THE COLLEGE OF
# WOOSTER

# The Philosophy Major's Handbook

Department of Philosophy
The College of Wooster
2020-2021

*Welcome to the Philosophy Department! The aim of this handbook is to help you develop the skills and acquire the knowledge that will be most beneficial to you in your study of philosophy at the College of Wooster. As faculty we share the same aim as you, to facilitate your learning and development. It is your responsibility to use the resources, services, and help that we can provide.*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

4

# 1. MISSION STATEMENT AND LEARNING GOALS

### § Philosophy Department Mission Statement

*The Philosophy Department has as its mission the cultivation of philosophical skills and dispositions in its students that contribute to their development as autonomous persons and as responsible and engaged members of society. These skills and dispositions are acquired and honed through studying and doing philosophy. They facilitate a student's development by enabling the critical, systematic, and philosophically informed examination of beliefs, values, and conceptions of the world. Such a person exemplifies an independence of thought that embodies philosophical intellectual virtues or qualities.*

### § Philosophical Virtues or Qualities

The following intellectual qualities or virtues help define the character traits that trained philosophers should have

*Knowing how and when to be skeptical and critical and how and when to be open to new ideas*

*Knowing when to attend to broad strategic issues and when to look after details*

*Knowing how to be logical and systematic as well creative and intuitive*

*Being able to reason for oneself as well as to learn from others*

*Knowing how to cultivate and nourish one's own philosophical interests, passions and self-confidence*

### § Learning Goals

The following six goals are what the department expects majors to achieve by the end of their course of studies.

1. ***Interpretation and Analysis***
   Students should be able to analyze, interpret, and understand philosophical texts and discourse.

2. ***Argumentation***
   Students should be able to effectively identify, evaluate, and formulate arguments.

3. ***Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology***
   Students should be able to demonstrate a high degree of fluency with the major traditions, figures, concepts, and methods of philosophy.

### 4. *Communication*
Students should be able to develop, organize, and express ideas in a precise, clear, effective, and systematic manner in writing and discussion.

### 5. *Philosophical Independence*
Students should be independent in their thinking in order to be able to form their own philosophical views using the skills mentioned above.

### 6. *Personal Development*
Students should know how to cultivate the philosophical virtues or qualities mentioned earlier in ways that allow them to apply their philosophical skills beyond the philosophical academic context

## § Primary Traits Associated With Each Learning Goal

Each of the five learning goals is associated with measurable skills that help determine whether students are meeting the learning goals.

### 1. *Interpretation and Analysis*
Students should be able to analyze, interpret, and understand philosophical texts and discourse.

Success in achieving this goal will be assessed by a student's ability to:
- identify and describe the main aim(s) of a text or thinker.
- identify and describe the strategy of a text or thinker.
- identify and describe the main assumption(s) of a text or thinker.
- recognize what is important about or "at stake in" a philosophical debate.
- separate understanding a text from evaluating a text.
- summarize and explicate the main support for the main conclusion(s).
- pick-out key terms for analysis.
- identify incomplete, ambiguous, vague, or nonsensical concepts and statements.
- ask incisive questions of a thinker/text.
- apply the principle of charity in interpretation.

### 2. *Argumentation*
Students should be able to effectively identify, evaluate, and formulate arguments.

Success in achieving this goal will be assessed by a student's ability to:
- identify the difference between a position and an argument for a position.
- extract an argument from a piece of text.
- define and identify formal and informal fallacies.
- employ elementary logic to evaluate an argument.
- formulate a strong objection to a given argument.
- formulate an effective and well-reasoned argument for and against a position.

### 3. *Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology*

Students should be able to demonstrate a high degree of fluency with the major traditions, figures, concepts, and methods of philosophy.

Success in achieving this goal will be assessed by a student's ability to:
- recognize the difference between philosophical and non-philosophical questions.
- explain the relationship between the methodology of philosophy and that of other disciplines.
- distinguish between empirical claims and *a priori* claims.
- use conceptual analysis to enrich one's understanding of philosophical problems and proposed solutions.
- explain and employ the distinctions between metaphysics, epistemology, value theory, and logic.
- explain and use the fundamental concepts and theories in the main areas of philosophy such as ethics, political theory, logic, metaphysics and epistemology
- connect and integrate the discussion in one area of philosophy to another.
- exhibit fluency with major traditions and figures in the history of philosophy.

### 4. *Communication*

Students should be able to develop, organize, and express ideas in a precise, clear, effective, and systematic manner in writing and discussion.

Success in achieving this goal will be assessed by a student's ability to:
- discuss philosophy in a thoughtful and engaging manner.
- listen well to other people's presentations and commentaries
- show respect for others and their ideas (express disagreement in a respectful and rational manner).
- deliver oral presentations to a class or group.
- research a paper.
- plan a paper strategically.
- structure a paper given the strategy.
- choose the most appropriate and precise wording.
- stick to the point.

### 5. *Philosophical Independence*

Students should aim for independence in their thinking in order to be able to form their own philosophical views using the skills mentioned above

Success in achieving this goal will be assessed by a student's ability to:
- state philosophical positions that they consider to be their own and see the importance of those positions for other philosophical issues
- support those positions with well-reasoned argumentation, including being able to answer objections
- reach well-reasoned conclusions regarding ethical, political, social, and other philosophical issues
- formulate novel conceptual questions and distinguish them from problems that are empirical

### 6. *Personal Development*

Students should cultivate the philosophical virtues or qualities mentioned earlier in ways that allow them to apply their philosophical skills beyond the philosophical academic context

Success in achieving this goal will be assessed by a student's ability to:
- critically self-assess his or her progress with regard to the intellectual qualities or virtues required for philosophy
- apply philosophical thinking skills to conceptual problems in other academic disciplines.
- apply philosophical concepts and skills to problems as they arise in various careers and professions such as teaching, business, law, medicine and science.
- apply philosophical thinking skills relevantly to everyday contexts.

## 2. CURRICULUM

**Ethics, Justice, and Society**
- 100    Ethics, Justice, and Society
- 210    Jurisprudence: Law and Society  (Alternate Years)
- 212    Race, Gender, and Justice  [C]  (Alternate Years)
- 215    Biomedical Ethics  (Alternate Years)
- 216    Environmental Ethics  (Alternate Years)

**Philosophy and the Liberal Arts**
- 220    Logic and Philosophy
- 221    Philosophy and the Religious Life  [R] (Alternate Years)
- 222    Scientific Revolutions and Methodology  (Alternate Years)
- 223    Philosophy, Culture, and Education  (Alternate Years)
- 224    Art, Love, and Beauty (Alternate Years)

**Comparative Philosophy**
- 230    East/West Comparative Philosophy [C, W†]  (Alternate Years)
- 231    Indian Philosophy and Its Roots [C, W†]  (Alternate Years)

**Historical Foundations**
- 250    Ancient Philosophy: Plato and Aristotle
- 251    Rationalism and Empiricism
- 261    Themes in Continental Philosophy (Alternate Years)
- 264    Existentialism  [W†]  (Alternate Years)
- 266    American Philosophy  (Alternate Years)
- 299    Islamic Philosophy

**Advanced Seminars in Philosophy**
- 301    Ontological Commitments (Alternate Years)
- 302    Epistemology:  Rationality and Objectivity   (Alternate Years)
- 303    Understanding Language   (Alternate Years)
- 304    Philosophy of Mind and Cognitive Science  (Alternate Years)
- 310    Seminar in Philosophy [W†]
- 311    Ethical Theory
- 312    Political Philosophy  (Alternate Years)
- 400    Tutorial

**Independent Study**
- 401    Junior Independent Study
- 451    Senior Independent Study
- 452    Senior Independent Study

(Prerequisite for 300 and 400 level courses: Minimum of **two** philosophy courses.)

# Philosophy Department
## Philosophy Dept. Classes and Learning Goals

I = Introduced  E = Emphasized in Class  A = Assumed

**Philosophy Learning Qualities and Goals** — learning goal columns:

1. Skeptical vs Open to new ideas
2. Strategic overview vs Attention to Details
3. Systematic vs Creative
4. Reasoning for oneself vs Learning from Others
5. Cultivating one's own passions etc
6. Identify & describe aims, strategy, assumptions and argument of a text
7. Separate understanding & evaluation of text
8. Analysis of key terms and identify problematic statements
9. Identify and summarize arguments
10. Use informal and formal logic
11. Formulate strong objections
12. Formulate arguments for and against a position
13. Explain methodology of philosophy compared to other disciplines
14. Distinguish a priori and empirical claims
15. Understand key concepts in areas of philosophy
16. Connect areas of philosophy
17. Fluency with major historical traditions
18. Listen well and discuss with respect in group
19. Research, plan and structure a paper
20. Stick to point with appropriate word choice
21. Deliver an oral presentation
22. State one's own position and understand its importance for ethical social & political issues
23. Support one's position
24. Formulate novel non-empirical questions
25. Critical and appreciative self-assessment
26. Apply philosophical skills to other disciplines
27. Apply philosophical skills to social professional and everyday problems

Grouping: Philosophical Qualities (1–5); Interpretation and Analysis (6–8); Argumentation (9–12); Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology (13–17); Communication (18–21); Philosophical Independence (22–24); Personal Development (25–27).

| Courses \ Goal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Senior Independent Study | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |  | A | A | E | A | A | E | A | A | A | A | A | E |  | A | A | E |  |  |
| Junior Independent Study | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |  | A | A | E | A | A | E | A | A | A | A | E | E |  | A | A | E |  |  |
| Political Philosophy | A | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | A |  | E | A | E | A | E | E |  | E | E | E |  |  |  |
| Ethical Theory | A | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | A |  | E | E | E | A | E | E |  | E | E | E |  |  |  |
| Phil Mind and Cognitive Science | A | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | A | E | E | A |  | A | E | E |  |  | E | E |  | E |  |
| Understanding Language | A | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | A | E | E | A |  | A | E | E |  |  | E | E |  | E |  |
| Epistemology | A | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | A | E | E | A |  | A | E | E |  |  | E | E |  | E |  |
| Ontological Commitments | A | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | A | E | E | A |  | A | E | E |  |  | E | E |  | E |  |
| Existentialism | E |  | E | E |  | E | E |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | E | E | E | E |  |  |  | E |  |  |  | E |  |
| Topics in Continental Philosophy | E |  | E | E |  | E | E |  |  |  |  | E | A |  | E |  | E | E |  |  |  | E |  |  |  | E |  |
| Rationalism and Empiricism |  |  |  |  | E | E | E |  | E |  | E | E | A | E | E | E | E |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  | E |  |
| Ancient Philosophy |  |  |  | E |  | E | E |  | E | E | E | E | A |  | E | E | E | E |  | E |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Philosophy | E |  | E | E | E | E | E |  | E |  | E | E | A |  | E | E | E | E |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |
| African Philosophy | E |  | E | E | E | E | E |  | E |  | E | E | E |  | E | E | E | E |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese Philosophy | E |  | E | E | E | E | E |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | E | E | E | E |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indian Philosophy and Its Roots | E |  | E | E | E | E | E | E | E |  | E | E |  |  | E | E | E | E | E |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |
| East/West Comparative Philosophy | E |  | E | E | E | E | E | E | E |  | E | E |  |  | E | E | E | E | E |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |
| Art, Love, and Beauty |  |  | E | I | E | E | E | E | E |  | E | E |  |  | E | E | E | I |  | E |  | E |  |  |  |  | E |
| Philosophy, Culture, and Education |  |  | E | I | E | E | E |  | E |  | E | E |  |  | E | E | E | I |  | E |  | E |  |  | E | E | E |
| Scientific Revolutions and Methodology |  |  | E | I | E | E | E |  | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E |  | E |  | E |  |  | E | E | E |
| Philosophy and the Religious Life | E |  | E | I | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | I |  | E |  | E |  |  | E | E | E |
| Logic and Philosophy |  |  | E | I |  | E | E | E |  | E | E | E |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental Ethics |  |  | E | I | E | E | E |  | E |  | E | E | E | E | E |  |  |  |  | E |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biomedical Ethics |  |  | E | I | E | E | E |  | E |  |  | E | E | E | E |  |  |  |  | E |  | E | E | E |  |  | E |
| Race, Gender, and Justice | E |  | E | I | E | E | E |  | E |  | E | E | E | E | E |  |  |  |  | E |  | E | E | E |  |  |  |
| Jurisprudence |  |  | E | I | E | E | E | E | E |  | E | E | E | E | E | E |  |  |  | E |  | E | E | E |  | E | E |
| Ethics, Justice, and Society | I |  | I | I | I | I | I |  | I |  | I | I | I |  | I | I |  | I |  | I |  | I | I | I |  |  |  |

# 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MAJOR

## § Required Courses

We designed the major to provide students with as wide a knowledge of philosophy as we can, and, at the same time, to encourage double majors. This is why we have the minimum of *ten* required courses and, for this reason, majors need to understand and follow the structure of the curriculum. Additionally, the department offers courses in non-western philosophy and applied ethics, as well as interdisciplinary philosophical courses, such as jurisprudence (the philosophy of law), which majors can take even though they are not required. The entire curriculum is presented in Section 2.

The ten courses required for a philosophy major are:

- Logic and Philosophy (PHIL 220)
- Ancient Philosophy (PHIL 250)
- Rationalism and Empiricism (PHIL 251)
- Advanced Seminars in Philosophy (One Course)
    - Ontological Commitments (PHIL 301)
    - Epistemology: Rationality and Objectivity (PHIL 302)
    - Understanding Language (PHIL 303)
    - Philosophy of Mind and Cognitive Science (PHIL 304)
- Ethical Theory (PHIL 311)
- Junior Independent Study (PHIL 401)
- Senior Independent Study – Semester One (PHIL 451)
- Senior Independent Study – Semester Two (PHIL 452)
- Philosophy Elective
- Philosophy Elective

[**Note**: PHIL 100 – Ethics, Justice, and Society can count as one of the required electives.]

## § Recommended Timeline

The courses in the department are systematically related; skills and knowledge developed in some courses are presupposed and/or integrated into other courses. Thus, there is a timeline or schedule that helps students most effectively progress through the major. In general, we expect students to follow this schedule:

### First Year
Ethics, Justice, and Society (PHIL 100)
One Historical Foundations Course: Either PHIL 250 or PHIL 251

### Sophomore Year
One Historical Foundations Course: Either PHIL 250 or PHIL 251
Logic and Philosophy (PHIL 220) or one Continental Philosophy course
    (PHIL 261 or PHIL 264)
Philosophy Elective

### Junior Year
Advanced Seminar in Philosophy (Either Semester)
Junior I.S. (Either Semester)
Ethical Theory

### Senior Year
Senior I.S. Semester One
Senior I.S. Semester Two

This sequence will help effectively develop your philosophical skills and knowledge. Since the two historical foundations courses (PHIL 250 – Ancient Philosophy and PHIL 251 – Rationalism and Empiricism) provide important background for other courses, they should be completed in your sophomore year. Continental Philosophy courses presuppose an understanding of the issues in PHIL 251 – Rationalism and Empiricism; thus it is recommended to take this after completing PHIL 251. Please remember that your writing intensive course (W) must be completed prior to enrolling in Junior I.S. Additionally, students are urged to take courses that are relevant to their Senior I.S. before their senior year. In general, if you are planning to take a 200-level philosophy course as an elective, we would suggest that you do so in your sophomore or junior year.

However, we recognize that the program of study for each student may vary according to individual circumstances and needs. For example, students who study off-campus for a semester will need to carefully adjust their schedule, and double majors will need to be attentive to scheduling conflicts that can arise between required courses, such as Junior I.S. It is important to follow this schedule when possible and to discuss possible variations with your advisor.

# 5.  REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOUBLE MAJOR

We encourage students to consider a double major. There is a synergy between the study of philosophy and of the basic concepts and principles of another discipline: each can deepen one's understanding of the other.

With regard to almost all other disciplines, there is a philosophical study for that area, such as the philosophy of literature, biology, economics, and history. Each of these branches of philosophy has its own books, journals, and specialists, many of who have advanced degrees in both philosophy and the other discipline. Some of the work done in these branches of philosophy is very exciting. Often conceptual debates in other disciplines occur at the cutting edge. Furthermore, sometimes insights from one area of philosophy have not been applied in another.

Students who have a strong interest in two fields should begin by discussing their interests with faculty in each department.  This will help in identifying questions that can be effectively explored using the methodologies of different disciplines.  To officially declare a double major you need to obtain the "Proposal for a Double Major" form from the Academic Affairs' website <https://www.wooster.edu/offices/registrar/forms/>. To complete the form, you must meet with the Chair of each department to discuss potential topics for Senior I.S.

Requirements for each major in a double major are the same as those for a single major with the exception that, subject to the approval of both departments/programs, a joint Senior I.S. project may be done on a topic that incorporates materials, methodologies, and approaches from both disciplines.

Students who declare a double major must complete two separate **Junior I.S.** courses (401)—one in **each** major department. Students who have been approved for a double major must register for the **Senior Independent Study Thesis** in one major during the fall semester and in the second major during the spring semester.

An individualized piece of work for two departments requires some additional planning, and double major students are strongly advised to consult with both departments in mid-April of their junior year. Your philosophy advisor should help you to build a preliminary conceptual thesis that dovetails with your work in the other major. He or she will also help you build a preliminary bibliography to guide your summer research before your senior year.

As a double major student, your Senior I.S. thesis must satisfy the requirements of both departments. For example, most of the social and natural sciences will expect you to complete empirical research using the appropriate methods. Likewise, in the humanities, you will be expected to employ the critical methodology of the other discipline, such as literary criticism. However, almost any empirical investigation in the sciences or critique in the humanities raises, or depends upon, conceptual issues that can form the basis of an interesting philosophical thesis. Thus, you will learn how each discipline can inform the work of the other. In this way, one can write a joint senior thesis that satisfies the criteria for both departments and yet that has the integrity of a unified piece of work.

# 6. OFF-CAMPUS STUDY

Off-campus study enriches one's life both academically and culturally. Philosophy majors have participated in a wide array of off-campus study programs. In general, off-campus experiences can be distinguished into two general types: academic and cultural. Your experience can be designed to expose you to an academic environment different than Wooster's or to help you become engaged with a different culture and conception of the world. Clearly, these are not mutually exclusive, but on-campus living at the University of Aberdeen in Scotland where you are studying philosophy, history, and religious dimensions of the Scottish Enlightenment is different from a home-stay in Kenya where you are studying health care and development issues.

If you are planning to study off-campus for a semester, please consult your advisor about which courses you might take during that period.  You should also contact the Director of International and Off-Campus Study. A complete listing of Wooster Endorsed Programs and Policies is available at <https://www.wooster.edu/offices/off-campus/>.

Below is a list of off-campus programs in which philosophy students have recently participated.

## AFRICA
Botswana (SIT)
  David Wissemann, Fall 2007

Ethiopia (SIT)
  Jaimy Stoll, Fall 2006

Ghana (SIT)
  David Wigger, Fall 2006

Kenya (SIT)
  Kathryn Allen, Fall 2005

Morocco, Rabat (IES)
  Ben Peters, Fall 2013
  Paige Ambord, Spring 2013

South Africa, Cape Town (SIT)
  Colin Turner, Spring 2004

Uganda Development Studies (SIT)
  Megan Mitchell, Fall 2004

## NORTH AMERICA
USA, Philadelphia, The Philadelphia Center
  Anthony Apollon, Fall 2007

USA, Washington, American University
Washington Semester
  Methawee Manupipatpong, Spring 2012

## MIDDLE EAST
Jordan, Amman (SIT)
  Zane Shetler, Spring 2009
  Madelyn Cobb, Fall 2019

## OCEANIA
Australia, Melbourne (IES)
  Austin Drewyor, Spring 2009

Australia, Sydney (Arcadia)
  Alec Muller, Fall 2011

New Zealand, Auckland (IES)
  Addy Cary, Fall 2006

New Zealand, Christchurch (Arcadia)
  Alexander Cohen, Fall 2019

New Zealand, Christchurch (IES)
  Jordan Miller, Spring 2014

New Zealand, Dunedin (Arcadia)
  Sarah Leother, Spring 2014
  Ryan McCormack, Fall 2012

New Zealand, Wellington (Arcadia)
  Amy Hagedorn, Fall 2017
  Arthur Williams, Spring 2015

New Zealand, Wellington (IFSA Butler)
  Russell Roberts, Fall 2007

## LATIN AMERICA
Argentina, Buenos Aires (SIT)
  James Thomas Fall 2013

Chile, Santiago (IES)
  Robert Ippolito, Fall 2007
  Cassiel Archdeacon, Fall 2008

## EUROPE

Austria, Vienna (IES)
Jacob Caldwell, Spring 2015

Denmark, Copenhagen (DIS)
Alejandro Arriaga, Fall 2018

England, Oxford University (Arcadia)
Pedro Oliboni, Spring 2019
Rachel Villari, Fall 2011

England, London  (Wooster TREK)
Maxwell Gregg, Summer 2018

France, Toulouse (Dickson)
Zach Diehl, Spring 2014

France, Paris (IES)
Lauren Schreur, Fall 2005

France, Nantes (IES)
Eungyeol Kwan, Spring 2018

Germany, Berlin (IES)
Teagan Robinson, Fall 2017

Greece, Athens (Arcadia)
Kevin Whalen, Spring 2009

Greece, Athens (College Year in Athens)
Brittany Potts, Fall 2008
Halden Schwallie, Fall 2009

Hungary, Pécs (Wooster TREK)
Jacob Abramo, Summer 2018

Ireland, Dublin (IES)
Sarah Palagyi, Spring 2009

Ireland, Cork (Arcadia)
Peter Olson, Fall 2015

Italy, Florence (Syracuse University)
Richard Barnes, Spring 2013

Italy, Florence (API)
Deb Coffman, Spring 2006
Elizabeth Derringer, Fall 2008

Italy, Rome (IES)
Oliver Raker, Spring 2014
Mary Brickhouse, Fall 2010

Iceland, Reykjavik
Jon Martin, Fall 2006

Netherlands, Amsterdam (IES)
Penn Tarleton, Fall 2009

Netherlands, Amsterdam (SIT)
Meredith Wilson, Fall 2007

Netherlands, Leiden
Mark Schneider, Spring 2007

Scotland, University of Aberdeen (Butler)
Frank Simmerman, Spring 2006
David Albrechta, Fall 2006

Scotland, University of Aberdeen (Butler)
Frank Simmerman, Spring 2006
David Albrechta, Fall 2006

Scotland, University of St. Andrews (Arcadia)
Alex Fiander, Fall 2019

Scotland, University of St. Andrews (Butler)
Lindsay Brainard, Spring 2008

Scotland, University of Edinburgh (Arcadia)
Emma Arvedon, Fall 2017
Thomas Ames, Spring 2015

Scotland, University of Edinburgh
(Parliamentary Internship)
Ben Gummoe, Spring 2007

Spain, Granada (Arcadia in Granada)
Taylor Funderburk Fall 2015

Spain, Cordoba (PRESHCO)
Veronique Jones, Fall 2011

Europe, Multiple Locations
Sharah Hutson, Fall 2018


## Asia

China, Bejing (CIEE)
Brian Crist, Summer 2006

India, Bodh Gaia (Antioch)
Brendan Youngquist, Fall 2014

Nepal, Kathmandu (SIT)
Jacob Pine, Fall 2013

Thailand, Chiang Mai (ISDSI)
Nicklause Wilcher, Fall 2007

## 7. JUNIOR INDEPENDENT STUDY SEMINAR

### § Description and Seminar Goals

The fundamental goal of the Junior Independent Study Seminar is to help students further develop their ability to do independent research in philosophy and to write a philosophical thesis. In order to achieve this goal, the course will require students to examine questions about the nature and methodology of philosophy, engage in research using philosophical journals and electronic data bases, deliver oral presentations, participate in peer review of others' writing, and plan and write a philosophical paper.

Since Senior Independent Study integrates all five learning goals in philosophy, the Junior Independent Study Seminar will focus upon helping students integrate all five of these learning goals. Special attention will be devoted to help students interpret and analyze texts with increasing independence, to construct strong arguments, and to communicate in discussion and in writing.

### § Structure of the Seminar

The overall structure of the seminar is designed to equip students with the skills to form clear and interesting independent study projects; it will also provide students with the opportunity to arrive at a level of expertise sufficient for carrying out these projects. The exposure to other students' topics and projects should be both informative and motivating. In addition, students will engage in the process of peer review and peer-led philosophical discussions.

The Junior Independent Study Seminar has three parts.

1. *The Nature and Methodology of Philosophy*
   In the first unit students will read and discuss articles on meta-philosophy (i.e., reflections on the nature and purpose of philosophy), philosophical methodology (e.g., What is conceptual analysis? What are its limits? What role should descriptive claims play in philosophical analysis?), and the historiography of philosophy (i.e., How should we read texts in the history of philosophy?). Research tools and methodologies will also be discussed in the first several weeks.

2. *Student Presentations of Philosophical Articles*
   In the second unit each student will be required to lead the seminar by presenting an article that bears directly on the topic that he or she has chosen to investigate. The article selected by the student, with guidance from the instructor, should be appropriately accessible to a general philosophical audience and should provide a framework for inquiry into his or her thesis topic. The student presenting the article will be required to provide study questions one week prior to leading the seminar. All students in the seminar will be expected to read and to discuss the article(s) in question.

**3.** *Student Oral Presentations of Theses*

    In the third unit, each student will give an oral presentation of his or her Junior I.S. thesis. These presentations may draw on the material discussed in the earlier presentation, but should cover more ground and contain original analysis.

## § Junior Independent Study Paper

The paper that emerges from the Junior Independent Study process should be about 15 pages and should be of the type and quality that could be submitted to an undergraduate journal. In addition, it should demonstrate knowledge of the relevant issues on the topic and should be attentive to the relevant philosophical literature, including journal articles.

We strongly encourage students to pursue the thesis topic that interests them most. There is no special reason to postpone choosing such a topic of interest until the senior year; it is possible to write a senior thesis on a different aspect of the same topic as your junior thesis.

Stages of the Junior Independent Study Project:

1. *Selection of a Topic (Completed by Week 3)*
   - Identify a topic that interests you.
   - Convert an unfocused interest in a general topic to a clear and specific conceptual question that can form the basis of a thesis.
   - Develop a research strategy for answering the question.
   - Select an appropriate reading for the group by the fourth week.
       (Note: This reading must be approved by the instructor.)
   - Write a one-paragraph proposal.

2. *Peer Review of Proposals (Completed by Week 4)*

3. *Submit Detailed Proposal (Completed by Week 5)*
   - Revise and develop a thesis proposal.
   - Construct an appropriate bibliography for the thesis.
   - Write a complete proposal using the I.S. Proposal Sheet.

4. *Seminar Presentation of Salient Article (Weeks 4 – 9)*

5. *Oral Presentation on Project (Weeks 10 – 12)*

6. *Submit a Draft of Paper (By Week 12)*

7. *Submit Final Paper to the Instructor (By the Last Day of Class in the Semester)*

## § Undergraduate Journals of Philosophy

Submitting work to undergraduate philosophy journals or essay contests can be a valuable experience for any philosophy major.  Preparing a paper for submission requires a careful review of one's analysis, presentation, and writing mechanics, a process that serves to hone one's philosophical skills.  Students are encouraged to submit papers that they may have already written for a class or on any topic of philosophical interest.  Students completing both Junior and Senior Independent Study should consider these or other journals when submitting their work for publication.

*Aporia*
Brigham Young University
http://aporia.byu.edu/site.php?id=current

*Canadian Undergraduate Journal of Cognitive Science*
Simon Fraser University
http://www.sfu.ca/cognitive-science/news-and-events/2013/cujcs-2013-launch-party.html

*The Dualist*
Stanford University
https://philosophy.stanford.edu/dualist-journal

*Ephemeris*
Union College
https://muse.union.edu/ephemeris/

*Episteme*
Denison University
https://digitalcommons.denison.edu/episteme/

*Janua Sophia*
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
http://www.edinboro.edu/academics/schools-and-departments/cahss/departments/english/student-publications.html

*Lyceum*
Saint Anselm College
http://lyceumphilosophy.com/

*Meteorite*
University of Michigan
https://meteorite.philosophy.lsa.umich.edu

*Dialogue*
Phi Sigma Tau, the International National Honor Society in Philosophy
https://phisigmatau.org/dialogue

*Princeton Journal of Bioethics*
Princeton University
http://pjb.mycpanel2.princeton.edu/wp/

*Hemlock*
University of British Columbia
http://psa.sites.olt.ubc.ca/undergraduate-journal/

*Prometheus*
Johns Hopkins University
https://johnshopkins.campuslabs.com/engage/organization/prometheus

*Sapere Aude*
The College of Wooster
https://sapereaude.voices.wooster.edu

## 8.  SENIOR INDEPENDENT STUDY

### § Introduction

Senior Independent Study is a unique requirement at Wooster and a special opportunity for you to develop intellectually and philosophically. This section is designed to provide you with information regarding the requirements for a Senior Independent Study Project in the Department of Philosophy and also to provide you with some recommendations to help you construct a quality project and thesis. It also outlines some useful tips for writing the thesis, identifies some pitfalls to avoid, and discusses the criteria used for grading the I.S. project.

The Senior Independent Study thesis you create is your *own*. Your thesis should be an example of your best work. Your advisor's role is to help you shape your project and to challenge you to perform your best, but in the end, the thesis is your responsibility. It is your responsibility to know the deadlines and the requirements related to your project. (Deadlines are listed at the end of this section.) The standard pattern in this department is for each student to meet weekly with his or her advisor for at least an hour of discussion. Each advisor should periodically inform each student whether he or she is making adequate progress toward completion of the thesis. In almost every case that progress will be measured by the amount and quality of writing produced.  Throughout the year there are specific departmental deadlines which are designed to help you make effective progress in completing your thesis.

### § Recent Senior I.S. Titles

Your senior thesis can be on any philosophical topic that interests you. Some students choose topics that examine an aspect of a central question in philosophy. Other students write on problems and ideas that arise from a specific philosopher of the past.  Still others work in areas where philosophy intersects with other disciplines, such as mathematics, art, and literature. Of course, it is also possible to write a thesis that does not fit into any of these categories. We encourage you to explore your ideas with several faculty members.  Please feel free to review the list of Senior I.S. titles online and contact the Philosophy Department Administrative Coordinator to review the department's collection of past senior theses.

Online Data Base: http://openworks.wooster.edu/

### 2020

- Examining Love Through a Philosophical Lens
- Combining Phenomenology and Moral Particularism A Trilemma of Moral Truth
- Saying "Yes," East and West: A Comparative Analysis of Meaning and Affirmation in Nietzsche and Mahayana Buddhism
- "Big Time" College Sports: Amateurism, Exploitation, and Predicting Attitudes Regarding Student-Athlete Compensation
- A Cognitivist Conclusion in Metaethics:  The Value of a Realist Notion of Ethics in Fighting Injustice
- Resistance in The American Political Sphere: A Rhetorical Analysis of Alexandrio Ocasio-Cortez's Tweets
- On the Relative Long-Term Future Importance of Investments in Economic Growth and Global Catastrophic Risk Reduction

- Just Cyber Warfare? An Exploration into the Ethics of International Cyber War
- "To Thine Own Self Be True": Deconstructing the Ideal of Authenticity
- The Genuine Option: What Religious Studies is Missing Concerning William James
- Defending Preservation of the Environment in While Considering Wild Animal Suffering

## 2019

- Insurrecting Purity: Creativity as Resistance in Somatic Ambiguity
- Tying Truth's Shoes: The Value of a Realist Notion of Truth Within Democratic Discourse
- Says Who? A Feminist Challenge of Moral and Epistemic Authority in Advocacy
- Towards a Phenomenological Study of the American Criminal Courts
- Ethics in Computing
- America's Best Idea: Arguing for Bears Ears National Monument Through Leopold's Land Ethic
- Rethinking Humans Through Genetic Enhancement: The Ethics of Choosing Children
- Revisiting Love in the Modern Era: The Need for the Flourishing of Universal Love
- The Lakota: On the Importance of Community and Selflessness
- Moral Obligations: Toward a Just System of Immigration
- A few Clumsy Lines: Ramifications of Philosophical Shifts in Neo- Confucian Philosophy to Ming Governance
- Inviting Others In: How Oppression Affects the Self
- Letters from Heaven
- Beyond Bratwurst: Animal Ethics in Germany and the United States
- Know Thyself: A Study of Being Human
- "Dumb Brutes" or "Fellow-Critters": Toward a More Virtuous Characterization of Nonhuman Animals
- Modal Notions and Semantics
- Applying Gadamer: An Evaluation of Interpretations of the Confucian *Analects* by Different Schools Under the Light of Gadamerian Hermeneutics
- 

## 2018

- Wilderness Preservation in the Capitalocene: Valuing Wild Lands in an Instrumental World
- Understanding Human Well-Being
- Human Action Motivation: For Love of Thyself: The Egoist Approach to Navigating Motives Among Social Guise
- The Good Life: An Analysis of Buddhist, Epicurean, and Ascetic Perspectives
- Reclaiming Self-Love: Philosophy of Moral Worth
- Comedic Personal Narrative and the Self Awareness of Vice: Rethinking Virtue
- Folktales from Origin Valley
- Does Law Affect Morality? An in Depth Analysis of the Effects of Injustice on Morality
- A Sound of Drum and Bass: Hip Hop as Identity and Means to Ethical Growth through Aesthetic Value
- The Responsibility of For-profit Corporations: A Dilemma in Ethics and Rationality
- Walden, Wilderness, and Wrenches: The Radical Environmentalism of Henry David Thoreau and Edward Abbey
- Political Conflict and Dialogue: Toward the Criteria for Reaching Understanding

- Pathways Through Democratic Disconnection: Rawls, Connolly, and Mouffee
- Affordable Care Act: Is It Enough? An Economic and Philosophical Analysis of Medicaid Expansion Under the Affordable Care Act
- Rules of Engagement: Ethical Consideration in Artistic Evaluation

## 2017

- Radical Adornments: Subversion Through Self-Presentation
- A Stroll Through Cantor's Paradise: Appraising the Semantics of Transfinite Numbers
- Problems of Irrationality: Self-deception and Akrasia
- Self-interpreting Animals: Understanding the Self and the Meanings of Life
- Importing Ballet to Bhutan: An Evaluation on Dance Value and Cultural Interaction
- Islamic Ornamentation as a Test Case for Aesthetic Theory
- On Rationality and Morality: Three Kinds of Approaches
- Consent Ethics and the Harms of Rape
- Plays with Words: Understanding Visual Interpretation through Ed Ruscha's Text Works
- Alternative Facts Are Not Facts: Arguments against Conceptual Relativism and for a Pragmatic Notion of Truth
- Revolting Against Racism in Urban America: Questioning the Ethical and Political Concerns of Violent Urban Protest
- A Meaningful Time Recasting the Growing Block in Terms of Content
- Philosophies of Faith and the Megachurch Phenomenon
- It's an Ant's Life: A Moral and Political Account of the Valuable and Meaningful Life
- "I'm Offended!": A Theory of Justified Offense Taking
- Are Virtual Things Real? An Investigation Into the Nature of Reality
- WHAT IS PRIVACY? The Threat of Surveillance and Blackmail in the 21st Century
- Understanding Mental causation in the Enlightenment of Top-down Causation within the Physical
- A Theory of Concepts for a Transient Mind
- The Philosophy of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and The Mystical Disposition

## 2016

- Infinity & Beyond: Logicism and the Continuum Hypothesis
- Authorship, Utterance, and Meaning
- The Groundwork for Food Criticism: How Normative Aesthetic Judgments are Possible with Regards to Tastes
- Placing the International Criminal Court on Trial: A Jus Cogens Theory of Procedural Due Process Peremptory Norms at the International Court
- The Ineffability of "Nothing"
- Thoughts on Poetry
- The Tension Between Immanuel Kant's Ethical & Political Philosophies
- The Virtuous Rebel: Developing an Anarchist Ethic Informed by the American Anarchist Movement (1881-1919)
- In Favor of an Interactionist View of Development - To Improve Our Conceptualization of Innateness, Genetic Content and the Casual Rose of Genes in Trait Determination
- Fair Play and Obligation: Do Citizens have a Moral Obligation to Obey the Law?
- Authentically Ethical: An Ethics of Being
- Finding the Phenomenological Region of Meditative Experience

# 2015

- Rethinking the Autonomous Women: A Philosophical Examination of Feminist Approaches to Autonomy Operating Within Transnational Discourse
- Plato and Aristotle on the Ancient Quarrel: A Search for Poetic Meaning in Vergil's Aeneid
- Attachment and Emotions in Relation to Ideas and Concepts: A Psychological and Philosophical Inquiry
- The Changing of Just War Theory: Understanding How Just War Theory Needs to Evolve with Modern Warfare, Changing Conceptions, and Various Ethical Systems
- The Thinking Machine: An Intentional Study into the Prospect of Strong AI
- My Bun in Her Oven: Ethics, Exploitation, and Dharma in India's Surrogacy Industry
- THE SEMANTICS OF GOODNESS A Study of Prudential Value
- Beyond Etiquette: Connecting to the Value of People
- Evaluating Education in Japan: Why Juku Schools May be Threatening a Child's Ability to Succeed and Increasing the Income Inequality Gap
- "I am Is": Reconciling Grief, Language, and Being in William Faulkner's As I Lay Dying
- Evaluating Virtue Based Approaches in Environmental Philosophy
- Measure and Response: An Interpretation of Three Works Regarding Sovereignty
- Conceptions of Political Authority: Analyzing Contemporary American Events in a Different Light
- My Tattoos Are My Story: An Exploration of the Self and Body Modification
- Realizing Social Justice
- The Virtual Community: Understanding the Impact of Technology on Human Interaction Through the Work of Albert Borgmann
- Don't Forget Your Tao: A Comparative Analysis of the Philosophical Doctrines in the Dao De Jing
- To Be or Not to Be Selfish: Ethical Egoism and Altruism
- A Moral Objection of Capitalism Regarding the Treatment of Labor and What an Alternative System Should Aim to Resolve
- Rawls L.E.A.D.S. the Way: Justice in the City from a Philosophical Perspective
- How to Run a Successful and Ethical Intervention into Genocide
- Relativistic Perturbations and Ontological Implications: Exploring the Zitterbewegung and Laying the Groundwork for a Quantum Ontology
- Was the Great War Just? A Re-examination of Just War Theory in Light of Events During 1900-1920
- TOMSfoolery: A Neocolonial Deconstruction of the One for One Ideology of Giving
- Ought-Thenicity: A Restructuring of Understanding Why One Should Strive Towards Being an Authentic Human Being
- Can Pure Music Be Meaningful?
- Is Belief in Progress Delusional? An Investigation of the Notion of Human Progress
- Ain't It The Truth? A Consideration of 'Truth' in Moral Knowing as Framed in Plato's "Meno"
- Armed with an Easel: Understanding Artistic Political Praxis Through the Works of Theodor Adorno and Chantal Mouffe

## § Expectations

1.     You should discuss possible topics with faculty before you leave campus at the end of your junior year in order to define and refine your general topic and to construct an appropriate reading list. Read and think about your project during the summer months.

2.     Your thesis should consist of arguments in favor of a definite conclusion or answer to a specific philosophical question.

3.     Your thesis should contain critical thinking, analysis, and argumentation. It should not primarily consist in a historical report, a psychological study, or a collection of opinions.

4.     The thesis should be well organized, argued, and written. We expect it to explain, evaluate, and use important research in the relevant areas of philosophy. At the same time, it should include your own conclusions. We will evaluate your work according to the criteria specified in Section 11.

5.     The thesis should be about 50-80 pages in length.   Writing a thesis of greater length will not necessarily increase the grade.   What is crucial is the quality of the philosophical work and argumentation.  It should be grammatically correct, without mistakes in typing, punctuation, or spelling.

6.     A complete rough draft should be submitted to your advisor by the fifth week of the second semester.

7.     We expect that all seniors will regularly attend the Philosophy Roundtable, and that you will provide constructive criticism and comments on the presentations of other students.

## § Official Department Requirements

1.     During the first week of your senior year, you must attend the Thursday Philosophy Roundtable, briefly present your topic, and submit a Senior I.S. Proposal. The Senior I.S. Proposal form is presented near the end of this section. The department will then assign an advisor to you. You may indicate a preference for a particular advisor, but the final decision rests with the department.

2.     No later than the fifth week of the Fall Semester, you are required to submit a two-page revised project proposal with a bibliography to the Philosophy Department Administrative Coordinator for circulation to the faculty.

3.     You are required to give a Roundtable presentation of your thesis during your senior year. The date of this presentation will be determined by the department.  You are required to hand-in a copy of your Roundtable handout to the Philosophy Department Administrative Coordinator.

4.	In order to receive a grade of Satisfactory Progress for PHIL 451 (i.e., the first semester of Senior Independent Study), you must come prepared for your meetings with your advisor, and work consistently at a sufficient level throughout the semester.

	In addition, by the end of the last day of classes you must electronically submit to the Philosophy Department Administrative Coordinator, a title page, abstract, outline of the entire project, working bibliography, and a minimum of 20 pages which must include at least one polished chapter.  It is possible to receive a failing grade for PHIL 451 for poor preparation, non-attendance at meetings with one's advisor, or insufficient work.

5.	In accordance with College policy, you are required to submit one electronic and two bound copies of the thesis to the College Registrar's Office before the I.S. deadline. You should keep a third bound copy for yourself; please bring a copy to your oral exam.

6.	Your thesis must contain a title page, 150-300 word abstract, a table of contents, and a bibliography. The format for each of these is outlined in Section 10 of this Handbook.

7.	After you have submitted a thesis, you will have a one-hour oral examination, during which your advisor and a second reader will ask you questions about your thesis and the topics it covers.

## § Grades

A.	Grading Scale
For PHIL 451, there are two possible grades: Satisfactory Progress (SP) and Unsatisfactory Progress (U). A grade of Unsatisfactory Progress indicates insufficient work, poor preparation, failure to attend meetings, or a failure to adequately meet the requirements stipulated above.  A grade of Satisfactory Progress indicates that all requirements have been met and sufficient progress has been made toward the completion of Senior I.S.

	For PHIL 452, there are four possible grades: Honors, Good, Satisfactory, and NC (No Credit). A grade of Honors is reserved for outstanding philosophical work. A grade of Good indicates an exceptionally strong project. A grade of Satisfactory does not indicate substandard work, and the department expects that many of the majors will receive this grade.

B.	Assigning a Grade
To determine a grade, we look at four aspects of your independent study project: the thesis itself, the Roundtable Presentation, the quality of the process you undertook, and the oral examination.

	For each aspect of the project, there are specific criteria which we use to determine the grade. These criteria are specified in Section 11: Independent Study Assessment Guide and Interpretative Scale.

After the oral exam the department will meet to discuss the entire project. On the basis of the criteria within each category, the department as a whole will assign a grade.

C.      Double Major – Joint Thesis
        If you are a double major and choose to write a joint thesis, your work will be judged as a single integrated piece of work using the relevant criteria from both departments. You will receive one final grade based on the joint evaluation of both departments. You are advised to pay equal attention to both aspects of your work. Please realize that to receive an Honors you must satisfy the expectations for both departments.

D.      Time Schedule
        Oral examinations will usually be completed in the first two to three weeks after spring break. The Philosophy Department will meet to determine grades in the third or fourth week. The department announces grades only after all theses have been discussed, evaluated, and assigned a grade. As a consequence, if the department needs to appoint further readers for borderline cases, then the announcing of the final grades may be delayed by a week or so. Once all grades have been determined, you will receive a letter stating your grade and a written set of comments from both your first and second readers.

### § Tips and Pitfalls

The following is a short list of positive suggestions and pitfalls to avoid. The list is not exhaustive.

1.      It is easy to waste the first half of the first semester and, thereby, feel rushed in the month of February. You do not have two full semesters to complete your project. You need to submit a complete rough draft around mid–February so that your advisor can give you comments before spring break. Therefore, please try to define your main aims early in the first semester, and begin to write as soon as you can in order that you can complete a substantial part of the written work by the end of the first semester.

2.      Try to choose a general topic for your thesis that really interests you. After this, define the main aims of your thesis early in the process. These can be definite conclusions you wish to argue for or, failing that, a specific philosophical question that you wish to answer. However, avoid asking a question that is too broad.

3.      In order to not feel daunted by the amount you must write, please consider, with the help of your advisor, how to best split the thesis into smaller projects, or chapters and subsections. For example, you might have chapters on the following: explaining the problem and its importance; explaining and evaluating significant attempts by important other authors to solve the problems; and explaining and arguing for your solution to the problems.

4.      Each part of the I.S. should have a clearly defined aim. Signs that this is lacking include the following: the reader never knows just what is at issue; the discussion seems to ramble from one point to the next without structure or rationale; issues

introduced are not dealt with later, or are dealt with only superficially; or significant portions of the I.S. are irrelevant to the main aims.

5. Once you understand something, write it down immediately. Do not leave it for later, even if you intend to deal with this idea in a later section or chapter. If in conversation with your advisor, a point becomes clear, write it down. Later, you may find it difficult to recollect and reconstruct the point. You can always place it in a file called 'notes' or 'points to consider later'.

6. Avoid trying to answer empirical questions with philosophical methods. For example, 'why are people violent?' is an empirical question that requires a study based on observation. Also, avoid merely expressing your opinion; your thesis must have arguments for your position.

7. In your research you need to be thorough. This means that you need to know what the most important works are which are directly relevant to your thesis. However, it is also easy to get distracted and confused by either reading too much or by focusing on complex ideas that are not directly relevant to your thesis. To avoid this, try to find recent works that give a solid overview of your area, and use their bibliographies to guide and help you select your reading.

8. You are expected to know the major authors and scholarly papers in your area of concern, however, your thesis is not just a research project that reports and explains these works. You have to try to argue for your own conclusions. This does not mean that you cannot use the arguments of other philosophers to construct your own piece. Avoid reinventing the wheel. You must decide which arguments are best, and you must do this in a rational manner, providing reasons for your position. When you use someone else's work, cite it.

9. It is very useful to identify important authors that would disagree in a significant way with what you want to say. Try to spot and challenge their assumptions, and specify why you disagree with their arguments or interpretation of a text.

10. Please be careful when using Internet sites as reference sources; their quality can vary tremendously. It is probably best to use published books and journal articles initially, until you are more familiar with the field.

11. Finally, you will end up writing various versions of the same chapter or section. You should always date your rough work, so that you know which is the latest version. Also, keep back-up copies of everything. Please consider copying all your work regularly onto your Dropbox account or an external hard drive.

**§ Senior I.S. Proposal Form**

**The College of Wooster**
**Department of Philosophy**
**Independent Study Proposal**

Name: _____     Date: _____

**I.  Area of Project**

This proposed I.S. project deals primarily with the following area(s) of philosophy:
(check a maximum of 2)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ____ Metaphysics | ____ Ethical Theory | ____ Ancient Philosophy |
| ____ Epistemology | ____ Applied Ethics | ____ Modern Philosophy |
| ____ Philosophy of Math | ____ Biomedical Ethics | ____ Environmental Philosophy |
| ____ Philosophy of Mind | ____ Political Philosophy | ____ Comparative Philosophy |
| ____ Philosophy of Science | ____ Philosophy of Law | ____ Existentialism |
| ____ Philosophy of Language | ____ Aesthetics | ____ Continental Philosophy |
| ____ Philosophy of Religion | ____ Logic | ____ Other (explain) |

**II. Central Question(s) of this Project:**

I propose to address the following question(s):

**III. Prospectus**

A prospectus is a brief account (250 – 750 words) of the project that you are proposing. It should include any ideas that you have for the organization (chapter/section breakdown) of the project. Explain what is at stake or why these questions are important. Indicate, to the best of your ability at this time, what you think your answer(s) to the central question(s) is (are) likely to be.

The prospectus must be typed, follow I.S. format guidelines, and be attached to this proposal form.

**IV. Bibliography**

Please also submit an initial bibliography of sources that are relevant to your project. This bibliography also should be typed and should follow I.S. format guidelines. (See the Philosophy Major's Handbook for the guidelines.)

- You are required to include a minimum of 10 entries.
- You should include *at least* one professional journal article, one book, and one book chapter. [A maximum of 5 of these entries can be selected from the readings you have completed in any of your courses. Indicate which are from coursework and which are items found in preparing this proposal.]
- In assembling this bibliography, be sure to make use of standard, reliable research databases such as PhilPapers.org, the *Philosopher's Index*, and the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (online).

Rev. 8/7/19

## § Important Deadlines

| | |
|---|---|
| ***Classes Begin Fall Semester*** | Wednesday – 19 August, 2020 |
| ***First Philosophy Roundtable***<br><br>***Brief Presentation of Topic & Senior Independent Study Proposal Due***<br>(see Senior I.S. Proposal Form) | *Thursday – 27 August, 2020 |
| ***Revised Thesis Proposal With Bibliography Due***<br>(To be submitted to the Philosophy Department Administrative Coordinator.) | *Friday – 25 September, 2020 |
| ***Last Day of Classes Fall Semester***<br><br>***First Semester Thesis Components Due***<br><ul><li>Title page;</li><li>Abstract;</li><li>Outline of the entire project;</li><li>Working bibliography; and</li><li>Minimum of 20 pages which must include at least one polished chapter.</li></ul>(To be submitted to the Philosophy Department Administrative Coordinator) | *Friday – 4 December, 2020 |
| ***Classes Begin Spring Semester*** | Monday – 11 January, 2021 |
| ***Final Draft of Thesis for Advisor Due*** | *Friday – 19 February, 2021 |
| ***Spring Break*** | Friday – 5 March 2021 to Sunday – 21 March, 2021 |
| ***Turn Thesis into Registrar's Office***<br>(Submit 2 bound copies to the Registrar's Office and an electronic copy to the Library Archives.) | *Monday – 22 March, 2021 |
| ***Target Date for Completing I.S. Orals*** | Friday – 23 April, 2021 |
| ***Last Day of Classes*** | Friday – 30 April, 2021 |
| ***Graduation*** | Monday – 10 May, 2021 |

*Designates official Department/College deadlines

## 9.  STYLE AND CITATION REQUIREMENTS

### § Word Processing Style Requirements

Please abide by the following suggestions regarding the style for your thesis:

1. Fonts: Always pick a font that is specifically designed for the LaserWriter printer. We recommend that you use 'Times,' the font you are reading now.

2. Font styles: Use the underlining, boldfacing, and italics options sparingly but effectively. For example, the titles of books should always be italicized, and titles of articles and essays should be in double quotes. Subtitles sometimes are clearer if they are boldface.

3. Margins: With the exception of page numbers, all text must fit within margins set at 1.5 inches from the bound edge of the page and 1 inch from other edge, top, and bottom. These dimensions are known as 'thesis margins.'

4. Justification: The text should be justified on the right margin as well as the left.

5. Page numbering: All pages must be numbered except the title page. Page numbers may be centered at the bottom of the page at least 0.5 inch from the edge, or in the top right corner at least 0.5 inch from the top and 1 inch from the right edge.

6. Line spacing: Text must be double-spaced. Quotations longer than four lines should be single-spaced and indented on both sides. Footnotes and references should be single-spaced.

7. Double-sided printing: In order to save paper, you are strongly encouraged to print the final copies of your thesis back-to-back.

### § Citation Requirements

Ideas and/or arguments that are not your own, as well as, direct quotations from another author, must be referenced with a citation to the original source. Citations and bibliography should follow the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

There are two different documentation systems presented in *Chicago Manual of Style*: (1) footnotes/bibliography and (2) in-text citation/references. You should discuss with your advisor which system is most appropriate for your thesis. The footnote system presents bibliographic information in footnotes at the bottom of each page and a bibliography at the end of the thesis.  The in-text system provides name of the author, year of publication, and page number in the original work in the body of the text and a bibliography (or list of references) at the end of the thesis.

*The Chicago-Style Citation Quick Guide* provides  examples  of the most common types of citations. It is available at <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html>.

## 10. INDEPENDENT STUDY FORMAT SAMPLES

### § Sample Title Page

# Pulling Rabbits from the Hat of Uncertainty:

# Rethinking Epistemology's Pursuit of Truth

By Aaron McKay Kriska

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of Senior Independent Study

Advisor: Henry Kreuzman

Department of Philosophy
The College of Wooster
March 2013

**§ Sample Abstract**

Abstract

This Independent Study thesis is divided into four chapters. The first chapter, "Appearance, Reality, and Relativism", draws a distinction between our sensory experiences and what is or is not true of the external world. The conclusion is drawn that we do not have direct access to the external world. Because of this, no one can ever lay claim to having knowledge about the "true" nature of the external world. It seems as if the doctrine of skepticism prevails, stating that truth is relative to the perceiver, and that there can be no epistemic warrant for our beliefs.

The second chapter, "The Traditional Epistemological Enterprise," examines responses to the charges of skepticism by two major schools of philosophy. Specifically, it looks at the rationalist answer given by Descartes and the empiricist answer given by the Logical Empiricists. Neither of these responses, however, can successfully dispute the charges of relativism and ground our knowledge.

The third chapter, "Quine's Critique of Traditional Epistemology," inspects the philosophy of W.V.O. Quine as a refutation of traditional epistemology. Although he identifies errors, particularly in regard to the Logical Empiricists, his comments can be viewed as a broader attack on any foundational picture of knowledge and justification.

The fourth chapter and final chapter, "Order Restored to Epistemology…Almost," presents and argues for an account of how we can non-arbitrarily choose between theories even though access to the external world can never be had. I conclude that there can be rules governing theory choice only in relation to a particular goal. However, the threat of relativism and skepticism will always lurk near the periphery of a theory, ready to jump in and attack any claims of absolute certainty.

## § Sample Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements

[This page, which thanks and acknowledges those who have contributed to your project, comes after the Abstract and before the Table of Contents.]

## § Sample Table of Contents

Table of Contents

# 11.  ASSESSMENT GUIDES

***Research Paper Assessment Guide***

Student: _____       Date: _____

**Form:**

- Title (*clear, concise, informative*):                                            0  1  2  3  4

- Abstract (*150-300 word effective summary of the paper's thesis, main arguments*): 0  1  2  3  4

- Introduction (*provides context and purpose for the thesis*):          0  1  2  3  4

- Summary (*the thesis's primary points are briefly restated*):          0  1  2  3  4

- Citation of sources (*all borrowed ideas and words adequately cited*): 0  1  2  3  4

- Spelling & Grammar (*proper punctuation, spelling, sentence structure, etc.*):  0  1  2  3  4

- Proper format followed (*meets the requirements outlined in our style guide*):  0  1  2  3  4

**Content:**

- Understanding – Interpretation and Analysis:                           0  1  2  3  4
   (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to analyze, interpret, and understand
      philosophical texts and discourse.*)
- Argumentation:                                                          0  1  2  3  4
   (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to effectively identify, evaluate, and formulate
      arguments.*)
- Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology:                               0  1  2  3  4
   (*The paper demonstrates a high degree of fluency with the major traditions,
      figures, concepts, and methods of philosophy.*)
- Communication:                                                         0  1  2  3  4
   (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to develop, organize, and express ideas in a
      precise, clear, effective and systematic manner.*)
- Praxis:                                                                0  1  2  3  4
   (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to critically and creatively apply concepts,
      theories, and arguments from one context to another.*)

**Comments:**

***Oral Presentation Assessment Guide***
***(Department of Philosophy)***

Student: _____          Date: _____

# ORAL  PRESENTATION

**Form:**

- Student was clear with audible vocal projection:                    0  1  2  3  4

- Student was articulate with minimal verbal clutter:                 0  1  2  3  4

- Student spoke at an appropriate pace:                               0  1  2  3  4

- Student showed poise and self-confidence:                          0  1  2  3  4

- Student developed a rapport with the audience:                     0  1  2  3  4

- Student communicated effectively with the audience:                0  1  2  3  4

- Handout was well organized, clear, and effectively used:           0  1  2  3  4

**Content**:

- Understanding – Interpretation and Analysis:                       0  1  2  3  4
   *(The student demonstrates an ability to analyze, interpret, and*
   *understand philosophical texts and discourse.)*
- Argumentation:                                                      0  1  2  3  4
   *(The student demonstrates during meetings an ability to effectively*
   *identify, evaluate, and formulate arguments.)*
- Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology – (Depth, Originality, Creativity):   0  1  2  3  4
   *(The student demonstrates a high degree of fluency with the major*
   *traditions, figures, concepts, and methods of philosophy.)*
- Communication:                                                      0  1  2  3  4
   *(The student demonstrates an ability to develop, organize, and express*
   *ideas in a precise, clear, effective and systematic manner.)*
- Praxis:                                                             0  1  2  3  4
   *(The student demonstrates an ability to critically and creatively apply*
   *concepts, theories, and arguments from one context to another.)*

***Independent Study Assessment Guide***
(Department of Philosophy)

Student: _____     Date: _____

## I.  THESIS

**Form:**

- Title (*clear, concise, informative*):                                    0  1  2  3  4

- Abstract (*150-300 word effective summary of the paper's thesis, main arguments*):     0  1  2  3  4

- Introduction (provides context and purpose for the thesis):         0  1  2  3  4

- Summary (the thesis's primary points are briefly restated):         0  1  2  3  4

- Citation of sources (all borrowed ideas and words adequately cited):   0  1  2  3  4

- Spelling & Grammar (proper punctuation, spelling, sentence structure, etc.):   0  1  2  3  4

- Proper format followed (*meets the requirements outlined in our style guide*):   0  1  2  3  4

**Content:**

- Understanding – Interpretation and Analysis:                    0  1  2  3  4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to analyze, interpret, and
    understand philosophical texts and discourse.*)

- Argumentation:                                                  0  1  2  3  4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to effectively identify, evaluate,
    and formulate arguments.*)

- Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology:                        0  1  2  3  4
  (*The paper demonstrates a high degree of fluency with the major
    traditions, figures, concepts, and methods of philosophy.*)

- Communication:                                                  0  1  2  3  4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to develop, organize, and express
    ideas in a precise, clear, effective and systematic manner.*)

- Praxis:                                                         0  1  2  3  4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to critically and creatively apply
    concepts, theories, and arguments from one context to another.*)

## II. ROUNDTABLE PRESENTATION

**Form:**

- Student was clear with audible vocal projection:                    0 1 2 3 4

- Student was articulate with minimal verbal clutter:                 0 1 2 3 4

- Student spoke at an appropriate pace:                               0 1 2 3 4

- Student showed poise and self-confidence:                           0 1 2 3 4

- Student developed a rapport with the audience:                      0 1 2 3 4

- Student communicated effectively with the audience:                 0 1 2 3 4

- Handout was well organized, clear, and effectively used:            0 1 2 3 4

**Content:**

- Understanding – Interpretation and Analysis:                        0 1 2 3 4
   (*The student demonstrates an ability to analyze, interpret, and understand
      philosophical texts and discourse.*)

- Argumentation:                                                      0 1 2 3 4
   (*The student demonstrates during meetings an ability to effectively identify,
      evaluate, and formulate arguments.*)

- Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology – (Depth, Originality, Creativity):  0 1 2 3 4
   (*The student demonstrates a high degree of fluency with the major traditions,
      figures, concepts, and methods of philosophy.*)

- Communication:                                                     0 1 2 3 4
   (*The student demonstrates an ability to develop, organize, and express ideas in
      a precise, clear, effective and systematic manner.*)

- Praxis:                                                            0 1 2 3 4
   (*The student demonstrates an ability to critically and creatively apply concepts,
      theories, and arguments from one context to another.*)

**III. PROCESS**

- Understanding – Interpretation and Analysis:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates an ability to analyze, interpret, and understand philosophical texts and discourse.*)
- Argumentation:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates during meetings an ability to effectively identify, evaluate, and formulate arguments.*)
- Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology – (Depth, Originality, Creativity):  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates a high degree of fluency with the major traditions, figures, concepts, and methods of philosophy.*)
- Communication:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates an ability to develop, organize, and express ideas in a precise, clear, effective and systematic manner.*)
- Praxis:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates an ability to critically and creatively apply concepts, theories, and arguments from one context to another.*)
- Literature and Research:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates skill in finding and using appropriate research materials.*)
- Effort:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student comes prepared for each meeting, exhibits consistent effort, and demonstrates active engagement with the project.*)


**IV. ORAL EXAMINATION**

- Understanding – Interpretation and Analysis:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates an ability to analyze, interpret, and understand philosophical texts and discourse.*)

- Argumentation:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates during meetings an ability to effectively identify, evaluate, and formulate arguments.*)

- Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology – (Depth, Originality, Creativity):  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates a high degree of fluency with the major traditions, figures, concepts, and methods of philosophy.*)

- Communication:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates an ability to develop, organize, and express ideas in a precise, clear, effective and systematic manner.*)

- Praxis:  0 1 2 3 4
  (*The student demonstrates an ability to critically and creatively apply concepts, theories, and arguments from one context to another.*)

# Interpretative Scale

## Understanding – Interpretation and Analysis

4   Exceptional: Interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions are exceptionally clear, precise, and reveal a rich and insightful understanding of the assumptions, strategies, and aims of the text.

3   Exceeds expectations: Interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions are clear, precise, and reveal a rich understanding of the basic assumptions, strategies, and aims of the text.

2   Satisfies expectations: Interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions are correct on all basic points and fit within the standard interpretations and show an awareness of the basic assumptions and aims of the text.

1   Does not satisfy expectations: Interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions do not reveal an understanding of "what is at stake" and/or do not effectively identify the basic aims and assumptions of the text.

0   Significantly below expectations: There is an absence of interpretations and analyses of the philosophical positions and/or a failure to engage the text.

NA   Not Applicable.


## Argumentation

4   Exceptional: Argumentation is exceptionally well-organized, tightly constructed, clearly presented, philosophically sophisticated, effective, and well-reasoned. In addition, it shows a rich and insightful understanding of other arguments for and against the position.

3   Exceeds expectations: Argumentation is well-organized, tightly constructed, clearly presented, philosophically sophisticated, effective, and well-reasoned. In addition, it shows a rich understanding of other arguments for and against the position.

2   Satisfies expectations: Argumentation is organized, clearly presented, philosophically informed, and generally well-reasoned. In addition, it effectively demonstrates an understanding of other arguments for and against the position.

1   Does not satisfy expectations: Argumentation is poorly organized, lacking clarity and structure, and not well-reasoned and/or does not effectively demonstrate an understanding of other arguments for and against the position.

0   Significantly below expectations: There is an absence of argumentation and/or no indication of an awareness of other arguments for or against the position.

NA   Not Applicable.


## Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology

4   Exceptional: The project demonstrates facility with and mastery of a wide range of philosophical concepts and methodologies. In addition, the project exhibits a deep and insightful understanding of the relevant literature, theories and traditional approaches to the issue(s).

3   Exceeds expectations: The project demonstrates facility with a wide range of philosophical concepts and methodologies. In addition, the project exhibits a deep understanding of the relevant theories and traditional approaches to the issue(s).

2   Satisfies expectations: The project is developed in accordance with fundamental philosophical concepts and methodologies. In addition, it effectively demonstrates an understanding of theories and traditional approaches to the issue(s).

1   Does not satisfy expectations: The project is not clearly developed in accordance with fundamental philosophical concepts and methodologies and/or does not effectively demonstrate an understanding of theories and traditional approaches to the issue(s).

0   Significantly below expectations: The project fails to employ fundamental philosophical concepts and methodologies and/or to demonstrate an awareness of theories and traditional approaches to the issue(s).

NA   Not Applicable.

**Communication**

4    Exceptional:   Ideas and issues are presented with clarity and in a style that is engaging, thoughtful, and insightful.  Tone and word choice is not only effective, but also elegant and demonstrates an awareness of the audience in a manner which not only eliminate potential misunderstandings but also enriches understanding.  The project is developed according to a clear and effective structure and strategy that is easily recognizable and enhances the audience's understanding.

3    Exceeds expectations: Ideas and issues are presented with clarity and precision and in a style that is engaging and thoughtful.  Tone and word choice is effective and demonstrates an awareness of the audience by attempting to eliminate potential misunderstandings and confusions.  The project is developed according to a clear and effective structure and strategy.

2    Satisfies expectations: Ideas and issues are presented with a reasonable degree of clarity and precision.  Appropriate tone and word choice are generally employed.  The project is developed with a discernible structure and strategy such that lapses do not detract from overall understanding.

1    Does not satisfy expectations: Ideas and issues are presented in a manner that is frequently vague or ambiguous.  Organization and structure is inconsistent and the strategy employed is difficult to recognize and assess.

0    Significantly below expectations: There is an absence of clarity, precision, and/or organization.

NA   Not Applicable.

**Praxis**

4    Exceptional:   Concepts, theories, and arguments are critically and creatively apply from one context to another such that there is a discernible philosophical vision manifest.  Ideas are connected and integrated from one field to another with clarity and precision in a manner which exhibits philosophical sophistication and originality.

3    Exceeds expectations: Concepts, theories, and arguments are critically and creatively apply from one context to another.  Ideas are connected and integrated from one field to another with clarity and precision in a manner which exhibits philosophical sophistication.

2    Satisfies expectations:  Concepts, theories, and arguments are critically applied from one context to another.  Ideas are connected and integrated from one field to another with a reasonable degree of clarity and precision.

1    Does not satisfy expectations:  Concepts and theories are not effectively applied from one area to another.  Attempts to connect and integrate ideas are frequently vague and ambiguous.

0    Significantly below expectations: There is a failure to apply concepts and theories and/or to connect ideas from one area of inquiry to another.

NA   Not Applicable.

## 12. FURTHER LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

The department encourages all majors to participate and to become engaged in various activities that provide an opportunity to do philosophy outside the classroom.

### § Philosophy Roundtable

Roundtable is held every week on Thursday at 11:00 a.m. All majors are *expected* to attend, and we hope that you will feel motivated to participate in the discussion. Seniors present their thesis topics from October to March. Students are welcome to present papers, to lead discussions, and to suggest speakers and topics outside those dates.

### § Special Lectures

Throughout the year, philosophers are invited to campus to give talks and lead discussions. These are valuable opportunities to be exposed to different philosophical ideas and to engage other philosophers. Recent philosophers invited to campus have included: Tommie Shelby (Harvard), Elizabeth S. Anderson (University of Michigan), Kwame Anthony Appiah (NYU), Christine M. Korsgaard (Harvard), Erin Kelley (Tufts), Richard Fumerton (University of Iowa), Richard Foley (NYU), and David Luban (Georgetown), Onora O'Neill (British Academy, President), Aloysius P. Martinich (University of Texas at Austin), Daniel Jacobson (Bowling Green State University), Nigel Dower (University of Aberdeen), Edward Minar (University of Arkansas), Louise M. Antony (The Ohio State University), Martin Gunderson (Macalaster College), and Janet Kourany (Notre Dame University).

### § Teaching Apprenticeships

The department offers students the opportunity to serve as a teaching apprentice for some courses. The goal of this course is to help students reflect upon the nature and process of teaching and education and to also gain a deeper understanding of the course's subject matter. If there is an area of philosophy in which you are especially interested and you would like to assist in the teaching process, please approach the professor as early as possible.

### § Research Assistants

Faculty members are engaged in research projects, and the department itself sometimes has research needs (e.g., to ensure that the library holdings are sufficient). If you are interested in participating in the Sophomore Research Program, please ask members of the department. Information about the College's support for undergraduate research is available at <http://www.wooster.edu/academics/research/>.

# 13. HONORS AND PRIZES

### § Phi Sigma Tau – Philosophy Honor Society

The Department of Philosophy has been a member of *Phi Sigma Tau*, the National Philosophy Honor Society, since 1983. Every spring, students are inducted into *Phi Sigma Tau*. To be eligible you must have a general grade point average of 3.0, have completed at least four courses in philosophy, and have earned a grade of B+ or higher in three of those courses.

### § John F. Miller Prize

The John F. Miller Prize, established in 1913, is given at graduation to the major student who has the highest standing in Philosophy.

### § Remy Johnston Memorial Prize

The Remy Johnston Memorial Prize in Philosophy was established in 1989 by the Johnston family and the faculty and students of the Department of Philosophy in memory of Remy Alexander Johnston, a senior Philosophy major at the College. The prize is awarded annually to a senior Philosophy major who, in the Department's judgment, has shown outstanding progress in developing philosophical skills and promise as a philosopher.

### § D. Ivan Dykstra Philosophy Roundtable Book Prize

The D. Ivan Dykstra Philosophy Roundtable Book Prize was established in 1999 by the family of Dr. Ivan Dykstra. This prize honors Ivan Dykstra's lifelong commitment to the study of philosophy in the context of a liberal arts education. His commitment was manifested both in his long teaching career at Hope College and in his leading role through penetrating questions and insightful comments at Philosophy Roundtable discussions during his retirement in Wooster. This Prize is awarded annually to a Philosophy major who, in the Department's judgment, has distinguished herself/himself during the past year in the weekly Philosophy Roundtable.

### § The Ronald E. Hustwit Prize in Philosophy

The Ronald E. Hustwit Prize in Philosophy, which was established in 2007 by students, colleagues, and friends of Ron Hustwit, will be awarded annually to a senior philosophy major who, in the judgment of the Department, has shown great love of both the subject and the practice of philosophy. This prize honors Professor Ronald Hustwit for his life-long commitment to the students at the College of Wooster and for his contributions to the cultivation of philosophical skills, dispositions, and enthusiasm for philosophy among those students.

# 14. PHILOSOPHY AFTER WOOSTER

On our department notice board you can find plenty of evidence that graduates in philosophy have found high-quality employment in almost all fields of work. Our alumni careers vary widely: doctor, lawyer, teacher, systems programmer, artist, actor, sales director, minister, professor, CPA, financial analyst, dentist, writer, social worker, airline pilot, and military analyst.

We recommend that all majors examine the book *What Color is Your Parachute?* (Richard Bolles) which provides an effective non-traditional approach to seeking employment. It includes helpful advice for determining what type of work best suits you.

We also recommend William Poundstone's *How Would You Move Mount Fuji? : Microsoft's Cult of the Puzzle – How the World's Smartest Companies Select the Most Creative Thinkers*. Poundstone tells the history of Microsoft's hiring practices and interlaces it with intellectual puzzles which challenge one's analytic and creative abilities. Matthew Stewart's essay in *Atlantic Monthly* (June 2006), "The Management Myth," recounts his experience as a consultant and argues that studying philosophy is an excellent path to success in business. This article is on the department bulletin board and a copy is available in the Department Office.

## § Selected Alumni Careers

### Law

Solomon Oliver '69
  Federal Judge

Amelia Beyer Kays '01
  Judge Advocate
  U.S. Marine Corps

Latecia Eileen Wiles '00
  Judge
  Wayne County Probate and Juvenile Court

Joseph Buckley '85
  Judge
  Cleveland Juvenile Court

### Higher Education

Justin Steinberg '99
  Faculty Member
  Brooklyn College of CUNY

Kathleen Dean Moore '69
  Professor of Philosophy
  Oregon State University

Elizabeth A. Bartlett '74
  Professor of Women Studies
  University of Minnesota

Jeff Edwards '73
  Professor of Philosophy
  SUNY - Stoney Brook

### Research and Archives

Colleen K. Flewelling, Ph.D. '91
  Director of Institutional Research
  St. Vincent College

Wendy Marie Pflug '02
  Archivist
  The History Factory

### Environmental Fields

Seth Micah Levy '02
  Public Lands Fellow
  American Hiking Society

Anne L. Moser '78
  Process Engineer
  First Solar

## Art

Theresa Jenoure '74
  Director, Augusta Savage Gallery
  University of Massachusetts

Krista Hicks Benson '93
  Graphic Artist

Andy Cobb '93
  Comedian and Actor
  Second City

William C. Hunt '68
  Professor
  Columbus College/Art & Design

Ford Neale '69
  Filmmaker and TV Script Writer

## Business

Mark D. Goodman '89
  Exec VP-Marketing & Membership
  Sam's Club

Jennifer Lynn Novak Callaway '94
  Vice President
  Cumberland Trust & Investment

Elaine P. Keyes '67
  Investment Performance Analyst
  Bank One

Owen S. Lyons '88
  Market Maker
  Neuberger and Berman

## Computer Programming

Seth A. Fagans '97
  Quality Assurance Engineer
  Phase Forward – Linden Group

David Corey Hershhorn '97
  Software Engineer
  Quovadx

Joseph Shemac '02
  Department of Homeland Security

## Medicine

Dr. Margaret L. Plews-Ogan '77
  Professor Clinical Internal Medicine
  University of Virginia VA

Dr. James F. Leckman '69
  Professor of Child Psychology & Pediatrics
  Yale Child Study Center

## Social Services

Jill M. Maiorca '97
  Program Coordinator
  Big Brothers Big Sisters Program

Ronald C. Hughes '70
  Psychologist/Director
  Institute for Human Services

Holly Huswit '91
  Social Worker
  Hospice of Wayne County

Rev. Shannan Renee Vance-Ocampo '98
  Pastor
  First Presbyterian Church of Rumson

## Childhood Education

Beth Goldstein Gormley '97
  Special Education Teacher

Wende Laker Patton '82
  Teacher
  Washington Waldorf School

Michael Smith '93
  History Teacher
  Eastern Lancaster County Schools

Seth R. Jenkins '95
  Vocational Teacher/Coordinator
  Hillcrest Educational Centers

## Law Enforcement and Military

Thomas Hetrick '84
  Special Agent
  FBI

Richard Lottes '73
  Pilot – 737
  United Airlines

Ronald E. Hustwit, Jr., Ph.D. '95
  2nd Lieutenant
  United States Air Force

Carlton Shafer III '79
  Major USMC Reserve
  Director of National Helicopter Museum

# PHILOSOPHY AT WOOSTER

## 1. GENERAL AREAS OF PHILOSOPHY

The Philosophy Department faculty shares a conception of philosophy: philosophy is the critical search for new understanding through argumentation and the analysis of concepts. Philosophical issues arise in all areas of human inquiry, and consequently the types of questions that philosophy examines are diverse. What is a just society? What is the relationship between law and morality? When is killing murder? What is the meaning of a word? Can computers think? Does the world consist only of matter? What is friendship? What does it mean to be rational? What obligations do we have to the environment?

Traditionally philosophy is divided into five areas:

- Metaphysics – the study of the nature of reality
- Epistemology – the study of the nature and scope of knowledge
- Logic – the study of reasoning and language
- Ethics – the study of moral concepts and how we should live our lives
- Political Philosophy – the study of the nature of the state, political authority, and justice

However, this way of drawing boundaries within the discipline does not really do justice to many aspects of contemporary philosophical investigation. The question "What is the nature of meaning?" cuts across the traditional boundaries and thus gives rise to the philosophy of language and the philosophy of mind, which are distinct from both logic and epistemology. Similarly, questions about the nature of race and gender contain metaphysical, epistemological, ethical, and political dimensions. An important part of contemporary philosophy is the study of conceptual questions related to other areas of knowledge, such as the philosophy of science, law, history, and literature. Often these studies do not easily fit into the traditional divisions. Another area of recent philosophical investigation is the metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical views within a given cultural tradition; this has given rise to other subjects, such as Indian Philosophy, Chinese Philosophy, and Comparative Philosophy. Some of the special fields within philosophy are:

- Philosophy of Mind
- Philosophy of Language
- Philosophy of Science
- Philosophy of Biology
- Philosophy of Physics
- Philosophy of Mathematics
- Philosophy of Logic
- Philosophy of History
- Comparative Philosophy
- Indian Philosophy

- Philosophy of Law
- Philosophy of Race
- Philosophy of Gender
- Environmental Ethics
- Bio-Medical Ethics
- Business Ethics
- Applied Ethics
- Philosophy of Art
- Philosophy of Education
- Philosophy of Religion

For a broad overview of contemporary western philosophy, please consult:

Scruton, Roger. *Modern Philosophy: An Introduction and Survey*. New York: Penguin, 1994.
    This book's primary purpose is to present the fundamental questions, concepts, and arguments in contemporary philosophy. Each chapter focuses upon a different conceptual issue.

Grayling, A.C., ed. *Philosophy: A Guide Through the Subject*. Volumes 1 & 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
    This is an excellent collection of essays edited by Grayling that contains essays written by leading philosophers on various areas of philosophy.

Russell, Bertrand. *The Problems of Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
    This book by Russell, first published in 1912, is still an outstanding introduction to classic philosophical questions. Russell introduces the issues in clear, concise, and non-technical language.

## 2. READING PHILOSOPHY

Reading furnishes the mind with materials of knowledge; it is thinking which makes what we read ours. We are of the ruminating kind, and it is not enough to cram ourselves with a great load of collections; unless we chew them over again they will not give us strength and nourishment.

– John Locke

Locke describes the reading process as an active and iterative process in which the reader needs to continually reflect upon and engage with the author and text. Here are five steps that will be helpful in guiding your reading so that it becomes an interactive and reflective process.

1. *Preview*
   Preview the entire selection before you start reading. The purpose of this is to become familiar with the *general outline* or to grasp the *big picture*.

   Specific suggestions:
   - Read the "Introduction" and the "Preface."
   - Look at the titles of chapters and the headings of sections.
   - Scan the chapter you are reading.
   - Make predictions about what issues will be addressed.

2. *Formulate Questions*
   *Read with a purpose*. This means that you should have specific questions in mind and read to find answers to these questions.

   Specific questions:
   - Why did this philosopher write this? What is this philosopher's purpose?
   - To whom is the philosopher writing? (e.g., the general public, other philosophers, a particular group of philosophers, one opponent?)
   - What is the meaning of the title of the chapter or section?
   - What is the main point that the philosopher is trying to get across?
   - Why is he or she emphasizing this point that does not seem to relate to everything else that is said?

3. *Read Interactively*
   Now you are ready to begin reading. Keep in mind that reading philosophy is *an active process*, not a passive process. You must *interact* with the material. You can not act like a sponge; rather you should act like a participant in a discussion. Carry on a dialogue with the philosopher.

   Most importantly, you should *try to get an overall picture* of the text. You want to get the whole picture so that you can fit the parts into it. You should make a very brief outline of the reading (half a page). The most important thing in *remembering* what you read and in *understanding* what you read is *organizing the material into a general pattern*. This enables you to fit pieces of the puzzle into the overall picture.

Specific suggestions:
- Identify and describe the main aim(s) of a text or thinker.
- Identify and describe the strategy of a text or thinker.
- Identify and describe the main assumption(s) of text or thinker.
- Recognize what is important about or "at stake in" a philosophical debate.
- Separate understanding a text from evaluating a text.
  - Identify the *conclusions* by looking for conclusion indicators – words such as 'therefore,' 'hence,' 'thus,' 'so,' 'consequently.'
  - Identify the *premises* by looking for premise indicators – words such as 'since,' 'because,' and 'for the reason that.'
  - One of the best ways to identify the arguments is to *find the summaries of the argument*. Many times these summaries are also easier to understand and follow.
- Summarize and explicate the main support for the main conclusion(s).
- Pick-out key terms for analysis.
- Identify incomplete, ambiguous, vague, or nonsensical concepts and statements.
- Ask incisive questions of a thinker/text.
- Apply the principle of charity in interpretation.

### 4. Reconstruct the Reasoning

*Try to reconstruct the reasoning of the philosopher*. Look away from the book and try to *state in your own words* what you just read. If you can do this then you understand what you just read. If you cannot, then you do not understand and you must stop and *reread* the previous section. It is not enough to think about what the philosopher said; *you must verbalize it*, either out loud or under your breath. This helps you remember what you read and helps you get the general organization. *This is challenging and takes time*. Spend *at least 1/3 of your time* in thoughtful reconstruction. *Remember* – your goal is to understand and comprehend what you read, not to just cover pages.

### 5. Review

Sometime after you have finished reading, *without looking at your book, try to reconstruct in your own words* what the philosopher wrote. If you fail at this try, then try to do it just looking at your marginal notes.

An additional resource on reading philosophy: Jim Pryor (New York University) "Guidelines on Reading Philosophy" <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/reading.html>.

# 3. DISCUSSING PHILOSOPHY

Reading philosophy can be rewarding, but most people find talking about what they have read also enjoyable. Fortunately, it is a skill that with time and practice one can significantly improve. Here are some suggestions that should help you get more out of class, small group discussions, and Philosophy Roundtable. The conversational skills you will be developing are ones that you can easily apply in other classes and non-academic situations.

## 1. *Some Basic Strategies for Discussions*

- *Listen* to other people. This is perhaps the most difficult but also the most essential skill of all. A discussion needs the cooperation of all its members, and people stop cooperating if they feel ignored or not taken seriously.

- Apply *the principle of charity*. Don't interpret the text, the author, or remarks of others as mistaken if you can think of a more reasonable interpretation. Be considerate of all questions and opinions sincerely offered. In short, be *sympathetic* to the text and others.

- Express your ideas as *clearly as possible*, and always *give reasons* for them. Make *the argument* the center of attention.

- Be flexible, reasonable, and eager to consider other points of view. Don't express a fixed, and thus foreboding, argument the first time you offer an opinion in a discussion.

- Always think in terms of what will help the group advance in the discussion to a clearer understanding. Don't dominate the discussion. Back off if you find yourself doing too much of the talking.

- When someone who is talking gets stuck, *help out*. Offer an example, a restatement, a distinction, or a point of clarification.

## 2. *Ways to Clarify and Focus a Discussion*

- *Ask a question of clarification*. If you feel shy or awkward about joining the discussion, this is the easiest, most painless way. It is an option which almost always helps out other members of the group and usually makes you look smart. Examples: "I think I see what general approach Kant is taking here, but I'm not clear on exactly what he means by the *hypothetical imperative*," or "I really don't understand what you mean by *perception*."

- *Draw a distinction* if you see one being glossed over and if you think it will help the group think more clearly about the subject under discussion. Example: "When you call the fetus a person, do you mean to say that it is a member of the species *Homo sapiens sapiens* or, instead, that it is something like a member of the moral community?"

- *Offer an example or analogy to help illustrate or clarify* a difficult point with which the group is struggling.  Example: "It sounds like what Gorgias does for a living is something like what someone does who works for an advertising agency."

- *Restate* a point that has been made. Example: "Let me see if I've got this straight; you are saying that . . ."

- *Make a connection* with another author or topic. Example: "What Aristotle says about the *teleos* reminds me of what Plantinga says in his lecture about intelligent design."

- *Pull the discussion back on track* if you think it is straying. Everyone will be grateful to you.  Example: "I don't understand how this relates to Regan's argument for animal rights.  What is the connection?"

- Focus attention on a *specific passage*. Example: "On the top of page 89 Singer gives a definition of the 'prior existence' version of utilitarianism."

## 3.  Ways to Defend or Critique a Position

- *Ask a critical question* of the author, text, or participants. For example: "I believe that in Book V of the *Republic* Plato is not endorsing a feminist position because he is not concerned with the 'rights' of women.  Your comments indicate that you disagree.  Can you explain what is wrong with my interpretation?"

- *State a reason for disagreeing* about a specific point in the theory.  Examples: "I can't agree with you on that because . . ." (Providing a *reason* for disagreeing changes it from a direct confrontation to a shared search for the best reasons.), or "I think that X is a good point you are making, but I worry about Y and Z."

- *Offer a counterexample*.  Example: "I don't see how the definition of lying can possibly be 'deliberately saying something false.' When I tell a joke I might be deliberately saying something false, but I'm not lying."

# 4. RESEARCH IN PHILOSOPHY

For any paper that you write, it will almost certainly help your thinking to use the work of recent philosophers. For the process of Independent Study, it is essential. However, building a strong bibliography that is relevant to your research can be a difficult process. It is easy to make a large bibliography of works that are only half-relevant. Yet, at the same time, it is easy to omit vitally important pieces. On the one hand, if you construct a large bibliography that includes many works of little value, you may end up reading too much and becoming confused. On the other hand, if you leave out some crucial works then you may have a thesis that reinvents the wheel or is radically incomplete.

One of the best ways to start investigating a topic and developing a list of valuable references is to talk with someone who knows the field, such as a member of the department or a fellow student who has done some work on the topic.

## § Print and Electronic Resources

1. *Encyclopedias*
   Encyclopedias are a useful place to start researching.  They will help you understand the overall issue and the main positions on the issue.

   * *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
     This is one good place to start.  This ten-volume work, published in 2000, has essays written by contemporary philosophers for a general philosophical audience and also has extensive bibliographies on topics which direct you to some of the most important books and articles on the topic.

   * *Concise Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
     This is a companion volume to the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy;* it has briefer entries and more compact bibliographies but is also a good starting point.

   * *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Paul Edwards, ed. New York: Macmillan, 1967)
     This is a classic.  Some of the essays are a little dated, but this is still a good source for obtaining an overview of a topic and identifying central essays on the topic. A one-volume "Supplement" published in 1996 provides additional articles and resources.

   * *Stanford Philosophy Encyclopedia*
     This is an excellent electronic encyclopedia.  The articles are written by leading philosophers and provide very good overviews of the main issues.  The Bibliographies direct you to both classical and contemporary sources. <http://plato.stanford.edu/>

   * *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
     This is another good source.  It is a work in progress, so there may be topics for which the essays are not yet written. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/>

- *Wikipedia*
  *Wikipedia* is "the free encyclopedia that anyone can edit." This tag-line captures its primary strength and weakness. Some of the articles are very good, but some are wrong, confused, or quirky. The primary problem is that unless you know the subject, you can't tell whether the article is reliable. It can be a good place to start research, but do so with epistemic caution.
  <http://en.wikipedia.org/>

- *The Citizendium* (sit-ih-ZEN-dee-um)
  This is a new encyclopedia started by a founder of Wikipedia and designed to improve on the *Wikipedia* model by adding "gentle expert oversight." At this stage *Citizendium* is not as comprehensive as the other resources. <http://en.citizendium.org/>

2. ***General Introductory Books***
   Books that provide a general introduction to an area or field of philosophy are one place to start your research. The purpose of these books is to provide the reader with both the big picture and the primary issues in the field. These books are also valuable because they can guide you to further readings in the area. Clearly, one drawback of this approach is that the book can shape the way you see a problem in a way that is peculiar to the author.

   Specific Examples of Introductory Books:

   - Honderich, Ted, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

   - McGee, Bryan. *The Great Philosophers: An Introduction to Western Philosophy*. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

   - Lowe, E.J. *A Survey of Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

   - Fumerton, Richard. *Epistemology (First Books in Philosophy)*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

   - Haack, Susan. *Philosophy of Logics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

   - Read, Stephen. *Thinking about Logic: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Logic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

   - Rachels, James. *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*. 3rd ed. Boston: McGraw Hill, 1999.

   - Deutsch, Eliot. *Introduction to World Philosophies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997.

- Blocker, H. Gene. *World Philosophy: An East-West Comparative Introduction to Philosophy*. Englewoods Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998.

### 3. *Classics in the Field*

Another way to approach your investigation is to read one of the classics (i.e., *locus classicus*) in a field. It can be exciting to read an author and text that has become one of the defining works of the field and frames the issues and subsequent debates. While it is stimulating to be engaged directly with a philosopher's words and ideas, such a book might have a peculiar viewpoint on an issue and might not provide a good overall perspective.

Specific Examples of Classics:

- Singer, Peter. *Practical Ethics*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

- Okin, Susan Moller. *Justice, Gender and the Family*. New York: Basic Books, 1989.

- Longino, Helen. *Science as Social Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

- Nozick, R. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1974.

### 4. *Anthologies*

Anthologies are also an excellent place to begin your research because they bring together a collection of the most important primary sources in a field and provide a structure for thinking about the relationship between the philosophers. This approach to research has the advantage of immediately immersing you into some of the most central debates through primary texts. You may also find an article related to your topic; the bibliography of the article can serve as a starting point from which you can build your own preliminary bibliography of relevant books and journal articles.

Specific Examples of Anthologies:

- Kim, J., and E. Sosa, eds. *Metaphysics: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

- Daniels, N., ed. *Reading Rawls: Critical Studies on Rawls' 'A Theory of Justice'*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975.

- Martinich, A. P., ed. *The Philosophy of Language*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

- Pojman, Louis, ed. *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*. 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2004.

- Pojman, Louis, ed. *The Theory of Knowledge: Classic and Contemporary Readings*. 3rd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2004.

There are three recent *series of anthologies* that are designed to provide comprehensive introductions to various areas of philosophy:

### *Oxford Companion Series (Examples)*

- Honderich, Ted. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. New ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Gregory, Richard. *The Oxford Companion to the Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

### *Blackwell Companion to Philosophy Series (Examples)*

- Bunnin, Nichols, and E. P. Tsui-James, eds. *The Blackwell Companion to Philosophy*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

- Singer, Peter, ed. *A Companion to Ethics (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy)*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

- Patterson, Dennis, ed. *A Companion to Philosophy of Law and Legal Theory (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy)*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

- Deutsch, Eliot, and Ron Bontekoe, eds. *A Companion to World Philosophies (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy)*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.

### *Cambridge Companion Series (Examples)*

- Guyer, Paul, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy (Cambridge Companions to Philosophy)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Gutting, Gary, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault (Cambridge Companions to Philosophy)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Villa, Dana, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Hannah Arendt (Cambridge Companions to Philosophy)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

## 5. *Printed Research Guides*
Printed research guides and bibliographies were until recently one of the standard starting points for doing philosophical research. The printed research guides are still valuable tools to locate classical pieces but more importantly to learn research strategies.

- De George, Richard. *The Philosopher's Guide to Sources, Research Tools, Professional Life and Related Fields*. Lawrence, Kansas: Regents Press of Kansas, 1980.

- Tice, Terrence, and Thomas Slavens. *Research Guide to Philosophy*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1983.

- List, Charles, and Stephen Plum. *Library Research Guide to Philosophy*. Ann Arbor, MI: Pierian Press, 1990.

## 6. *The London Philosophy Study Guide*

Web-based research guides provide access to recent information and their quality is rapidly increasing. The University of London has developed a comprehensive study guide which is excellent – *The London Philosophy Study Guide*. The *LPSG* is organized by philosophical areas, and within each area the material is organized in the following manner:

- *Paper*: A brief overview (1-3 paragraphs) describing the area and the focus of the following bibliography.
- *General Readings*: A list of central books and some of the most important general anthologies on the topic.
- *Topics*: A detailed list of books and articles arranged by special topic within the area.

The areas covered in the *London Philosophy Study Guide* are:
<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/philosophy/LPSG/contents.htm>

- Logic & Metaphysics
- Epistemology & Methodology
- Ethics
- Political Philosophy
- Philosophy of Mind
- Philosophy of Religion
- Philosophy of Language
- Philosophy of Science
- Aesthetics
- Set Theory & Further Logic
- Mathematical Logic
- Philosophy of Mathematics
- Greek Philosophy
- Modern Philosophy
- Post-Aristotelian Philosophy
- Medieval Philosophy
- Indian Philosophy
- Kant
- 19th Century German Philosophy
- Phenomenology
- Frege, Russell & Wittgenstein
- Philosophy of Psychology
- Marxism

## 7. *Books and Articles in Books*

Searching for books and articles in books can be done via CONSORT and OhioLINK.

- **CONSORT**
  The College's library and the libraries at Denison, Kenyon, and Ohio Wesleyan can be searched using CONSORT. This database continues to grow and develop in sophistication.  It can be searched by Keyword, Title, Author, and Subject. In addition, most recent books are indexed so that not only authors of books but also authors of articles in books can be found by the Author search. You can electronically request that items not available on-campus be sent to you free of

charge, usually within three working days. Items sent to you from other libraries may be picked up at the Andrews Library circulation desk.

- ***OhioLINK***
  A larger consortium of colleges, universities, and research libraries across the state of Ohio is accessible via OhioLINK. This consortium has a shared library catalog that allows you not only to determine which library owns an item, but also to electronically request that a circulating item, not available in CONSORT, be sent to you at the College of Wooster Libraries free of charge, usually within five working days. Items sent to you from other libraries may be picked up at the Andrews Library circulation desk.

## 8. *Journals*

There are a variety of ways to search for journals and articles in journals. If you have found a reference to an article that you would like to read, these databases will help you locate the journal and get a copy. In addition, if you want to search a journal(s) for articles which contain a particular keyword, these databases will be useful. For further guidance you may want to consult the Libraries' FAQ page:
<http://www.wooster.edu/academics/libraries/>.

- ***Wooster eJournals and Journals***
  This search engine can be accessed from The College of Wooster Libraries homepage. Use this search engine to determine if the College has access to specific journals (electronic/microform/print) through our databases, subscriptions, and collections. <http://yb7zk3sd3g.search.serialssolutions.com/>

- ***OhioLINK EJC***
  In addition to using the College's search engine, you can also directly search the OhioLink Electronic Journal Center. You can access OhioLINK EJC from this site: <http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/index.cgi>.

- ***JSTOR***
  Many major philosophy journals are part of the JSTOR electronic system. This system provides access to back issues of the journal but usually has a 'moving wall' that blacks out the last four or five years. Even if JSTOR does not provide access to the journal, it may be in the College's print collection or it may be accessible through another electronic database. You can access JSTOR from this site: <http://0-www.jstor.org.dewey2.library.denison.edu/>.

- ***EBSCOhost (Religion and Philosophy Collection)***
  This database indexes articles in religion, theology, and philosophy from 1974 to the present; many citations link to the full text online. It covers such topics as world religions, major denominations, biblical studies, religious history, epistemology, political philosophy, philosophy of language, moral philosophy, and the history of philosophy. It provides indexing, abstracts, and full text for over 290 journals. You can access EBSCOhost from this Wooster site by going to the *Academic Search Complete* link and then using their *Choose Database* tool to choose the *Religion and Philosophy Collection* database:
  <http://libguides.wooster.edu/philosophy>.

- ***CONSORT (Journal Title Search)***
  This is another gateway to the College's extensive network of Journals and eJournals. Once in CONSORT, you search by 'Journal Title.' If the College has only the printed edition of the journal, you can go to the stacks to retrieve the proper volume.  If the College has electronic access to the journal, you can download the article. You can access CONSORT from this site: <http://consort.library.denison.edu/>.

- ***WebZap***
  WebZap is the Libraries' online interlibrary loan (ILL) system. It is used to request journal articles not available at Wooster, or books and other materials that are not available via CONSORT or OhioLINK. You log into the system using the barcode number from the back of your C.O.W. card and your last name. Once you have accessed WebZap you will be prompted to fill in your patron information. You will then proceed to choose the type of item to be requested (article, book, etc.) and then subsequently be provided the appropriate form to fill out. <https://wooster.illiad.oclc.org/illiad/logon.html>

9. ***Electronic Databases***
   The following two databases may help you to locate relevant research material, but they do not provide direct electronic links to journal articles. Both of these databases are crucial in doing philosophy research, but they require some practice to use effectively.

   - ***Philosopher's Index***
     This is an electronic index for most major philosophy journals from 1940 to the present.  You can search by keyword or author. You can access the Philosopher's Index from this Wooster site by going to the *Academic Search Complete* link and then using their *Choose Database* tool to find the *Philosopher's Index* database. <http://libguides.wooster.edu/content.php?pid=55204&sid=428530>

   - ***Arts and Humanities Citation Index (ISI)***
     This is a fascinating database that allows you to do a citation search. Once you have identified a book or article that is of interest, you can do a citation search to find all subsequent works that cite the earlier book or article. For example, suppose you were interested in replies to W.V.O. Quine's "Two Dogmas of Empiricism."  This database allows you to find books and articles that subsequently cited Quine's earlier essay. You can access this database on the following Wooster site by scrolling down to the *Arts and Humanities Citation Index* link. Anything you search from that interface will be searching the index. <http://libguides.wooster.edu/az.php>

10. ***Browse the Stacks and Journals***
    In a highly electronic age it may seem anachronistic and archaic to actually browse through the library or the paper copies of a journal, but this can actually be a useful research technique.

The Library of Congress Cataloguing System is designed to place books with similar subjects on the shelf next to each other. For example, you may be interested in the concept of virtue and ethics, and you find that Phillipa Foote has written the book *Virtues and Vices*. It would be helpful to locate Foote's book in the stacks and browse the surrounding shelves for others who have written about virtue and ethics.

It can also be helpful to browse through the philosophy journals. This can be a way to quickly peruse a large number of articles for relevance to your topic. You may also discover connections between other areas of philosophy that initially did not seem related to your project. In addition, sometimes journals produce special issues in which all the articles are on the same topic; these issues can be particularly valuable because you may have one location that contains eight to ten current articles on a single topic. Finally, browsing journals can help you discover new areas of philosophy of which you were previously unaware.

# 5. WRITING IN PHILOSOPHY

Writing a philosophy paper is an intellectual process in which you explain and defend a thesis. Your goal should be to write a well-structured and tightly argued paper. There are a variety of general models for writing a philosophy paper, but one of the most effective is outlined below. A variation of this model is developed and explained by Robert Paul Wolff. He calls this "A Simple Foolproof Method for Writing Philosophy Papers":

1. A clear and concise statement of your thesis.
2. An analysis and explanation of the thesis.
3. The arguments in support of your thesis.
4. The examination of objections to your thesis.
5. Your replies to these objections.
6. Your conclusion.

## § Resources on Writing Philosophy

- Feinberg, Joel. *Doing Philosophy: A Guide to the Writing of Philosophy Papers*. 3rd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 2004.

- Graybosch, Anthony J., Gregory Scott, and Stephen Garrison. *The Philosophy Student Writer's Manual*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003.

- Martinich, A.P. *Philosophical Writing*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

- Pryor, Jim. "Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper." Available from <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/writing.html>. Accessed 5 February, 2007.

- Wolff, Robert Paul. "Appendix: How to Write a Philosophy Paper." In *About Philosophy*. 5th ed. Robert Paul Wolff. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992.

# 6.  KEY CONCEPTS AND LEXICON

## § Philosophy Dictionaries

The following dictionaries are helpful in defining the above concepts:

- Audi, Robert, ed. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

- Blackburn, Simon. *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Flew, Antony, and Steven Priest. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. 3rd ed. London: Pan Books Limited, 2005.

- Mautner, Thomas. *The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy*. 2nd ed. Pittsburgh, PA: Penguin Press, 2007.

- Pence, Gregory. *A Dictionary of Common Philosophical Terms*. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2000.

- Pryor, Jim. "A Philosophical Glossary for Beginners." Available from <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/vocab/glossary.html>.  Accessed 5 February, 2007.

## § Key Concepts

Philosophy majors should have a good understanding of various technical philosophical terms and of elementary logical inferences and fallacies. The key concepts are listed below.

## *Metaphysics*

Existence / Essence
Being / Non-being
Realism / Idealism
Substance – Monism / Dualism
Substance – Materialism / Idealism
Particulars / Universals
  - Realism
  - Conceptualism
  - Nominalism
Free Will
  - Libertarianism
  - Determinism
  - Compatibilism
Ontology
Teleology
Cosmology
Four *Aitia* (Causes)
Zeno's Paradox
Meno's Paradox

## *Epistemology*

Empirical / Non-empirical
*A priori* / *A posteriori*
Necessary / Contingent
Analytic / Synthetic
Rationalism / Empiricism
Skepticism
Solipsism
Relativism
Objectivism / Subjectivism
Knowledge
Justification
Problem of Induction
Foundationalism
Coherentism
Truth
  - Correspondence Theory
  - Coherence Theory
Abstraction
Innate Ideas

## *Ethics*

Metaethics / Normative ethics
Descriptive Ethical Relativism
Normative Ethical Relativism
Cognitivism / Non-cognitivism
Subjectivism / Objectivism
Egoism
Altruism
Morally Obligatory / Supererogatory
*Prima Facia* Duty
Intrinsic Value / Instrumental Value
Fact / Value
Is / Ought
Utilitarianism
Deontology
Divine Command Theory
Categorical Imperative
Virtue Theory
*Eudaimonia*
*Akrasia*

## *Logic*

Argument
Premise
Conclusion
Entailment
Necessary and Sufficient
    Conditions
Deduction
Valid / Invalid
Sound / Unsound
Induction
Strong / Weak
Cogent / Uncogent
Formal Fallacy
  - Affirming the Consequent
  - Denying the Antecedent
Informal Fallacy
  - Complete List in Appendix XI

### *Political Philosophy*

Autonomy
Justice
Rights
Political Obligation / Duties
State of Nature
Social Contract
Consent (Tacit / Express)
Positive Law / Natural Law
Neutrality
Free Rider
Liberalism
  - Comprehensive / Substantive
  - Political / Procedural
Communitarianism
Marxism
Historical Materialism
Libertarianism
Perfectionism
Civil Disobedience
Ideology
Priority of Right Thesis
Public / Private Distinction
Impartiality
Distributive Justice
Original Position
Reflective Equilibrium
Veil of Ignorance
Basic Liberties Principle
Difference Principle
Primary Goods (Natural, Social)
Locke's Conception of Property
Nozick's "Entitlement Theory"
Maximin Strategy
Humanism
Individualism
Social Constructionism

### *Philosophy of Language*

Sense / Reference
Intension / Extension
Connotation / Denotation
Picture Theory of Meaning
Verification Theory of Meaning
Logical Atomism
Private Language
Performative Utterance
Conversational Implicature
Metaphor
Paradox

### *Philosophy of Mind*

Mind - Body Dualism
Behaviorism
Functionalism
Physicalism
Phenomenalism
Personal Identify
Artificial Intelligence
Turing Test
Identity Theory
Consciousness
The Unconscious
Will
Emotions

# 7. INDUCTIVE LOGIC

**Inductive Argument:** An argument in which it is claimed that, if the premises are assumed to be true, then it is probable that the conclusion is true.

**Strong Argument**: An inductive argument in which the premises support the conclusion in such a way that, if the premises are assumed to be true, then (based on that assumption) it is probable that the conclusion is true.

**Cogent Argument**: An inductive argument that: (1) is strong, and (2) has all true premises.

## § Some Types of Inductive Arguments

### 1. Arguments by Example (Inductive Generalization)

All of the *observed* A's are B's
Therefore, it is probable that *all* A's are B's.

X percent of the *observed* A's are B's.
Therefore, it is probable that X percent of *all* A's are B's.

Criteria for evaluation:
  a. Is the sample size large?
  b. Is the sample representative?
  c. Has evidence against the generalization been overlooked (e.g., counterexamples)?

### 2. Arguments by Analogy

A and B are alike in the following relevant respects: W, X, Y.
A also has characteristic Z.
Therefore, it is probably true that B has Z.

Criteria for evaluation:
  a. Number of similarities – In how many ways are A and B alike?
  b. Relevance of similarities – Are the observed similarities relevant?
  c. Number and Variety of Primary Analogates – How many and varied are the observed A's?
  d. Disanalogies – Are A and B different in important ways?

Ways to refute an argument by analogy:
  a. Disanalogies – Point out dissimilarities between A and B.
  b. Counteranalogies – Produce a counteranalogy.
  c. Extending the analogy – Extend the original analogy to produce an unacceptable conclusion; thereby illustrating the weakness of the original conclusion.

### 3. Arguments from Authority

X (some person or organization who ought to know) says that Y.
Therefore, Y is probably true.

Criterion for evaluation:
Is the authority qualified, unbiased, trustworthy, and reliable?

### 4. Hypothetico-Deductive Arguments

Confirmation:
If hypothesis H is true, then the prediction P will be true.
The prediction P is true.
Therefore, it is probable that the hypothesis H is true.

Disconfirmation:
If hypothesis H is true, then the prediction P will be true.
The prediction P is not true.
Therefore, the hypothesis H is not true.

Criteria for evaluating predictions:
a. Deducibility – Does the prediction follow as a logical consequence of the hypothesis?
b. Testability – Is it possible to determine whether the prediction is true?
c. Specific Prediction (Severe Test) – Is the prediction unlikely to be true, unless the hypothesis is true?

## 8. DEDUCTIVE LOGIC

### § Categorical Logic

These are argument forms based on set membership. A set is a collection of entities. For example, Hilary Clinton is a member of the set of all women, which is a more formal way of expressing the claim 'Hilary Clinton is a woman.' The members of a set are said to belong to that set. For example, 'All As are B' means that all members of the set of A things belong to the set of things that are B. An instance of 'All As are B' is 'All apples are fruit' or 'All members of the set of apples are members of, or belong to, the set of all fruit."

1. *Standard Form for Categorical Propositions*

    **A:  All S are P.**          Every member of the class S is a member of the class P.

    **E:  No S are P.**          No member of the class S is a member of the class P.

    **I:   Some S are P.**        At least one member of the class S is a member of the class P.

    **O:  Some S are not P.**    At least one member of the class S is not a member of the class P.

2. *Some Valid Argument Forms in Modern Categorical Logic*

All A are B.                    All A are B.
All B are C.                   No C is B.
Therefore, all A are C.         Therefore, no C is A

No B is A.                      All A are C.
Some C is A.                  Some B are A.
Therefore, some C are not B.    Therefore, Some B are C.

## § Propositional Logic

### 1. Three Types of Symbols in Propositional Logic

- **Abbreviating Symbols**
  Capital letters which represent a simple sentence (i.e., P, Q, R, S, T, etc.)
  For example: 'The grass is green.' can be symbolized as G.
  'Snow is white.' can be symbolized as W.

- **Logical Operator Symbols**
  There are five logical operators: $\sim$ , $\bullet$ , $\vee$ , $\supset$ , $\equiv$
  The following chart shows the logical operators and corresponding symbols and .

| Logical Operator | Symbol | Description |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| Negation | $\sim$ | not |
| Conjunction | $\bullet$ or & or $\wedge$ | and |
| Disjunction | $\vee$ | or |
| Conditional | $\supset$ or $\rightarrow$ | if . . . then . . . |
| Biconditional | $\equiv$ or $\leftrightarrow$ | . . . if and only if . . . |

- **Grouping Symbols**
  Any formula or symbolization which contains 3 or more letters (i.e., abbreviating symbols) requires grouping symbols. All of the following symbols can be used for grouping: ( ) or [ ] or {  }.

### 2. Truth Functions
In propositional logic simple sentences can be combined using the logical operators and grouping symbols to produce compound sentences. It is also truth functional; this means that the truth-value of a compound sentence is a function of its component parts.

These five basic operators are defined in the following truth tables.

| P | $\sim$ P |
|:---:|:---:|
| T | F |
| F | T |

| P | Q | P ∞ Q | P ∨ Q | P ⊃ Q | P ≡ Q |
|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| T | T | T | T | T | T |
| T | F | F | T | F | F |
| F | T | F | T | T | T |
| F | F | F | F | T | F |

## *3. Rules of Inference*

Modus Ponens (MP)

    P ⊃ Q

    P        

    Q

Modus Tollens (MT)

    P ⊃ Q

    ~ Q      

    ~ P

Hypothetical Syllogism (HS)

    P ⊃ Q

    Q ⊃ R  

    P ⊃ R

Disjunctive Syllogism (DS)

    P v Q

    ~ P      

    Q

Constructive Dilemma (CD)

    (P ⊃ Q) • (R ⊃ S)

    P v R   

    Q v S

Simplification (SIMP)

    P • Q    

    P

    Q

Conjunction (CONJ)

    P

    Q      

    P • Q

Addition (ADD)

    P       

    P v Q

## § Predicate Logic

Predicate logic is a system that roughly combines the features of both categorical logic and propositional logic. It starts with the symbolization and the rules of rules of inference from propositional logic and adds three additional types of symbols.

### 1. Four Additional Types of Symbols in Propositional Logic

- ***Predicate Symbols***
  Capital letters which represent a predicate (i.e., P, Q, R, etc.)
  For example: 'is green.' can be symbolized as G.
  
  'is hot' can be symbolized as H.

- ***Individual Constants***
  Lower case letters usually at the beginning of the alphabet which symbolize individuals (i.e., a, b, c, etc.).
  For example: 'Socrates' can be symbolized s.

- ***Variables***
  Lower case letters usually at the end of the alphabet (i.e., x, y, z, etc.).
  For example: 'Socrates' can be symbolized s.

- ***Quantifiers***
  - *Existential Quantifier*
    For example: 'Something is red.'
    
    This sentence posits the existence of a red thing.
    It has the logical form: 'There is an x, and x is red.'
    Symbolization: $(\exists x)\,(Rx)$

  - *Universal Quantifier*
    For example: 'Everything is blue'
    
    This sentence asserts that all everything is blue but in predicate logic this does not entail that anything blue exists.
    It has the logical form: 'For all x, x is blue.'
    Symbolization: $(x)\,(Bx)$

### 2. Exchange of Quantifier Rules

$(x)\,Fx :: \sim(\exists x) \sim Fx$          $(\exists x)\,Fx :: \sim(x) \sim Fx$

$\sim(x)\,Fx :: (\exists x) \sim Fx$          $\sim(\exists x)\,Fx :: (x) \sim Fx$

## § Modal Logic

(Adapted from *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*)

Modal Logic addresses the modal concepts of possibility and necessity.

### 1. *Modal Operators*

The basic modal operators are usually written □ (or L) for Necessarily and ◊ (or M) for Possibly.

    □ P means 'necessarily P'
    ◊ P means 'possibly P'

In a classical modal logic, each can be defined from the other and negation:

    ◊ P ≡ ~ □ ~ P means
    'It is possible that P is logical equivalent to it is not necessary that not P.'

    □ P ≡ ~ ◊ ~ P means
    'It is necessary that P is logically equivalent to it is not possible that not P.'

### 2. *Axioms of System K*

    Necessitation Rule:   If A is a theorem of K, then so is □ A.
    Distribution Axiom:  □ (A→B) → (□ A→□ B).

### 3. *Axioms of System T*

    If Axiom (M) is added to System K the result is System T.

    Axiom (M):  □ A→A

    (M) claims that whatever is necessary is the case.

### 4. *Axioms of System S4*

    Many logicians believe that M is still too weak to correctly formalize the logic of necessity and possibility. They recommend further axioms to govern the iteration, If Axiom (S4) is added to System T the result is System S4.

    (S4) □ A→□ □ A

### 5. *Axioms of System S5*

    If Axiom (S5) is added to System S4 the result is System S5.

(S5)  ◊A→□ ◊A        (S5 implies: ◊□ A→□ A)

# 9. FALLACIES
(Adapted from Patrick Hurley, *An Introduction to Logic*)


**Affirming the Consequent**  --  A formal fallacy which has the following form:
> If A, then B.
> B_____
> Therefore, A


**Denying the Antecedent**  --  A formal fallacy which has the following form:
> If A, then B.
> Not A_____
> Therefore, not B


**False Dichotomy** (false dilemma)  --  A fallacy in which the argument has the form of a disjunctive syllogism (i.e. A or B; not A; therefore B).  But the two alternatives are not jointly exhaustive, that is, there is a third alternative possible.  Such an argument is an informal fallacy even though the argument is deductively valid.


**Equivocation**  --  A fallacy in which the conclusion appears to follow from the premise(s) because there is some word or short phrase which is used in two different senses in the argument.  The fallacy results from an ambiguous word or short phrase (i.e. semantical ambiguity).


**Straw Person** (straw man)  --  A fallacy in which the arguer ignores an opponent's actual position and presents in its place an exaggerated or misrepresented version of that position, then demolishes the misrepresentation and concludes that the original position is demolished.


**Hasty Generalization** ("person who" fallacy or provincialism) **--**  A fallacy in which the arguer uses a non-representative sample as the basis for a generalization about all individuals of a particular type.  The sample group may be too small, not random or atypical in some way.  This is a weak inductive generalization.


**Weak Analogy**  --  A fallacy in which the conclusion of the argument depends upon a weak analogy (similarity).  A weak analogy is one in which there is not the appropriate causal or systematic relationship between the attributes of the two things being compared.


**Appeal to Illegitimate Authority** (*ad vericundiam*)  --  A fallacy in which the arguer attempts to get a person to accept a conclusion on the basis of an illegitimate authority.  The authority may be "illegitimate" because they are unqualified (i.e. outside his or her field of expertise), biased, untrustworthy, or unreliable.


**False Cause**  --  A fallacy in which the arguer attempts to get one to accept a conclusion on the basis of a causal connection that does not probably exist.  One should be able to state the supposed causal connection: "It is assumed that X causes Y when in fact it probably does not."  Five types of false causes:
> 1) coincidence fallacy - believing that A causes B, when really A and B are independent events, occurring together as a matter of chance.
> 2) *post hoc ergo propter hoc* - (after this, therefore on account of this); believing that A causes B, when really A and B are independent events, occurring one after another as a matter of chance.
> 3) backward fallacy - believing A causes B, when really B causes A.
> 4) common cause - believing A causes B, when really a third factor causes both A and B.
> 5) oversimplified cause -  identifying one aspect as the cause when in actuality there are a variety of causal factors.


**Slippery Slope**  --  A fallacy in which it is assumed that some event A must inevitably lead to some other Z, but no argument or reason has been given for the inevitability of this chain reaction from A to Z.

**Ad Hominem** -- A fallacy in which the arguer attacks the person, not the person's claim. Three types of *ad hominem* attacks:

       1) *ad hominem* abusive - the attack is insulting and verbally abusive of the person.

       2) *ad hominem* circumstantial - the attack takes the form of attempting to discredit the claim by alluding to certain circumstances relating to the person.

       3) *ad hominem tu quoque* - the attack attempts to make the person appear to be a hypocrite. Common forms: "Your claim cannot be taken seriously because you are no better than I" or "You would do the same to me" or "What you say is inconsistent with other things you have said or done."

**Appeal to Force** -- A fallacy in which the arguer tries to get a person to accept a conclusion by <u>threatening</u> him or her.

**Appeal to Pity** (*ad misericordiam*) -- A fallacy in which the arguer tries to get a person to accept a conclusion by eliciting <u>pity</u> or compassion.

**Appeal to the People** (*ad populum*) -- A fallacy in which the arguer attempts to win acceptance of a conclusion by exciting the emotions and enthusiasms of a large crowd (direct approach). A fallacy in which the arguer attempts to win acceptance of a conclusion by appealing to an individual reader's or listener's desire for acceptance, security, love, respect, vanity, etc. (indirect approach). This fallacy relies heavily upon emotive language. Common types of this fallacy:

       1) bandwagon argument - A fallacy in which the arguer attempts to get a person to accept a conclusion because everyone (lots of people, most societies, etc.) accepts the conclusion.

       2) appeal to snobbery - A fallacy in which the arguer attempts to get a person to accept a conclusion by playing on the individual's need to feel superior.

       3) appeal to vanity - A fallacy in which the arguer attempts to get a person to accept a conclusion by playing on the individual's vanity.

**Appeal to Ignorance** (*ad ignorantiam*) -- A fallacy in which an arguer uses the fact that <u>nothing has been proven</u> about something <u>as evidence in support</u> of some conclusion about that thing.

**Missing the Point** (*non sequitur*) -- A fallacy in which the arguer is ignorant of the logical implications of his or her own premises and draws a conclusion different from that supported by the premises. The arguer misses the point of his or her own argument. One should be able to identify the correct conclusion that the premises logically imply. Non sequitur means "does not follow".

**Red Herring** -- A fallacy in which the arguer <u>diverts the attention</u> of the reader/listener by changing the subject to some totally different issue. The structure of this fallacy is: "I have succeeded in drawing you off the track; therefore, I have won the argument."

**Begging the Question** (*petitio principii*) -- A fallacy in which the arguer phrases a key premise in such a way that it conceals the questionably true character of the premise. There are various techniques for concealing the nature of a premise:

       1) the premise and the conclusion may be merely restatements of each other;

       2) there may be a chain of arguments that move in a circle;

       3) there may be a hidden premise which is ignored altogether.

The argument begs the question at issue; in other words, it asks that the statement to be proved be granted beforehand. (These arguments are deductively valid yet they are not good arguments because of this informal fallacy.)

**Suppressed Evidence** -- A fallacy in which the arguer <u>suppresses or ignores relevant evidence</u> which outweighs the presented evidence and supports a different conclusion.