in a total of 10 response papers, each of which is worth 3% of your final grade. *Late papers will not be accepted.*

**Short Analysis Papers:** You will write two 4-page analysis papers. The first of these is due by the end of week 6 and the second is due by the end of week 7. We'll talk more about the short analysis papers in due course.

**Term Paper:** The paper is due May 7<sup>th</sup>, and should be 8 pages in length, double-spaced, and written in a standard font with standard margins. I'll provide you with detailed term-paper handout (with a list of possible topics) in due course. Papers will be penalized one full letter grade for each day they are late.

**Participation:** Your attendance and active participation in class discussions are required both for the course to succeed and for you to succeed in the course. Participation is worth 10% of your final grade.

**Academic Integrity:** I take academic dishonesty *very* seriously, and will immediately report any suspected cases to the appropriate university authorities. You should be familiar with IUP's *Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures*. For a full description consult the latest course catalog, or look online here: <http://www.iup.edu/registrar/catalog/acapolicy/>

**Students with Disabilities:** If you have a disability, you should inform me of your needs *as soon as possible* so that appropriate accommodations can be made.

### **Tentative Schedule of Readings:**

#### **PART I: THE SOUL/MIND**

##### Week 1

*Tuesday: The Soul, Dualism, and Immortality*

Plato, *Phaedo*

Descartes, *Meditations II, VI*

*Thursday: The Soul, Dualism, and Immortality, cont'd*

Flanagan, Owen (2002) "Mind" in *The Problem of the Soul*. New York: Basic Books.

Rey, Georges (1997) "Temptations to Dualism" in *Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*. Oxford: Blackwell.

##### Week 2

*Tuesday: Materialistic Minds*

Fodor, Jerry (1981) "The Mind-Body Problem" *Scientific American*.

Pinker, Steven (1997) *How the Mind Works*. New York: Norton (chapter 2)

*Thursday: The Psychology of Souls*

Bloom, Paul (2005) "Worse Than Creationism" *American Psychological Society Observer*.

Bloom, Paul (2004) *Descartes' Baby*. New York: Basic Books. (chapter 7)

##### Week 3

*Tuesday: The Psychology of Souls, Cont'd*

Bering, Jesse (forthcoming) "The Folk Psychology of Souls" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.  
Kuhlmeier, Valerie *et al.* (2004) "Do 5-month-old infants see humans as material objects?"  
*Cognition* 94: 95-103.

*Thursday: The Psychology of Souls Cont'd*

Bering, Jesse (forthcoming) "The Folk Psychology of Souls" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.  
Kuhlmeier, Valerie *et al.* (2004) "Do 5-Month-Old Infants See Humans as Material Objects?"  
*Cognition* 94: 95-103.

## **PART II: FREE WILL**

### Week 4

*Tuesday: Introduction and Libertarianism*

Chisholm, Roderick (1964) "Human Freedom and the Self" in Watson (ed.) 2003. *Free Will*.  
Oxford: OUP.

*Thursday: Skepticism*

Strawson, Galen (1994) "The Impossibility of Moral Responsibility" *Philosophical Studies* 75:5  
-24.

### Week 5

*Tuesday: Compatibilism*

Hobbes, Thomas (1651) *Leviathan*, chapter XXI.

Flanagan, Owen (2002) "Free Will" in *The Problem of the Soul*. New York: Basic Books.

*Thursday: Compatibilism cont'd*

Nagel, Thomas (1986) "Freedom" in *The View From Nowhere*. Oxford: OUP.

Dennett, Daniel (1984) *Elbow Room*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (excerpts)

### Week 6

*Tuesday: Psychology of Free Will: Who's Really In Charge?*

Bargh, J.A. and M.J. Ferguson (2000) "Beyond Behaviorism: On the Automaticity of Higher  
Mental Processes." *Psychological Bulletin* 126: 925-945.

*Thursday: Psychology of Free Will: It's an Illusion!*

Wegner, Daniel, and Thalia Wheatley (1999) "Apparent Mental Causation" *American  
Psychologist* 54: 480-492.

Wegner, Daniel (2002) *The Illusion of Conscious Will*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Chs 1-3)

### Week 7

*Tuesday: The Illusion of Free Will cont'd*

Wegner, Daniel, and Thalia Wheatley (1999) "Apparent Mental Causation" *American  
Psychologist* 54: 480-492.

Wegner, Daniel (2002) *The Illusion of Conscious Will*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Chs 1-3)

*Thursday: catch-up*

## **PART III: MORALITY**

### Week 8

#### *Tuesday: Violent by Nature*

Hobbes, Thomas (1651) *Leviathan*, chapter XIII, XIV (excerpts)

Wrangham, Richard (2004) "Killer Species" *Daedalus* 25-35.

#### *Thursday: Benevolent by Nature*

Hume, David (17xx) *Treatise of Human Nature*, Book III (excerpts)

Pinker, Steven (1997) *How the Mind Works*. New York: Norton. (chapter 6 and 7, excerpts)

### Week 9

#### *Tuesday: How Do Humans Make Moral Judgments?*

Bloom, Paul (2004) *Descartes' Baby*. New York: Basic Books. (chapter 5)

Haidt, Jonathan (2001) "The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail" *Psychological Review* 108: 814-834.

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph (2004) "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" *Daedalus* 55-66.

#### *Thursday: How Do Humans Make Moral Judgments?*

Bloom, Paul (2004) *Descartes' Baby*. New York: Basic Books. (chapter 5)

Haidt, Jonathan (2001) "The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail" *Psychological Review* 108: 814-834.

Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph (2004) "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" *Daedalus* 55-66.

### Week 10

#### *Tuesday: The Analogy with Chomskyan Grammar*

Hauser et al.(forthcoming) "Reviving Rawls' Linguistic Analogy" in Sinnott-Armstrong (ed.) *Moral Psychology and Biology*. Oxford: OUP.

#### *Thursday: Implications for Philosophy and Law*

Greene, Joshua, Cohen, J. D. (2004) "For the Law, Neuroscience Changes Nothing and Everything" *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 359: 1775-17785.

Greene, Joshua (2003) "From Neural "Is" to Moral "Ought" *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 4: 847-850.

Levy, Neil (2006). Cognitive Scientific Challenges to Morality. *Philosophical Psychology*.

## **PART IV: RELIGIOUS BELIEF**

### Week 11

#### *Tuesday: Reasons for Belief*

Aquinas "The Cosmological Argument"

Paley, William "The Design Argument"

Gould, Stephen "The Panda's Thumb"

Dawkins, Richard (2006) *The God Delusion*. New York: Houghton Mifflin. (excerpts)

*Thursday: Reasons for Belief Cont'd*

Aquinas "The Cosmological Argument"

Paley, William "The Design Argument"

Gould, Stephen "The Panda's Thumb"

Dawkins, Richard (2006) *The God Delusion*. New York: Houghton Mifflin. (excerpts)

### Week 12

*Tuesday: The Biology of Belief*

Bloom, Paul (2007) "Religion is Natural" *Developmental Science*, 10, 147-151.

Kelemen, Deborah (2004) "Are Children Intuitive Theists?" *Psychological Science*. 15:295-301.

*Thursday: The Biology of Belief Cont'd*

Atran, Scott (2004) "Religion's Evolutionary Landscape" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 27: 713-70.

Boyer, Pascal (2001) *Religion Explained*. New York: Basic Books. (excerpts)

### Week 13

*Tuesday: The Biology of Belief Cont'd*

Atran, Scott (2004) "Religion's Evolutionary Landscape" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 27: 713-70.

Boyer, Pascal (2001) *Religion Explained*. New York: Basic Books. (excerpts)

*Thursday: Suicide Bombers*

Atran, Scott (2003) "Genesis of Suicide Terrorism" *Science* 299:1534-1539.



## PHIL 481: Human Nature

### Term Paper Topics and Tips

Due: May 7<sup>th</sup>, in box outside my office (443 Sutton)

#### Topics

(1) Outline, discuss, and evaluate the claim that our minds are bodies are composed of distinct substances, one mental and the other physical. Questions to consider: What are Plato's and Descartes' arguments in favor of the view that the soul is a substance distinct from the material body? Are their arguments convincing? What are some of the other "temptations to dualism"? Why do contemporary philosophers and psychologists typically deny dualism, and claim instead that the mind is determined by and dependent upon the physical body/brain? What is some of the evidence from developmental psychology that dualism is essentially "hard-wired" into our brains? How (if at all) does this evidence bear on the issue of the truth or falsity of dualism?

#### Readings:

Plato, *Phaedo*

Descartes, *Meditations II, VI*

Flanagan, Owen (2002) "Mind" in *The Problem of the Soul*. New York: Basic Books.

Rey, Georges (1997) "Temptations to Dualism" in *Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fodor, Jerry (1981) "The Mind-Body Problem" *Scientific American*.

Pinker, Steven (1997) *How the Mind Works*. New York: Norton (chapter 2)

Bloom, Paul (2005) "Worse Than Creationism" *American Psychological Society Observer*.

Bloom, Paul (2004) *Descartes' Baby*. New York: Basic Books. (chapter 7)

Berring, Jesse (forthcoming) "The Folk Psychology of Souls" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.

Kuhlmeier, Valerie *et al.* (2004) "Do 5-month-old infants see humans as material objects?" *Cognition* 94: 95-103.

(2) Stake out and defend a position on the philosophy and/or psychology of free will. Questions to consider: Why does the issue of free will seem to matter so much? In your view which is more plausible, Compatibilism or Incompatibilism? Why? How does Chisholm articulate and defend Libertarianism? Is his defense plausible? What is Strawson's argument for the impossibility of moral responsibility? How do Dennett and Nagel defend Compatibilism? Does Dennett's or Nagel's notion of "freedom" deviate from our ordinary common-sense notion? If so, in what ways, and how might this affect their defense of Compatibilism? What scientific evidence do Wegner and Wheatley offer for the claim that free will is an illusion? Supposing they're right, is their argument stronger or weaker than the standard Incompatibilist position that denies the existence of free will? What do you think a Libertarian or Compatibilist philosopher ought to make of Wegner's and Wheatley's arguments?

#### Readings:

Chisholm, Roderick (1964) "Human Freedom and the Self" in Watson (ed.) 2003. *Free Will*. Oxford: OUP.

Strawson, Galen (1994) "The Impossibility of Moral Responsibility" *Philosophical Studies* 75:5-24.

Hobbes, Thomas (1651) *Leviathan*, chapter XXI.  
 Flanagan, Owen (2002) "Free Will" in *The Problem of the Soul*. New York: Basic Books.  
 Nagel, Thomas (1986) "Freedom" in *The View From Nowhere*. Oxford: OUP.  
 Dennett, Daniel (1984) *Elbow Room*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (excerpts)  
 Bargh, J.A. and M.J. Ferguson (2000) "Beyond Behaviorism: On the Automaticity of Higher Mental Processes." *Psychological Bulletin* 126: 925-945.  
 Wegner, Daniel, and Thalia Wheatley (1999) "Apparent Mental Causation" *American Psychologist* 54: 480-492.  
 Wegner, Daniel (2002) *The Illusion of Conscious Will*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Chs 1-3)

(3) Stake out and defend a position on the nature of human morality. Questions to consider: Why do Hobbes and Wrangham think that human beings are violent by nature? Are their claims convincing? Why or why not? What are some of the philosophical and psychological arguments for the claim that human beings are benevolent by nature, put forward by (e.g.) Hume and Pinker? What is the evidence from developmental psychology that our moral thought is in some sense innate? How does this evidence bear on the philosophical question of whether human moral judgment is driven by reason or emotion? What is the "linguistic analogy" and why do some theorists (e.g., Hauser et al.) believe that it is a fruitful way of studying human morality? What exactly do Greene and Cohen mean when they claim that "for the law, neuroscience changes nothing and everything"? Are they right? Just what are the meta-ethical implications of the cognitive science of morality?

*Readings:*

Hobbes, Thomas (1651) *Leviathan*, chapter XIII, XIV (excerpts)  
 Wrangham, Richard (2004) "Killer Species" *Daedalus* 25-35.  
 Hume, David (17xx) *Treatise of Human Nature*, Book III (excerpts)  
 Pinker, Steven (1997) *How the Mind Works*. New York: Norton. (chapter 6 and 7, excerpts)  
 Bloom, Paul (2004) *Descartes' Baby*. New York: Basic Books. (chapter 5)  
 Haidt, Jonathan (2001) "The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail" *Psychological Review* 108: 814-834.  
 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph (2004) "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" *Daedalus* 55-66.  
 Bloom, Paul (2004) *Descartes' Baby*. New York: Basic Books. (chapter 5)  
 Haidt, Jonathan (2001) "The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail" *Psychological Review* 108: 814-834.  
 Haidt, Jonathan and Craig Joseph (2004) "Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues" *Daedalus* 55-66.  
 Hauser et al.(forthcoming) "Reviving Rawls' Linguistic Analogy" in Sinnott-Armstrong (ed.) *Moral Psychology and Biology*. Oxford: OUP.  
 Greene, Joshua, Cohen, J. D. (2004) "For the Law, Neuroscience Changes Nothing and Everything" *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 359: 1775-17785.  
 Greene, Joshua (2003) "From Neural "Is" to Moral "Ought" *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 4: 847-850.  
 Levy, Neil (2006). Cognitive Scientific Challenges to Morality. *Philosophical Psychology*.

(4) Stake out and defend a position on the nature of religious belief. Questions to consider: what are some of the standard philosophical arguments in support of belief in God? Are these arguments any good? Why or why not? What is some of the psychological evidence in support of the claim that human beings are in some sense hard-wired for religious belief? How, if at all, does this evidence bear on the question of the rationality of religious belief?

*Readings:*

Bloom, Paul (2007) "Religion is Natural" *Developmental Science*, 10, 147-151.

Kelemen, Deborah (2004) "Are Children Intuitive Theists?" *Psychological Science*. 15:295-301.

Atran, Scott (2004) "Religion's Evolutionary Landscape" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 27: 713-70.

Boyer, Pascal (2001) *Religion Explained*. New York: Basic Books. (excerpts)

Atran, Scott (2004) "Religion's Evolutionary Landscape" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 27: 713-70.

Boyer, Pascal (2001) *Religion Explained*. New York: Basic Books. (excerpts)

Atran, Scott (2003) "Genesis of Suicide Terrorism" *Science* 299:1534-1539.

### **Tips for Writing the Term Paper**

Note that the above topics are merely suggestions. They're intended to give you some direction, and to help you start thinking about a thesis for your paper. You shouldn't think of these as exam questions, or write your paper so as to address every single question in that order. You also shouldn't feel confined to these topics. If there's something you want to write on that isn't listed here, come and talk to me about it. If you *think* you might like to write on something else but aren't sure whether the topic is suitable, or only have a very vague idea about how your paper might go, come and talk to me. I can point you in the right direction, and help you formulate a coherent question as a focus for your paper.

The paper is due **May 7<sup>th</sup>**, **and should be 8 pages long** (standard margins and font). Here are some things to keep in mind:

Allow yourself enough time. After you've decided on a topic, try to do some preliminary reading as soon as possible. Give yourself time to write both a rough draft and a more polished version of your paper. I'm happy to look over rough drafts during office hours.

Your primary goal is to write clearly and precisely, and to defend a thesis of some sort. It should be obvious to the reader *what* your thesis is, and *how* you plan to argue for that thesis. If your thesis is not clear, or the reasons or arguments you have put forward in support of your thesis are not clear, then your paper will suffer.

Your paper should have a clear structure. I recommend adopting a simple structure, consisting of an introduction, main body, and conclusion. There's no need to be fancy.

Your introduction can be very brief. State your thesis, and provide a brief outline of what's to follow. Your introduction should *not* look like the following: "Since the dawn of time, humans have pondered the question of whether free will is compatible with determinism. Introductions

of this sort are annoying, irrelevant, and quite often false (as this one is). Simply state your thesis and plan for the rest of the paper.

The main body will take up the bulk of the paper. This is where you present the reasons and arguments in favor of your position. You must *defend* your thesis. This requires putting forward objections to the thesis (or to your argument in favor of the thesis), and showing why those objections are not convincing. It should be clear to you exactly what contribution each paragraph of your paper makes to your overall argument. If you're not sure, the reader probably won't be either.

The conclusion, unsurprisingly, should sum up what you've tried to accomplish in the paper. In general, it's not a good idea to introduce a new idea or concept in your conclusion.

Provide references for any quotations or paraphrases. You are not required to use sources other than those that were assigned, but if you do make sure to provide a list of them at the end of your paper. Web sources must also be cited.

If you use technical vocabulary, make sure to explain it. Do not assume that the reader knows any philosophy. You should write in straightforward English. There's no need to try to sound fancy or deep. Philosophy is hard enough. Just use simple, concise sentences.

You should re-read your paper (including your draft) *at least once* before handing it in. I recommend reading your paper out loud. By doing so you'll catch infelicities that you might otherwise miss. You might also have a friend read your paper.

A friendly reminder: I take plagiarism very seriously, and will immediately report any suspected cases to the appropriate University authorities.

There's much more to say about how to write a good philosophy paper. For some *very good* advice, see Jim Pryor's 'Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper': <http://www.princeton.edu/~jimpryor/general/writing.html>.

You might also take advantage of IUP's Writing Center. There are a number of writing resources on their website: <http://www.wc.iup.edu/>

Lastly, don't forget about my office hours! I'm more than happy to meet with you about your paper, at whatever stage it's in. If you're not sure how to get started, if you'd like me to look at an outline or a rough draft, or if you'd just like to run an idea by me, feel free to stop by.