

SEP 16 2005

# REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO USE W-DESIGNATION

LSC # 255  
Action \_\_\_\_\_

## COVER SHEET: Request for Approval to Use W-Designation

### TYPE I. PROFESSOR COMMITMENT

- Professor Mary C. MacLeod \_\_\_\_\_ Phone 7- 5618
- Writing Workshop? (If not at IUP, where? when?) \_\_\_\_\_
- Proposal for one W-course (see instructions below)
- Agree to forward syllabi for subsequently offered W-courses?

### TYPE II. DEPARTMENT COURSE

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

### SIGNATURES:

Professor(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Department Chairperson Merrill J. Begues  
 College Dean Rawn 9/20/05  
 Director of Liberal Studies Thuy L. Sellen

### 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.
- II. Copy of the course syllabus.
- III. Two or three samples of assignment sheets, instructions, or criteria concerning writing that are given to students. Limit: 4 pages. (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"?



### 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
Short Exposition Paper	4	4	Yes	Yes	20%
Longer Exposition Paper	2	8	Yes	Yes	40%
Critical Term Paper	1	8	Yes	Yes	40%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>B. Examinations (Complete only if you intend to use essay exams/short answers as part of the required number of pages of writing.)</b>			
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 330 "Philosophy of Science" (Mary C. MacLeod)**

In my opinion, without clear writing there is no clear thinking. If I can do any lasting service to students it is in helping them to *think* clearly. To that end, I try to help them *write* clearly and efficiently, giving them manageably small expository writing tasks at first, and then, as the semester progresses, requiring them to write clear and accurate expositions of more difficult arguments with more complex logical structures. Near the end of the semester comes a three staged process of crafting a longer piece of work the orientation of which is critical rather than expository.

Philosophy 330, Philosophy of Science, is proposed for Type III W-Designation. The course is taught once every three to four semesters and is listed as a Liberal Studies Elective. Class size is limited to 25. Most students in the class are juniors and seniors, but sophomores and freshman may be admitted. Typically, about half the enrollees are philosophy majors or minors, while the remainder may have had little or no exposure to philosophy. Because philosophical reading and writing are peculiar, students who are new to philosophy are disadvantaged, but I try to address this problem using individual workshops on expository writing.

### **I. Four 1 Page Expository Writing Assignments to Encourage Careful Reading and Efficient Writing with Individual Writing Workshops Early in the Semester (20% of grade)**

Students should understand that it may take them up to an hour to get through one page of philosophical reading. They should want to reach such a cadence because philosophical writing is dense and strange. Of course, we tend not to read at such a pace, and so I try to design assignments that will force them to. I ask students pointed questions about assigned readings that can be answered in under a page, but only after a good deal of patient engagement with the text. Students commonly insist that the answers cannot be given in one page, so I encourage them to write a two page draft and then figure out how to put their points more economically, assuring them that I have written a one page archetype myself. Content should accurately report on the primary text at issue, and the style should be clear, precise, plain and economical.

These short assignments are well suited for use in individual writing workshops because the short assignments are simpler and less difficult than longer assignments. That makes it easier to focus on writing skills. To this end, early in the semester I'll meet for no more than one half hour with each student individually in hopes of giving students a better sense for what philosophical writing requires. Each student will be asked to e-mail me an advance draft of one short expository writing assignment so that we can have it on computer in my office. I'll sit them down at my computer and have them work to improve a draft with my coaching. As a general rule, I find students speak more clearly and plainly than they write. Such students can be taught to write more as they speak. They need little more than to be told it is wanted. Many students, for example, write obscurely, or tend towards florid prose. I have found that students write this way only because they think, mistakenly, that we want them to. I assure them that such traits are not valued in philosophical writing. However disaffected they may seem initially, I have found that students respond to this exercise with determination and delight.

### **II. Two 4 Page Expository Writing Assignments to Encourage Clear, Concise Analysis and Recapitulation of Complex Philosophical Arguments (40% of grade)**

These assignments require the same kind of skills as the one page assignments, but are more challenging because they require students to attain a synoptic grasp of larger and more complex arguments and problem spaces. Students are invited to submit a draft for a second individual writing workshop before the first of these two assignments is due, but this is not required. Content should accurately report on the primary text at issue, and the style should be clear, precise, plain and economical. Presentation of points should mirror the justificatory structure of the arguments under

discussion, even if the points are presented in a different order in the original.

### **III. One 7 - 8 Page Critical Writing Assignment to Foster Intellectual Courage and Determination, with Peer and Instructor Reviewed Draft Work (40% of grade)**

Advanced undergraduate students are ready for the realization that the assigned readings didn't come down from Mount Sinai, if you will. A student should be made to want her own place to stand in a problem space, and should hope to be entitled to occupy it. Entitlement comes from careful thinking, the kind of care that we are forced to take only when it comes to putting our own original thoughts down on paper. Critical assessment encourages humility as well. Only if students have tried to do real work themselves will they appreciate the sometimes awesome genius of the readings they're asked to write about.

The final, critical writing assignment asks students to critically evaluate a particular article or a particular position studied in the course, first giving a charitable report on the content of the primary text, and then giving at least two, but not more than three important objections the arguments at issue. Finally, the student is asked to anticipate likely responses to these objections, and provide rejoinders. The final writing process is drawn out over three weeks, to encourage a serious attitude towards the work. Students are asked to write a draft at least six pages long, and to submit two copies for peer review. Students are asked to consider both style and philosophical content when reviewing drafts. Peer reviews are due one week later, and students are then given another week to revise their drafts in light of comments received. They then submit the resulting second draft to me for further review. Students are given one more week to complete and submit a final version.

**COURSE SYLLABUS**  
**Philosophy 330: Philosophy of Science**  
**Mary C. MacLeod**

**I. CATALOG DESCRIPTION**

PHIL 330 - Philosophy of Science  
Prerequisites: None  
3c - 01 - 3sh

An investigation into the nature of formal and empirical sciences: structure of scientific thought and its dependence upon or independence of theory; the logical and metaphysical status of scientific laws and theoretical concepts; reductionism in science; the concept of causality; the logic of explanation; problems in confirmation theory; science and value. No special background required. Recommended for math and science majors.

Instructor's Further Elaboration: This course aims to introduce students to important topics in the philosophy of science. Our first topic is the question whether scientific method is rational, i.e. likely to achieve its intellectual goals. We tend to think that empirical science is more reliable than astrology or parapsychology, pursuits we might disparage as "pseudo-scientific." We think empirical science employs rational, objective methods for acquiring knowledge about the world, methods not employed in "pseudo-scientific" pursuits. It is controversial, however, just what these methods are. It is even philosophically controversial whether empirical science is more responsive to evidence than are the so-called pseudo-sciences. We begin by studying these controversies.

Next, we turn to some questions about the essence of science. We tend to think that science is in the business of discovering laws of nature, laws that express very general truths about relations among things, and that allow us to predict and explain the behavior of those things. We will examine competing philosophical theories of explanation, and of the meaning and character of laws of nature. This leads us to consideration of the question whether physics is the ultimate empirical science, to which all others can be reduced.

Finally, most of us endorse a position philosophers call "scientific realism." The scientific realist thinks that the goal of science is to discover the ultimate "blueprint of the universe" and that, over the past few centuries, empirical science has made great progress in approaching this goal. We will consider arguments for scientific realism, and arguments against scientific realism. We all tend to think it would be ridiculous to deny that science increasingly approximates the truth about the universe, but the arguments against scientific realism are subtle and strong.

**II. COURSE OBJECTIVES**

- A. To acquaint students with competing accounts of what constitutes the rationality of science, and also with arguments challenging the very claim that science is rational.
- B. To acquaint students with competing accounts of the nature of scientific explanation, and with correlative accounts of the relationships holding among various empirical sciences.
- C. To acquaint students with the compelling debate over scientific realism, and to channel their natural engagement with this issue into sustained articulation and defense of their own stance on the issue.
- D. To instill students in the patience and critical reading skills required for reading philosophical writing and for giving accurate exposition of texts.

E. To assist students in recovering their natural propensity for clear, plain writing, and to guide them in learning the skills needed for well focused, efficient and precise written recapitulation of complex reasoning.

F. To foster the development of intellectual courage and determination in the articulation and defense of an original philosophical view.

### III. COURSE OUTLINE

#### A. Scientific Rationality

1. Hume's Challenge to Inductive Method
2. Popper's Falsification Solution
3. Irrationalist Challenges to Inductive and Falsificationist Methodologies
4. Sophisticated Falsificationism - Lakatos' Response to Irrationalist Challenges
5. Application to the Debate Concerning Creationist Science

#### B. Laws, Explanation and Theoretical Reduction

1. Laws of Nature: Humean Regularity Theory
2. Laws of Nature: Dretske's Necessitarian Theory
3. Scientific Explanation: Hempel's DN Model
4. Reductionism in Science

#### C. The Scientific Realism Debate

1. Carnap's Positivist Anti-Realism
2. Maxwell's Rejection of Positivism
3. van Fraassen's Non-Positivist Anti-Realism
4. The "No Miracles" Argument for Realism
5. Anti-Realist Challenges to the "No Miracles" Argument

### IV. EVALUATION METHODS

Final grade for the course is determined as follows:

- 20% Four 1 Page Expository Writing Assignments
- 40% Two 4 Page Expository Essays
- 40% One 7 - 8 Page Critical Term Paper

### V. REQUIRED READING

Selections from M. Curd and J. Cover. *Philosophy of Science: The Central Issues* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1998):

- W. Salmon "An Encounter with David Hume"
- N. Goodman "The New Riddle of Induction"
- C. Popper "The Problem of Induction"
- "Science: Conjectures and Refutations"
- W. Salmon "Rational Prediction"
- P. Duhem "Physical Theory and Experiment"
- T. Kuhn "The Nature and Necessity of Scientific Revolutions"
- I. Lakatos "Science and Pseudo-Science"

M. Ruse "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes"  
 "Creation Science Is Not Science"  
 "Response to the Commentary: *Pro Judice*"  
 L. Laudan "Commentary: Science at the Bar - Causes for Concern"  
 A. Ayer "What is a Law of Nature?"  
 F. Dretske "Laws of Nature"  
 C. Hempel "Two Basic Types of Scientific Explanation"  
 "The Thesis of Structural Identity"  
 E. Nagel "Issues in the Logic of Reductive Explanations"  
 R. Carnap "Empiricism, Semantics, and Ontology"  
 G. Maxwell "The Ontological Status of Theoretical Entities"  
 B. vanFraassen "Arguments Concerning Scientific Realism"  
 A. Musgrave "Realism versus Constructive Empiricism"  
 L. Laudan "A Confutation of Convergent Realism"

**Philosophy 330, MacLeod**  
**First Longer Expository Assignment**  
**4 pages**

Popper thinks it is rational to prefer a well corroborated theory to a less corroborated theory, and that it is rational to prefer a corroborated theory to a falsified theory. Can he give good reasons for these opinions? Explain.

**Guidance**

The answer isn't "Of course he can, obviously." I'm trying to get you to think about problems Salmon raises about Popper's position. Before getting to Salmon's objection, however, you'll need to do some set up. Explain what it is to be rational. Say something about the goals of scientific practice (where approximate truth is a possible goal, as is prediction and control.) Put the two last points together and say what it is, therefore, to give an account of scientific rationality. Explain Popper's account of scientific rationality. Explain its motivation (anti-inductivism). Explain falsification, and also corroboration, perhaps using an example. Now you can turn to Salmon. Salmon argues that Popper's anti-inductivism prevents him from defending the claims above. Explain Salmon's charge. If you wish, you may do a bit of critical assessment, but, as I note below, this paper is to be mainly an exercise in complex exposition.

**Format Requests**

Please do not identify yourself by name on the title page, or in the body of the text, but only on the back. Please write about seven or eight double spaced pages, 12 point Times font. Number the pages. Staple the pages together. Please computer print with a minimum of 1" margin for comments.

**Assessment**

In this assignment I am mostly interested in seeing clear, precise, and accurate exposition. The main challenge is to present the material charitably and clearly. It may help to imagine yourself writing for an intelligent 14 year old who is unfamiliar with the readings. You will have done a very good job your paper would get such a reader up to speed. Stylistic quality plays a lesser, but still significant role in determining your grade. I will use the following abbreviation list when attending to style; it may help to use the same list when proofreading your own work.

**AMB:** This sentence is ambiguous.

**A/Q:** Sentences begun in assertive mode should not end interrogatively.

**AWK:** This sentence is awkward in its construction.

**CIT:** You ought to give page references for claims attributed to some writer.

**CON?:** The connection between the two marked claims is UNC.

**DEF:** Technical terms should be defined for the uninitiated reader.

**G:** This sentence is ungrammatical.

**IMP:** This is imprecise.

**INC:** This is incomplete. Make more steps explicit. Leave less to the reader.

**IOW:** In other words... ; put your point in plainer terms.

**NB:** This is important.

**NNB:** Worth noting, but not a big deal.

**NS:** Non sequitur; the conclusion doesn't follow from the premises.

**NW:** To my knowledge, this is not a word.

**ORG:** The marked portion is not well organized. You would do well to make the order of presentation follow more closely the sequence of inferences in the reasoning you're laying out.

**PR:** Proofread your paper. The reader wonders, was it 3:00 or 4:00 am when you wrote this sentence?

**RH:** As a rule, avoid rhetorical questions. (Your opponent may not give you the answer you'd like to hear.)

**RO:** This is a run-on sentence. Break in two.

**SF:** This is a sentence fragment.

**SP:** This word is misspelled.

**TNA:** This needs argument, defense. Your claim is controversial.

**TNE:** This needs elaboration. Explain. Expand on this.

**UG:** Usage; this term should not be used here, I think.

**UNC:** This is unclear, confusing. (Where a chunk is marked UNC, I usually mean the structure of argument is UNC.)

**VG:** This is vague. I can guess what you intend to say, but really you've said something with less content than you intend.



### **Asides**

When you attribute claims to an author, cite text to back your attributions, and use quotation where you judge that this is most needed. Try to write clearly, precisely, and without pretense. Avoid very long sentences and very big words whenever possible. If you use technical terms, define them. Good writing is concise. If you can't keep it under 8 pages, find a ruthless editor. No chatty introductions, please. Get right to work. Do not plagiarize. Be sure to acknowledge all sources, however briefly considered. Papers submitted late without documented grounds for extension will be graded down for lateness, one third of a letter grade per day. As insurance against loss, please be sure to keep a copy.

### **IUP Academic Integrity Policy**

Please read the *IUP Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures*. It is your responsibility to know what kinds of activity are forbidden by this policy, and ignorance of promulgated policy is no excuse. The policy can be found in the Online Catalog by scrolling down the page at:

**<http://www.iup.edu/registrar/catalog/acapolicy/>**

I will not tolerate any violations of this policy. All alleged violations of the Academic Integrity Policy will be resolved either by Documented Agreement (Procedure Option II) or Formal Adjudication (Procedure Option III). Option II will be taken only with the student's consent, because only Option III provides the student a right of appeal. Options II and III both ensure that the violation, if factually established, will be on record in the university database of disciplinary files, thereby pertinent to the severity of sanctions in future violations, if any.

**Philosophy 330, MacLeod  
Critical Writing Assignment  
7 -8 pages**

**Please write on one of the following two questions, indicating your choice.**

I. Is scientific realism a defensible position?

II. Is constructive empiricism a defensible position?

**Guidance**

A good answer to Question I will overlap quite a bit with a good answer to Question II, but be sure that you don't try to do both. Whichever you choose, to make the problem-space clear you will need to answer the questions below on the way to defending an answer to the topic question.

What is scientific realism?

How does van Fraassen's scientific antirealism differ from early antirealism(s)?

How does it differ from scientific realism?

Once you've given an accurate and charitable report on all the relevant positions, it's time to turn to critical assessment. Give at least two, but not more than three important objections the position at issue (scientific realism if you choose Question I; constructive empiricism if you choose Question II.) If you opt for Question I, you should consider whether scientific realism survives van Fraassen's/Laudan's attacks. If you opt for Question II you should consider whether van Fraassen's position survives Musgrave's attack (and, perhaps, Maxwell's.) Of course, you might choose to focus on only some of these attacks, but be sure to pick tough ones. It's not enough to just pose objections; you must also anticipate likely responses to these objections, and provide rejoinders.

**Format Requests**

Please do not identify yourself by name on the title page, or in the body of the text, but only on the back. Please write about seven or eight double spaced pages, 12 point Times font. Number the pages. Staple the pages together. Please computer print with a minimum of 1" margin for comments.

**Assessment**

Until now, I've mostly been interested in seeing clear, precise, and accurate exposition. That is still important, but in this final assignment, it's time to let your own philosophical talent take wing. If you follow the guidance above carefully, you will have made an acceptable effort at original critical thinking. Expository and critical content will weigh equally in determining your grade, and as always, style will be considered too.

**Asides**

When you attribute claims to an author, cite text to back your attributions, and use quotation where you judge that this is most needed. Try to write clearly, precisely, and without pretense. Avoid very long sentences and very big words whenever possible. If you use technical terms, define them. Good writing is concise. If you can't keep it under 8 pages, find a ruthless editor. No chatty introductions, please. Get right to work. Do not plagiarize. Be sure to acknowledge all sources, however briefly considered. Papers submitted late without documented grounds for extension will be graded down for lateness, one third of a letter grade per day. As insurance against loss, please be sure to keep a copy.

**IUP Academic Integrity Policy**

Please read the *IUP Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures*. It is your responsibility to know what kinds of activity are forbidden by this policy, and ignorance of promulgated policy is no excuse. The policy can be found in the Online Catalog by scrolling down the page at:

<http://www.iup.edu/registrar/catalog/acapolicy/>

I will not tolerate any violations of this policy. All alleged violations of the Academic Integrity Policy will be resolved either by Documented Agreement (Procedure Option II) or Formal Adjudication (Procedure Option III). Option II will be taken only with the student's consent, because only Option III provides the student a right of appeal. Options II and III both ensure that the violation, if factually established, will be on record in the university database of disciplinary files, thereby pertinent to the severity of sanctions in future violations, if any.

#### **Guidance for Peer Reviewers**

Peer reviewers are encouraged to consider both content and style when reading drafts. Check whether the Guidance advice has been followed, and subject the author's arguments to scrutiny. Reviewers may wish to make use of the following abbreviation list when commenting on style.

**AMB:** This sentence is ambiguous.

**A/Q:** Sentences begun in assertive mode should not end interrogatively.

**AWK:** This sentence is awkward in its construction.

**CIT:** You ought to give page references for claims attributed to some writer.

**CON?:** The connection between the two marked claims is UNC.

**DEF:** Technical terms should be defined for the uninitiated reader.

**G:** This sentence is ungrammatical.

**IMP:** This is imprecise.

**INC:** This is incomplete. Make more steps explicit. Leave less to the reader.

**IOW:** In other words... ; put your point in plainer terms.

**NB:** This is important.

**NNB:** Worth noting, but not a big deal.

**NS:** Non sequitur; the conclusion doesn't follow from the premises.

**NW:** To my knowledge, this is not a word.

**ORG:** The marked portion is not well organized. You would do well to make the order of presentation follow more closely the sequence of inferences in the reasoning you're laying out.

**PR:** Proofread your paper. The reader wonders, was it 3:00 or 4:00 am when you wrote this sentence?

**RH:** As a rule, avoid rhetorical questions. (Your opponent may not give you the answer you'd like to hear.)

**RO:** This is a run-on sentence. Break in two.

**SF:** This is a sentence fragment.

**SP:** This word is misspelled.

**TNA:** This needs argument, defense. Your claim is controversial.

**TNE:** This needs elaboration. Explain. Expand on this.

**UG:** Usage; this term should not be used here, I think.

**UNC:** This is unclear, confusing. (Where a chunk is marked UNC, I usually mean the structure of argument is UNC.)

**VG:** This is vague. I can guess what you intend to say, but really you've said something with less content than you intend.

## Philosophy 481W (S 06): Hume's *Treatise*

This course will be an intensive examination of David Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature* (1739), one of the most important texts in the history of Western philosophy. Hume called the *Treatise* "an attempt to introduce the experimental method of reasoning into moral subjects." Put in more contemporary terms, we could say the *Treatise* was meant to establish a new science, psychology, including not only a study of human motivation and values, but also a study of human cognition (belief and knowledge.)

The first book of the *Treatise*, "Of the Understanding," concerns belief and knowledge, and is widely regarded as the purest development of British Empiricist methods and strictures. Hume's famous skepticism about induction is found here, as are his unusual views concerning external world skepticism and personal identity. The second book, "Of the Passions," explores human motivations and feelings (including pride, sympathy, anger and love), and is most closely tied to what we now would call "psychology." Hume's study of motivation sets the stage for the third book of the *Treatise*, "Of Morals," which develops and defends the view that moral judgments are not based on reason, but on feeling ("sentiment.") We will study all three books, and will also read secondary literature on Hume's *Treatise*. As well as illuminating the primary text, attention to secondary literature is meant to initiate students in the critical assessment of competing scholarly interpretations.

### Text

There are two required texts:

*A Treatise of Human Nature*, D. Hume, Oxford University Press, ISBN 0-19-824588-2, and, *Hume's System*, Pears, D. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), ISBN 0-79-875099-4.

In addition, numerous articles interpreting Hume will be assigned, and available through WebCT.

### Course Objectives

- A. To acquaint students with Hume's famous treatments of topics in metaphysics, epistemology, moral psychology, and metaethics.
- B. To initiate students in the critical assessment of competing scholarly interpretations.
- C. To instill in students the patience and critical skills required for reading philosophical writing and for giving accurate exposition of texts.
- D. To assist students in recovering their natural propensity for clear, plain writing, and to guide them in learning the skills needed for well focused, efficient and precise written recapitulation of complex reasoning.
- E. To foster the development of intellectual courage and determination in the articulation and defense of an original philosophical view.

### Our Mutual Obligations

I will prepare for each class mindful of my obligations to you and to IUP. I will always do my part, working hard to make each class session instructive, thought provoking, and lively. You must work hard too. You owe careful reading and regular attendance to yourself, to me, and to your classmates, because we are engaged in a joint learning endeavor the success of which depends partly on your effort.

Students who faithfully attend class will be welcomed with delight during my scheduled

office hours, however weak their command of the material. Students who regularly miss class without a documented excuse forfeit the right to my help. They'll probably get it anyway, but they won't have a right to it.

## Evaluation Methods

Final grade for the course is determined as follows:

<b>Weekly 1 Page Expository Papers</b>	35%
<b>One 6 Page Critical Paper</b>	20%
<b>Peer Reviews</b>	5%
<b>One 10 -12 Page Critical Term Paper</b>	40%

**1 Page Expository Papers:** For each of these assignments, you must answer a pointed question about assigned readings. These questions can be answered in one page, but only after a good deal of patient engagement with the readings. Content should accurately report on the text at issue, and the style should be clear, precise, plain and economical. I will drop you lowest 1 page paper score when calculating your final grade. The 1 page paper due April 10 will be a term paper outline, and must include a proposed bibliography. The outline must make clear the structure and content of your paper. It should make clear what interpretive thesis you're defending, and also how you'll defend it, all in enough detail to allow me to provide useful feedback. This will require a good deal of work, but should prepare you well for initial draft writing. There are nine 1 page papers in total.

**6 Page Critical Paper:** The 6 page paper requires the same expository skills as the one page papers, and more. To do well, you will need to attain a synoptic grasp of larger and more complex arguments and problem spaces. The main task will be critical assessment of some interpretive thesis, which you will need to present and then discuss. You will be given a choice of topics.

**10 - 12 Page Critical Term Paper:** The final paper assignment requires you to defend your own scholarly interpretation of some portion of the *Treatise* studied in this course. Your discussion must show knowledge of the primary text and also of relevant secondary literature assigned in connection with your topic. You must give charitable expositions of the portions of the *Treatise* you're discussing, defend a stance on some controversial topic in Hume scholarship, marshaling arguments in support of your interpretive thesis. You must then give at least two, but not more than three important objections to these arguments. Finally, you must provide responses to these objections, and anticipate likely rejoinders, responding again briefly.

The writing process for the term paper is drawn out over four weeks, to encourage a serious attitude toward the work. You must write a draft at least seven pages long, and submit three copies for peer review. Students are asked to consider both style and content when reviewing drafts. Peer reviews are due one week later, and you are then given another week to revise your draft in light of comments received. You then submit your revised draft to me for further review, together with the Peer Reviews you received on your first draft. You will receive my feedback on your revised draft at the Mandatory Paper Workshop (our final class meeting.) You are then given one more week to complete and submit a final version.

During the final four classes we will hold term paper colloquia, and attendance is mandatory at all four sessions. These sessions will be in class conversations about student's work. Each student will be asked to provide a 5 - 10 minute presentation summarizing his or her term paper (which, at this point, will still be a work in progress.) Following the presentation, students will be asked to contribute helpful feedback.

### **Due Dates:**

1 Page Papers:	Each Monday except 1/23, 3/6, 4/17, 4/26 & 5/1
5 Page Paper:	March 8
7 Page Term Paper Draft:	April 17

Peer Reviews:	April 19
10 Page Revised Draft:	April 26
Final Version of Term Paper:	May 8

1 page papers are due on \*-ed dates in the Reading and Writing Schedule.

**Late Paper Policy:** Please don't ask for extensions unless you have documented grounds to do so. Paradigmatic grounds are medical emergency, medical illness, and family emergency. If a paper is submitted without documented grounds for extension, the following deduction policy will apply:

- late 5 page paper or late term paper -- one third of a letter grade per day;
- late 1 page paper -- one letter grade per day; and,
- late peer review -- no credit at all.

### IUP Academic Integrity Policy

Please read the *IUP Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures*. It is your responsibility to know what kinds of activity are forbidden by this policy, and ignorance of promulgated policy is no excuse. The policy can be found by scrolling down the page at <http://www.iup.edu/registrar/catalog/acapolicy>

I will not tolerate any violations of this policy. All alleged violations of the Academic Integrity Policy will be resolved by either Documented Agreement (Procedure Option II) or Formal Adjudication (Procedure Option III). Option II will be taken only with the student's consent, because only Option III provides the student a right of appeal. Options II and III both ensure that the violation, if factually established, will be on record in the university database of disciplinary files, pertinent to the severity of sanctions in future violations, if any.

### Important Rule Concerning Paper Submissions

I will return ungraded any paper handed in without a Bibliography, and will deduct points for lateness until the paper is resubmitted with proper bibliographic references. You must acknowledge any material you have read in preparation for your written work, whether that material comes from the required text, library books, academic journals, your personal library, or the Internet. Bibliographic references must include the title of the work, the author, page numbers, publisher, and date of publication.

### Reading and Writing Schedule

**Book One: Of the Understanding**

Jan	18	Introduction
	23	<i>Impressions, Ideas and The Copy Principle</i> I.1.i - v (i.e. Book I Part 1 Sections i - v)
	25	ARTICLES:     1. Pears, D., "A General Account" 2. Ibid., "The Derivation of Ideas from Impressions" from <i>Hume's System</i> , Pears, D. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), Chs. 1 & 2.
	30*	<i>Knowledge, Inference, Reason</i> I.3.i - vi [NOTE: I.3.vi is very important.]
Feb.	1	I.3.i - vi continued ARTICLE:       3. Winkler, K., "Hume's Inductive Skepticism" from <i>The Empiricists</i> , Atherton, M., ed. (Lanham: Rowan and Littlefield, 1999) pp. 183 - 212.

- 6\* *Belief*  
I.3.vii - x and Appendix 623 -629  
ARTICLE: 4. Govier, T., "Variations on Force and Vivacity"  
from *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No 86 (Jan. 1972), 44 - 52.
- 8 *Idea of Necessary Connection*  
I.3.xiv pp. 155 - 162
- 13\* I.3.xiv pp. 162 - 172 and Appendix 632-633  
ARTICLE: 5. Pears, D., "Causation: The Second Effect of the Evidence"  
from *Hume's System*, Pears, D., Ch. 7.
- 15 *Is Hume A Sceptical Realist?*  
ARTICLE: 6. Winkler, K., "The New Hume"  
from *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 100, No. 4 (Oct. 1991), 541 - 579.
- 20\* ARTICLE: 7. Blackburn, S., "Hume and Thick Connexions"  
from *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 50, (suppl., 1990) 237 - 50.
- 22 *Scepticism with Regard to the Senses*  
I.2.vi & I.4.ii pp. 188 - 210 [NOTE: There is a reading from I.2 and also one from I. 4]
- 27\* I.4.ii pp. 211 - 218  
ARTICLE 8. Pears, D. ""Sense Perception: Hume's Assessment of the Problem"  
from *Hume's System*, Pears, D., Ch. 10.
- Mar 1 ARTICLE 9. Pears, D. ""Sense Perception: Hume's Heroic Solution"  
from *Hume's System*, Pears, D., Ch. 11.
- 6 *Personal Identity*  
I.4.vi
- 8 **The Notorious Appendix Retraction 633 - 636**  
SIX PAGE PAPER DUE
- 20\* ARTICLE: 10. Garrett, D., "Hume's Self Doubts about Personal Identity"  
from *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 90, No. 3 (July 1981), pp. 337 - 358.
- 22 No Class (Professor absent for conference presentation.)

**Book Two: Of the Passions**

- 27\* *The Influencing Motives of the Will*  
II.3.iii  
ARTICLE: 11. Mackie, J., "Hume's Psychology of Action"  
fr. *Hume's Moral Theory*, Mackie, J., (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980),  
pp.44 - 50.

**Book Three: Of Morals**

- 29 *Moral Distinctions not Derived from Reason*  
III.1.i

Apr 3\* ARTICLE: 12. Mackie, J., "Morality Not Based on Reason"  
fr. *Hume's Moral Theory*, Mackie, J., pp. 51 - 63.

5 *Moral Distinctions Derived from a Moral Sense*  
III.1.ii

ARTICLE: 13. Mackie, J., "Variants of Sentimentalism"  
fr. *Hume's Moral Theory*, Mackie, J., pp. 64 - 75.

**Back to Book Two: Of the Passions**

10\* *Indirect Passions, Pride and Humility*  
II.1.i - vii

12 *Liberty and Necessity*  
II.3.i - ii

17 ARTICLE: 14. Botterill, G., "Hume on Liberty and Necessity"  
from *Reading Hume on Human Understanding*, Millican, P., ed.  
(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 277 - 300.

19 Term Paper Colloquium

24 Term Paper Colloquium

26 Term Paper Colloquium

May 1 Term Paper Colloquium