

**GENERAL STUDIES COURSE PROPOSAL COVER FORM**  
(ONE COURSE PER FORM)

1.) DATE: <b>9/29/16</b>	2.) COMMUNITY COLLEGE: <b>Maricopa Co. Comm. College District</b>
3.) COURSE PROPOSED: Prefix: <b>PHI</b> Number: <b>224</b> Title: <b>Political Philosophy</b> Credits: <b>3</b>	
CROSS LISTED WITH: Prefix:            Number:            ; Prefix:            Number:            ; Prefix:            Number:            ;	
Prefix:            Number:            ; Prefix:            Number:            ; Prefix:            Number:            ;	
4.) COMMUNITY COLLEGE INITIATOR: <b>NICHOLAS MOWAD</b> PHONE: <b>480-726-4133</b>	
FAX:	
ELIGIBILITY: Courses must have a current Course Equivalency Guide (CEG) evaluation. Courses evaluated as NT (non-transferable are not eligible for the General Studies Program.	
MANDATORY REVIEW:	
<input type="checkbox"/> The above specified course is undergoing Mandatory Review for the following Core or Awareness Area (only one area is permitted; if a course meets more than one Core or Awareness Area, please submit a separate Mandatory Review Cover Form for each Area).	
POLICY: The General Studies Council (GSC) Policies and Procedures requires the review of previously approved community college courses every five years, to verify that they continue to meet the requirements of Core or Awareness Areas already assigned to these courses. This review is also necessary as the General Studies program evolves.	
AREA(S) PROPOSED COURSE WILL SERVE: A course may be proposed for more than one core or awareness area. Although a course may satisfy a core area requirement and an awareness area requirement concurrently, a course may not be used to satisfy requirements in two core or awareness areas simultaneously, even if approved for those areas. With departmental consent, an approved General Studies course may be counted toward both the General Studies requirements and the major program of study.	
5.) PLEASE SELECT EITHER A CORE AREA OR AN AWARENESS AREA: <u>Core Areas:</u> <b>Literacy and Critical Inquiry (L)</b> <u>Awareness Areas:</u> <b>Select awareness area...</b>	
6.) On a separate sheet, please provide a description of how the course meets the specific criteria in the area for which the course is being proposed.	
7.) DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course Description <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course Syllabus <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criteria Checklist for the area <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Contents from the textbook required and list of required readings/books <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Description of how course meets criteria as stated in item 6.	
8.) THIS COURSE CURRENTLY TRANSFERS TO ASU AS:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECIAS, PHI prefix <input type="checkbox"/> Elective	
Current General Studies designation(s): <b>HU</b>	
Effective date: <b>2017 Spring</b> Course Equivalency Guide	
Is this a multi-section course? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Is it governed by a common syllabus? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Chair/Director: <b>DAVE YOUNT, PHILOSOPHY IC CHAIR</b> Chair/Director Signature:	

AGSC Action:            Date action taken:             Approved             Disapproved

Effective Date:

Arizona State University Criteria Checklist for  
LITERACY AND CRITICAL INQUIRY - [L]

Rationale and Objectives

Literacy is here defined broadly as communicative competence—that is, competence in written and oral discourse. Critical inquiry involves the gathering, interpretation, and evaluation of evidence. Any field of university study may require unique critical skills that have little to do with language in the usual sense (words), but the analysis of written and spoken evidence pervades university study and everyday life. Thus, the General Studies requirements assume that all undergraduates should develop the ability to reason critically and communicate using the medium of language.

The requirement in Literacy and Critical Inquiry presumes, first, that training in literacy and critical inquiry must be sustained beyond traditional First Year English in order to create a habitual skill in every student; and, second, that the skill levels become more advanced, as well as more secure, as the student learns challenging subject matter. Thus, two courses beyond First Year English are required in order for students to meet the Literacy and Critical Inquiry requirement.

Most lower-level [L] courses are devoted primarily to the further development of critical skills in reading, writing, listening, speaking, or analysis of discourse. Upper-division [L] courses generally are courses in a particular discipline into which writing and critical thinking have been fully integrated as means of learning the content and, in most cases, demonstrating that it has been learned.

Notes:

1. ENG 101, 107 or ENG 105 must be prerequisites
2. Honors theses, XXX 493 meet [L] requirements
3. The list of criteria that must be satisfied for designation as a Literacy and Critical Inquiry [L] course is presented on the following page. This list will help you determine whether the current version of your course meets all of these requirements. If you decide to apply, please attach a current syllabus, or handouts, or other documentation that will provide sufficient information for the General Studies Council to make an informed decision regarding the status of your proposal.

Revised April 2014

Proposer: Please complete the following section and attach appropriate documentation.

ASU - [L] CRITERIA			
TO QUALIFY FOR [L] DESIGNATION, THE COURSE DESIGN MUST PLACE A MAJOR EMPHASIS ON COMPLETING CRITICAL DISCOURSE--AS EVIDENCED BY THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:			
YES	NO		Identify Documentation Submitted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CRITERION 1:</b> At least 50 percent of the grade in the course should depend upon writing assignments (see Criterion 3). Group projects are acceptable only if each student gathers, interprets, and evaluates evidence, and prepares a summary report. <i>In-class essay exams may not be used for [L] designation.</i>	1) Last page of this checklist 2) Syllabus pp2-3 3) PHI 224 Additional Clarification with C-1 Labels
1. Please describe the assignments that are considered in the computation of course grades--and indicate the proportion of the final grade that is determined by each assignment.			
2. Also: <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 10px; margin: 10px auto; width: 80%; text-align: center;">                         Please circle, underline, or otherwise mark the information presented in the most recent course syllabus (or other material you have submitted) that verifies this description of the grading process--and label this information "C-1".                     </div> C-1			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CRITERION 2:</b> The writing assignments should involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence. They should reflect critical inquiry, extending beyond opinion and/or reflection.	1) Last page of this checklist 2) Syllabus pp2-3, 4-5, 8-13 3) PHI 224 Additional Clarification with C-2 Labels
1. Please describe the way(s) in which this criterion is addressed in the course design.			
2. Also: <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 10px; margin: 10px auto; width: 80%; text-align: center;">                         Please circle, underline, or otherwise mark the information presented in the most recent course syllabus (or other material you have submitted) that verifies this description of the grading process--and label this information "C-2".                     </div> C-2			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CRITERION 3:</b> The syllabus should include a minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity. Substantial writing assignments entail sustained in-depth engagement with the material. Examples include research papers, reports, articles, essays, or speeches that reflect critical inquiry and evaluation. Assignments such as brief reaction papers, opinion pieces, reflections, discussion posts, and impromptu presentations are not considered substantial writing/speaking assignments.	1) Last page of this checklist 2) Syllabus pp2-3, 4-5, 8-13 3) PHI 224 Additional Clarification with C-3 Labels
1. Please provide relatively detailed descriptions of two or more substantial writing or speaking tasks that are included in the course requirements			

ASU - [L] CRITERIA

2. Also:

Please circle, underline, or otherwise mark the information presented in the most recent course syllabus (or other material you have submitted) that verifies this description of the grading process--and label this information "C-3".

C-3

ASU - [L] CRITERIA			
YES	NO		Identify Documentation Submitted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>CRITERION 4:</b> These substantial writing or speaking assignments should be arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments. <i>Intervention at earlier stages in the writing process is especially welcomed.</i></p>	<p>1) Last page of this checklist                      2) Syllabus pp2-3, 7-8                      3) PHI 224 Additional Clarification with C-4 Labels</p>
<p>1. Please describe the sequence of course assignments--and the nature of the feedback the current (or most recent) course instructor provides to help students do better on subsequent assignments</p>			
<p>2. Also:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 20px; text-align: center; margin: 20px auto; width: 80%;"> <p>Please circle, underline, or otherwise mark the information presented in the most recent course syllabus (or other material you have submitted) that verifies this description of the grading process--and label this information "C-4".</p> </div> <p>C-4</p>			

Course Prefix	Number	Title	General Studies Designation
PHI	224	Social and Political Philosophy	HU

Explain in detail which student activities correspond to the specific designation criteria.

Please use the following organizer to explain how the criteria are being met.

Criteria (from checksheet)	How course meets spirit (contextualize specific examples in next column)	Please provide detailed evidence of how course meets criteria (i.e., where in syllabus)
<p>Criterion 1: At least fifty percent of the grade in the course should depend upon writing assignments. Group projects are acceptable only if each student gathers, interprets, and evaluates evidence and prepares a summary report.</p>	<p>PHI 224 requires about 25 pages of written work from each student over the course of the semester. The midterm paper is 30% of the grade, the presentation is 25% of the grade. The presentation is a group project but which requires a paper submitted from each student individually. Those alone exceed the 50% requirement. But there is also the portfolio, with 11 distinct responses to reading questions, which accounts for another 30%, bringing the total up to 85%.</p>	<p>Documents: 1) Syllabus pp2-3. Pages 2-3 give the assignments that make up the grade for the class, including percentages and detailed descriptions of what is involved in each assignment. 2) PHI 224 Additional Clarification (page 1). A table is given showing all writing assignments, which activities are involved in it, what percent of the grade it contributes, and which criteria are satisfied.</p>
<p>Criterion 2: The writing assignments should involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence. They should reflect critical inquiry, extending beyond opinion and/or reflection.</p>	<p>Writing Assignments for PHI 224 require reconstructing arguments given in the reading, interpreting them with respect to how they can be applied to different situations (anticipated or not by the arguemnts' authors), and evaluating them (including comparatively evaluating opposing arguments). Not only is this not limited to students giving unsubstantiated opinions, it requires students to explicitly subject their preconceived notions to rigorous critique.</p>	<p>1) Syllabus pages 2-3, 4-5, 8-13. Pages 2-3 give details about the writing assignments, how they are to be completed. Pages 4-5 give the rubric used to grade written assignments, as well as some further remarks about expectations (under "Writing Requirements" and "The Status of Opinions and Beliefs"). Pages 8-13 give the "Guide to Philosophical Writing" explaining how a position is to be taken and defended systematically by argumentation, including the critical examination of one's own position. 2) PHI 224 Additional Clarification (page 2). Examples are given of one (of eleven) reading questions to which students must respond, and the midterm paper assignment. It is there explained how each involves gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence.</p>

<p>Criterion 3: The syllabus should include a minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality and quantity. Substantial writing assignments entail sustained, in-depth engagement with the material.</p>	<p>PHI 224 includes a midterm paper and a presentation. The midterm paper is 5 pages, involves critically evaluating a philosopher's argument and determining to what extent it can be applied to a contemporary problem. The presentation is a group project, but each student completes a five paper paper as part of it, in which material uncovered in class is summarized and critically evaluated.</p>	<p>1) Syllabus pp2-3, 4-5. Pages 2-3 give directions for the midterm paper and the presentation. Pages 4-5 give the rubric according to which each is graded, as well as additional guidance (to ensure sustained, in-depth engagement with the material) on how the assignments are to be completed (see "Writing Requirements" and "Status of Opinions and Beliefs"). Pages 8-13 give the "Guide to Philosophical Writing" explaining how a position is to be taken and defended systematically by argumentation, including the critical examination of one's own position. 2) PHI 224 Additional Clarification pages 2-3. Here there is given an explanation of what the midterm paper and presentation involve, and how the guarantee of adequate engagement and depth are built into the assignments.</p>
<p>Criterion 4: These substantial writing or speaking assignments should be arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments.</p>	<p>Both the midterm paper and the presentation involve submission of drafts prior to the due date for the final versions. In each case, the instructor reviews the drafts and offers feedback, leaving students enough time to make revisions. (The responses to reading questions also allow students to make revisions before turning them in in their portfolios). For the midterm paper, students also complete two peer reviews, and thus also receive two peer reviews for their draft. For the presentation, groups meet individually with the instructor to go over how their work can be improved before the day of the presentation.</p>	<p>1) Syllabus pp2-3, 7-8. Pages 2-3 give directions for how the midterm paper and presentation are to be completed, including details about submission of drafts and the giving of feedback. Pages 7-8 give the schedule, which shows when drafts are submitted, when final versions are due, etc. 2) PHI 224 Additional Clarification page 3. Here it is stated how the design of the two substantial writing assignments allow for feedback before the final version is turned in.</p>

<p>Criterion 3:                  The syllabus should include a minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality and quantity. Substantial writing assignments entail sustained, in-depth engagement with the material.</p>	<p>PHI 224 includes a midterm paper and a presentation. The midterm paper is 5 pages, involves critically evaluating a philosopher's argument and determining to what extent it can be applied to a contemporary problem. The presentation is a group project, but each student completes a five paper paper as part of it, in which material uncovered in class is summarized and critically evaluated.</p>	<p>1) Syllabus pp2-3, 4-5. Pages 2-3 give directions for the midterm paper and the presentation. Pages 4-5 give the rubric according to which each is graded, as well as additional guidance (to ensure sustained, in-depth engagement with the material) on how the assignments are to be completed (see "Writing Requirements" and "Status of Opinions and Beliefs"). Pages 8-13 give the "Guide to Philosophical Writing" explaining how a position is to be taken and defended systematically by argumentation, including the critical examination of one's own position.                  2) PHI 224 Additional Clarification pages 2-3. Here there is given an explanation of what the midterm paper and presentation involve, and how the guarantee of adequate engagement and depth are built into the assignments.</p>
<p>Criterion 4:                  These substantial writing or speaking assignments should be arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments.</p>	<p>Both the midterm paper and the presentation involve submission of drafts prior to the due date for the final versions. In each case, the instructor reviews the drafts and offers feedback, leaving students enough time to make revisions. (The responses to reading questions also allow students to make revisions before turning them in in their portfolios). For the midterm paper, students also complete two peer reviews, and thus also receive two peer reviews for their draft. For the presentation, groups meet individually with the instructor to go over how their work can be improved before the day of the presentation.</p>	<p>1) Syllabus pp2-3, 7-8. Pages 2-3 give directions for how the midterm paper and presentation are to be completed, including details about submission of drafts and the giving of feedback. Pages 7-8 give the schedule, which shows when drafts are submitted, when final versions are due, etc.                  2) PHI 224 Additional Clarification page 3. Here it is stated how the design of the two substantial writing assignments allow for feedback before the final version is turned in.</p>





MARICOPA  
COMMUNITY  
COLLEGES

## Center for Curriculum & Transfer Articulation

Division of Academic and Student Affairs

### Political Philosophy

Course: PHI224

Lecture 3 Credit(s) 3 Period(s) 3 Load

Course Type: Academic

First Term: 2012 Spring

Load Formula: S

Final Term: Current

**Description:** Predominant figures and theories in Euroamerican political philosophy from Plato to contemporary social/political philosophers.

**Requisites:** Prerequisites: ENG101, or ENG107, or permission of Instructor.

**Course Attributes:**

General Education Designation: Humanities and Fine Arts - [HU]

- 
1. Identify and explain the challenges to the philosophical study of political systems. (I)
  2. Describe the relationship between government and civil society. (I)
  3. Trace the historical development of the predominant theories of government. (II)
  4. Compare and contrast theories of government. (III)
  5. Apply the theories to current tensions in civil society. (IV)
  6. Critically evaluate the theories in light of their application to current and future issues. (V)

- 
- I. Historical Background and Challenges\n
    - A. Beginnings of civil society\n
      1. In ancient Greek culture\n
      2. In Europe (1400's-present)\n
    - B. Rise of political systems\n
      1. Oligarchy\n
      2. Monarchy\n
      3. Democracy\n
  - II. Theories of Government\n
    - A. Historical origins of theories of governments\n
      1. Economic and cultural considerations\n
      2. Historical materialism\n
    - B. Arguments underlying classical theories of government\n
      1. Natural Law theory\n
      2. Contractarian theory\n
      3. Classic Liberalism\n
      4. Marxism\n
  - III. Analysis of Theories of Government\n
    - A. Justice vs. Social Utility\n
    - B. Strengths and theories of government weaknesses of\npredominant\n
  - IV. Applications to Current Societal Problems\n
    - A. Proposed solutions to current problems\n

- B. Effectiveness of predominant theories of government\n
- V. Future Concerns of Political Philosophy\n
- A. Changes and improvement on predominant theories\n
- B. Civil society in the Third Millenium\n

Last MCCCD Governing Board Approval Date: 5/24/2011

All information published is subject to change without notice. Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of information presented, but based on the dynamic nature of the curricular process, course and program information is subject to change in order to reflect the most current information available.

CLASSICS OF  
POLITICAL AND MORAL  
PHILOSOPHY



Edited by

Steven M. Cahn

*City University of New York Graduate Center*

New York      Oxford  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
2002

# CONTENTS

~

Preface xiii

## PLATO

*Introduction* 1  
Richard Kraut  
\**Defence of Socrates* 6  
\**Crito* 23  
*Republic* 32  
*Statesman* 168

## ARISTOTLE

*Introduction* 178  
Richard Kraut  
*Nicomachean Ethics* 182  
*Politics* 222

## EPICURUS

*Introduction* 273  
Richard Kraut  
\**Letter to Menoecus* 275  
\**Principal Doctrines* 278

## CICERO

*Introduction* 280  
Richard Kraut  
*On the Republic* 284  
*On the Laws* 291

## AUGUSTINE

- Introduction* 296  
Paul J. Weithman  
*The City of God* 300

## THOMAS AQUINAS

- Introduction* 308  
Paul J. Weithman  
*Summa Theologiae* 312

## NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI

- Introduction* 335  
Roger D. Masters  
*The Prince* 339  
*Discourses* 359

## THOMAS HOBBS

- Introduction* 383  
Jean Hampton  
*Leviathan* 386

## BARUCH SPINOZA

- Introduction* 441  
Steven B. Smith  
*Theologico-Political Treatise* 445

## JOHN LOCKE

- Introduction* 456  
A. John Simmons  
*Second Treatise of Government* 461  
*Letter Concerning Toleration* 506

## JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU

- Introduction* 513  
Joshua Cohen  
*Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* 517  
*Of the Social Contract* 532

## DAVID HUME

- Introduction* 567  
Donald W. Livingston  
*A Treatise of Human Nature* 571  
*\*Of Parties in General* 608  
*\*Of the Original Contract* 611

## ADAM SMITH

- Introduction* 620  
Charles L. Griswold, Jr.  
*The Theory of Moral Sentiments* 624  
*The Wealth of Nations* 633

## ALEXANDER HAMILTON and JAMES MADISON

- Introduction* 652  
Bernard E. Brown  
*The Federalist Papers* 656

## JEREMY BENTHAM

- Introduction* 708  
Jeremy Waldron  
*Principles of Legislation* 711

## IMMANUEL KANT

- Introduction* 731  
Paul Guyer  
*\*Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals* 737  
*\*On the Common Saying: "This May Be True in Theory but It Does Not Apply  
in Practice"* 775

## G. W. F. HEGEL

- Introduction* 795  
Steven B. Smith  
*Philosophy of Right* 799  
*The Philosophy of History* 814

**KARL MARX and FRIEDRICH ENGELS***Introduction* 827

Richard Miller

*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* 832*The German Ideology* 839*\*Manifesto of the Communist Party* 848*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* 866*\*Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* 868**JOHN STUART MILL***Introduction* 890

Jeremy Waldron

*\*Utilitarianism* 893*\*On Liberty* 927*Considerations on Representative Government* 988*The Subjection of Women* 977**FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE***Introduction* 1012

Richard Schacht

*Human, All Too Human* 1017*Those Spoke Zarathustra* 1021*Beyond Good and Evil* 1023*On the Genealogy of Morals* 1028*Twilight of the Idols* 1031**JOHN RAWLS***Introduction* 1034

Joshua Cohen

*A Theory of Justice* 1038**ROBERT NOZICK***Introduction* 1060

Thomas Christiano

*Anarchy, State, and Utopia* 1064**THOMAS NAGEL***Introduction* 1076

John Deigh

*Equality and Partiality* 1080

## MICHEL FOUCAULT

- Introduction* 1099  
 Thomas A. McCarthy  
*Power/Knowledge* 1102

## JÜRGEN HABERMAS

- Introduction* 1115  
 Thomas A. McCarthy  
 \**Three Normative Models of Democracy* 1118  
 \**On the Internal Relation Between the Rule of Law and Democracy* 1125

## MARTHA C. NUSSBAUM

- Introduction* 1132  
 Eva Feder Kittay  
 \**The Feminist Critique of Liberalism* 1136

## DOCUMENTS AND ADDRESSES

## PERICLES

- \**Funeral Oration* 1163

## EDMUND BURKE

- Speech to the Electors of Bristol* 1166

## \*THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE 1168

## \*THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES 1170

\*THE DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN AND  
OF THE CITIZEN 1183

## ABRAHAM LINCOLN

- First Inaugural Address* 1185  
 \**Gettysburg Address* 1188  
 \**Second Inaugural Address* 1189

## ELIZABETH CADY STANTON

- \**The Solitude of Self* 1190

## JOHN DEWEY

- Democracy* 1196

## MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

- \**Letter from a Birmingham City Jail* 1200  
 \**The March on Washington Address* 1209

\*Complete works.



PHI 224  
Social and Political Philosophy

Professor: Dr. Mowad  
Office & Office Hours: EST 126 MW 10:30-11:30 and by appointment  
Contact Information: nicholas.mowad@cgc.edu      Office phone number: (480) 726-4133

**Description:** Predominant figures and theories in Euroamerican political philosophy from Plato to contemporary social/political philosophers.

**Requisites:** Prerequisites: ENG101, or ENG107, or permission of Instructor.

**Course Attributes:**

General Education Designation: Humanities and Fine Arts - [HU]

**MCCCD Official Course Competencies**

1. Identify and explain the challenges to the philosophical study of political systems (I)
2. Describe the relationship between government and civil society (I)
3. Trace the historical development of the predominant theories of government (II)
4. Compare and contrast theories of government (III)
5. Apply the theories to current tensions in civil society (IV)
6. Critically evaluate the theories in light of their application to current and future issues (V)

**Assigned Text**

*Classics of Political and Moral Philosophy*. Ed. Cahn. Oxford University Press.

Note that the primary sources in this anthology are the only sources assigned and allowed for this class. No other publication or website should be used. And within the assigned book, the editors' introductions to the primary sources are hereby explicitly excluded from the assigned reading. Whatever you attribute to a philosopher, you must cite *the primary source* to back it up.

Additionally, you must purchase the print edition of the book and bring it to class every time we meet. Use of electronic devices is not allowed in class. An e-book will be of no use to you.

**Expectations of Students**

- (1) Adhere to all rules and regulations laid out in the syllabus, given during class sessions or via e-mail or Canvas.
- (2) Devote 5 hours of work, outside of class, to this course per week.
- (3) Arrive in class on time every time the class meets and stay until the class is dismissed.
- (4) Be attentive and engaged in class, taking notes, participating in the in-class exercises, and (if needed) asking questions.

**Contacting the Professor & Expectations of Accessibility**

To contact me outside of class, send an e-mail to nicholas.mowad@cgc.edu. All students registered for this class have access to the class on Canvas. It is your responsibility to check Canvas every day for announcements, e-mails, assignments, or any other important information. Additionally, please note that I may make a "comment" on a grade given on Canvas in which I explain why the grade is as it is. Canvas allows you the option to respond to this comment, or otherwise to leave a "comment" on an announcement, assignment or grade, but I receive no notification when you do so, and this is a very slow, inefficient and cumbersome way for us to communicate. Accordingly, I am asking you *not* to contact me by submitting such a "comment," and instead to e-mail me directly any questions or comments.

Additionally, I ask you not to contact me by telephone: I can respond much quicker if you send me an e-mail.

### Assignments and Grading

Grading Scale: Your grade in this course will be determined not by me, but by the quality of *your* work on the assigned material. Extra credit opportunities are built in to the syllabus, no additional opportunities will be given. Inability to attend extra credit opportunities will not adversely affect any student, and do not constitute reason to give further extra credit opportunities.

Letter Grade	Percent
A	90-100
B	80-89
C	70-79
D	60-69
F	<60

**C1** Midterm Paper (30%): There will be a midterm paper (5 pages). See "Writing Requirements" (p5) and "Guide to Philosophical Writing" (pp8-13) below for additional rules. **C3** Topic: Choose a persistent political issue in modernity (e.g. class division, inequalities cutting along racial or gender lines, the limits of property, the limits of national sovereignty, the permissibility of dissent, etc.). Choose either Plato or Aristotle, and determine what resources can be found in his political philosophy to understand and offer a solution to the problem. Then determine whether the ancient philosopher has something substantial and positive to contribute to modern political discourse on this issue, or not, and why or why not. **C2, C3**

You will be required to first submit a draft online, and complete peer reviews of the drafts of two other students, before turning in the final version of your paper. I will also review your draft to make suggestions. **C4** You may not use unassigned sources in a paper without expressed, written, prior consent from the professor. In your papers you must show me that you can read and understand the readings from the philosophers, not the summaries of the editors. Thus for all points you make, you must cite the assigned reading, the readings by the philosophers and not the editors. Failure to show that you have read and understood the assigned reading will be taken as a severe defect in a paper. Your aim in the paper is to demonstrate independent, critical thinking either in solving a philosophical problem, drawing out the nuances, pursuing the argument further than the author took it, etc. See the rubric for specific criteria.

**C1** Portfolio (30%): Reading questions are due at the beginning of some classes (about half) and will be posted on Canvas and are given below in the schedule. They will be posted as "assignments," but the only grade will come from when they are collected in bulk in the portfolio. Completed reading questions must be typed, printed-out, double-spaced (word processed) in 10-12 pt times new roman or calibri font, black ink on a full sheet of white 8x11 inch paper. See the "Guide to Philosophical Writing" (pp8-13) for complete information regarding the format. The length should be between 400 and 500 words (about 1-1 1/2 pages, double-spaced), unless otherwise indicated. The reading questions require you to demonstrate an understanding of the reading (even if it is not explicitly mentioned). I will mark completed reading questions at the beginning of class, but will collect them only on scheduled days. The entire portfolio will be collected three scheduled times over the course of the semester. If you know you will miss class, you may send me your reading question by e-mail (time-stamped before the class begins) to get credit for having turned it in (though this will not necessarily excuse the absence). Any attempt by a student to reproduce my mark on their own papers will be treated as a case of academic dishonesty (see below). Students without completed reading questions (this includes being printed out) will not be able to include the reading question for that day in their portfolio, lowering the grade for the portfolio collection. In addition, students without completed reading questions will not receive participation credit for the day. All reading questions must be revised and improved upon, and this must be done by the time of the portfolio collection: feel free to write notes on the paper itself during class (though later you must type out a separate revision). Revisions may reflect upon the professor's own responses to the question but revisions must be substantially independent work. You must keep all reading questions in a portfolio, which will be a folder (12"/9", with pockets, light-colored with the student's name written clearly on the outside front) containing all reading questions and notes from assigned films and class presentations. In

your revision, reproduce the original reading question marking any changes in bold and stapling it to the original reading question. Any plagiarism, however slight, will result at a minimum in a grade of zero. Your aim in the unrevised reading questions is to show that you have engaged independently with the reading and are prepared to discuss the material in class. Your aim in the portfolio is to show that you have understood well a certain reading to the point of critically analyzing it and evaluating it.

Participation (15%): You will be graded on participation every time the class meets. You will lose points for any of the following: arriving late; leaving early; not having all of the required material (book, notebook, pen or pencil); having to be told not to talk over the professor or another student who has the floor; having to be told to put away phone or other device; having to be told to put away material not pertinent to the class (including but not limited to a book or assignment for another class, food, etc.). You will lose a large number of points for any of the following: failing to actively and sufficiently participate in the discussion; not having completed reading question; disrupting discussion by being abusive or disrespectful to the professor, other students, or anyone else (this includes sexist, racist, homophobic, or otherwise bigoted comments). Even if you meet *some* requirements regarding participation, you still may receive a zero as a grade for the day. Your aim in class participation is to show me every class that you are present on time having done the reading and ready for sharing in (but not dominating) the discussion with questions and/or comments.

Presentation (25%): You and a few other students (to be determined later in the semester) will give a group presentation of 30 minutes in the final weeks of the semester, on a previously unassigned reading of your choosing (from the list below). Each student will be required to compose his/her own reading question on the selected text to guide the class discussion, as well as to compose a 5 page paper, in addition to the collective work of the group presentation. The 5 page paper will contain a 2 page summary of the reading, as well as a 3 page response to the reading question, taking the form of a critical evaluation of the text according to the required format. Each student will also turn in 5 unique "discussion points" to be relied on in the course of the presentation. A discussion point is a question you can pose to the class to incite discussion: it must be incisive, cutting to the heart of the matter in the assigned reading, making clear what is at stake and avoiding platitudes. Before submitting the final version students will submit drafts online, then meet with the professor to go over how their work can be improved. Topics: (1) Cicero & Augustine; (2) Aquinas; (3) Hume; (4) Smith; (5) Hamilton & Madison; (6) Bentham; (7) Kant; (8) Hegel; (9) Nietzsche; (10) Rawls; (11) Nozick; (12) Nagel; (13) Foucault; (14) Nussbaum Your aim in this presentation (including in your individual paper) is to demonstrate your learned skill in analyzing and evaluating a philosophical text on your own, without my guidance.

#### Deadlines and Late Work

When any work is assigned due on a certain day, it is due *at the beginning of class* on that day, after which it will not be accepted. All times are in Arizona time.

#### Absences Policy

All students are expected to be present and on time every time the class meets, up to and including the date of the final exam. I will take attendance at the beginning of each class. If you accrue more than two unexcused absences, you will be withdrawn from the class. If you are behaving disruptively, behaving disrespectfully to me or another student, or refusing to participate, I will ask you to leave class and you will be counted absent without excuse for that day. Moreover, that absence will count toward a possible withdrawal. If you miss more than 15 minutes of class, whether because you arrived over 15 minutes late, left at least 15 minutes early, or missed 15 minutes in the middle of class, you will be counted absent without excuse for the day, and such an absence can count toward a later withdrawal. If you come late to class, after I have taken roll, it is your responsibility to speak to me after class and make sure I see that you were present: otherwise you risk being recorded as absent without excuse. Refer to AR 2.3.2 in the Student Handbook to see which absences are "official absences" and excusable. If you are a CGCC athlete or are part of a CGCC organization requiring an absence, the verification card signed by the CGCC Vice President or other relevant official must be presented to me in advance. If you are an athlete, the official letter from your coach must be presented one week in advance of the absence. If you have a summons for jury duty or a subpoena, documentation must be provided in advance, and it must justify the absences.

on the day or days you claim to be excused from. Military commitments can be granted an excused absence of one week's worth of classes, if I am provided with sufficient documentation. If the commitment requires more than one week's worth of absences, you will be given an opportunity to take an incomplete or withdraw from the class. If an immediate family member dies, you will be excused to attend the funeral on the condition that prior notification is given and documentation (obituary or funeral program) are provided. For excuse during major religious holidays, see the student handbook.

**Statement concerning academic dishonesty**

Academic dishonesty is the representation of someone else's work as your own. Concerning written assignments: whether you take it from a book, an article, the internet, or another student: unless you enclose it in quotation marks *and* give a citation it is plagiarism and will be punished accordingly. Even if you study with another student, you are expected to write your own work. It does not matter whether or not you *intended* to engage in academic dishonesty. If in your work there is text taken from another source without citation, and the text appears unchanged *or* with only minor modifications, you are guilty of plagiarism. The CGCC Student Handbook states: "Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, the use of paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgement. It also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials." The same applies to cheating on a quiz or exam. If you are using an electronic device during a test, or if there is a book, photocopies or notes anywhere in the vicinity of your seat, you will be considered to be cheating. For all cases of academic dishonesty, the *minimum* penalty will be a grade of zero for the test, paper, quiz or the other assignment. The maximum penalty will be a grade of F or Y for the course.

**Penalty Waiver:**

The professor reserves the right to dispense a student from any regulation if he judges that the student has been the victim of extraordinary circumstances.

**Grading Rubric**

	A (90-100)	B (80-89)	C (70-79)	D (60-69)	F (<60)
Thesis (10 pts)	Easily identifiable, interesting, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, clear. (10)	Promising, but may be unclear or lacking insight or originality. (8)	Unclear, buried, poorly articulated, lacking in insight and originality. (7)	Difficult to identify, inconsistently maintained, or provides little around which to structure paper. (6)	No identifiable thesis or thesis shows lack of effort or comprehension of assignment. (0)
Structure and Style (10 pts)	Evident, understandable, appropriate for thesis. Essay is focused and unified. Words chosen effectively. Excellent transitions between points. Anticipates reader's need for information, explanation, and context. (10)	Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have some unclear transitions or lack of coherence. Does not fully appreciate reader's need for information, explanation, and context. (8)	Generally unclear, unfocused, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions. Does not provide sufficient information, explanation, and context for readers. (7)	Unclear, unfocused, disorganized, lacking in unity, transitions abrupt or confusing, context unclear. (6)	No evident structure or organization. No transitions between major points. (0)
Demonstration of an Understanding of the Assigned Material (28 pts)	Shows a clear grasp of what is at issue. incisive and original discussion of the major nuances, and some minor ones. (28)	Shows a competent understanding of what is at issue. Identifies and discusses the major nuances in	Shows a basic understanding of what is at issue. Identifies important nuances without providing adequate	Shows only a vague understanding of what is at issue. Failure to identify or discuss important	Makes many mistakes in representing the philosopher's argument, seems not to understand what is at issue. (0)

C2,  
C3



		competent but unoriginal ways. (22.4)	discussion of them. (19.6)	nuances. (16.8)	
Reference and Response to Counter-Arguments) (14 pts)	Author anticipates and successfully grapples with counter-arguments. (14)	Some counter-arguments acknowledged, though perhaps not addressed fully. (11.2)	Counter-arguments mentioned without rebuttal. (9.8)	Little to no effort to address alternative views. (8.4)	No attempt made to refer to or respond to counter-arguments. (0)
Logic and Argumentation (28 pts)	Arguments are identifiable, reasonable, and sound. Clear reasons are offered in support of key claims. (28)	Argument is clear and usually flows logically and makes sense. (22.4)	Arguments of poor quality. Weak, undeveloped reasons offered in support of key claims. (19.6)	Little attempt to offer support for key claims or to relate evidence to thesis. Reasons offered may be irrelevant. (16.8)	No effort made to construct a logical argument. Failure to support thesis. (0)
Mechanics & Format (10 pts)	Writing requirements strictly adhered to. Correct sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling, and abundant citations. (10)	Writing requirements mostly adhered to. Perhaps some spelling or grammatical errors, and/or inadequate citations (8)	Writing requirements more or less adhered to. Some problems with sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling, and/or a marked deficiency of citations. (7)	Writing requirements violated in significant ways. Several problems with sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling, and/or few citations. (6)	Writing requirements violated in significant ways. Difficult to understand because of significant problems with sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling, and/or no citations, or inaccurate citations. (0)

**Writing Requirements:**

The work for this class should be composed according to the guidelines given in the "Guide to Philosophical Writing" available on Canvas. The gist is that all work has four parts: thesis (in which your position is succinctly and clearly stated); argument (in which you develop the justification for your thesis, part by part in a way that shows a good grasp of the assigned reading and strong logical argumentation); a counterargument (in which you offer a criticism of your own position); and a response (in which you respond to the counterargument and show that it is baseless).

**The Status of Opinions and Beliefs**

"Opinion" and "belief" is here defined as: position held to be true without logical argument. Your opinions or beliefs (religious or otherwise) will never be solicited in this class. Giving an undefended opinion or belief should be considered a violation of the rules of the class, and will be taken by the professor to indicate a failure to grasp the assigned material and the purpose of the class. If, when evaluating an argument, you find it to be good merely because it aligns with your religious (or atheistic) views, you will have failed to do what is required in giving an evaluation. All of the assigned material consists of arguments that are defended more or less well. None of the assigned material consists of undefended opinions or beliefs. Any statement that the assigned material is merely "the opinion" or "belief" of the philosopher in question, without a proof showing how the assigned material is incorrect, will be taken by the professor to indicate a failure to grasp the assigned material and the purpose of the class. Additionally, you should be advised that studying philosophy involves being challenged to justify what one may previously have taken to be true without argument. Often this involves subjects which are deeply personal, such as the existence or non-existence of God, the nature of God, ethical obligations, political positions, etc. Questioning these topics makes some people uncomfortable. Nevertheless, by enrolling in this class you consent to subject your own positions on these matters and those of others to critical analysis.

C2,  
C3

#### Additional Rules and Miscellanea:

- 1) Use of unassigned material, especially sources on the internet, is not allowed.
- 2) No laptops or recording devices will be allowed at any time.
- 3) No food allowed at any time.
- 4) Disruption of the class will not be tolerated. Disruption includes but is not limited to: talking out of turn, whether this talking interferes with the professor's lecture or with another student speaking; the use of cell phones during class, which is strictly prohibited.
- 5) In an emergency calmly exit the room and assemble at parking lot 5 (directly east of here).

#### Statement on Special Needs

In order to receive appropriate accommodations, students with disabilities are required to register for services in the Disability Resources and Services (DRS) office in the Student Center at the beginning of the semester. Do not wait to visit the DRS office if you want support with any CGCC classes. The DRS office will meet with you to determine accommodations based on appropriate documentation. Therefore, faculty members are not authorized to provide or approve any accommodations for students in this class without written instructions from the DRS office. This must be on file before any accommodation will be provided. You can contact the DRS office at (480) 857-5188.

#### Information on the Learning Center

The CGCC Learning Center's mission is to support students' academic learning by providing free tutoring and resources to reinforce and supplement classroom instruction and to assist CGCC students to achieve academic success. Free tutoring services are available for many CGCC courses. The Learning Center is located on the second floor of the Library, rooms L227, L228, and L229. The Learning Center also provides instructional support resources in the form of videotapes, software, and print materials. For a schedule of tutoring hours, additional information or assistance contact the Learning Center at (480) 732-7231, or visit their website at <http://www.cgc.maricopa.edu/lc>.

#### Statement of Student Responsibility

All students are responsible for knowing, understanding, and adhering to everything contained in the syllabus, or otherwise communicated to them by the instructor. Additionally, all students are responsible for knowing, understanding, and adhering to all college policies given in the college catalogue and the student handbook.

#### Information for Student Veterans

Student veterans are defined as those engaged in prior or current military service in any branch of the military including the reserves, and who is attending college, whether on the GI bill or not. Student veterans have access to all standard college services plus specific veteran support and transition resources. Exceptions to rules are not made for veterans, or anyone else. But there are certain college-sanctioned accommodations that may be appropriate, and that veterans should seek out. CGCC suggests that student veterans identify themselves as such to the professor on the first day of class (whether in class, after class, or by e-mail), especially if the veteran will seek accommodations. Possible accommodations may include: flexibility in scheduling (to accommodate documented VA appointments or unit activation during the semester), physical or other service-related needs (e.g. service animal, visual or audial assistance, PTSD-related needs, seating preference, etc.). Some accommodations can only be met by registering with DRS (Disability Resource Services). Reasons for accommodations must be presented as early as possible for accommodations to be made. Contact the Office of Student Veteran Services for further information: 480-726-4122, Coyote Center 2<sup>nd</sup> floor (Services Coordinator Reda Chambers 480-726-4094, [reda.chambers@cgc.edu](mailto:reda.chambers@cgc.edu)). You may also contact Faculty Liaison for Student Veterans Miguel Fernandez ([miguel.fernandez@cgc.edu](mailto:miguel.fernandez@cgc.edu)). Be advised also that if you are dropped from a course due to insufficient attendance, the VA may require you to reimburse it, out of your own pocket, for the cost of the class, or lower or pro-rate your living allowance. Being withdrawn from a class can also change your status from full to part-time student, which can affect benefits.

Tentative Schedule (please note, all dates and material are subject to change).

Day	To Read Before Class	Assignments Due (at the beginning of class, unless otherwise specified)
Jan 20	NA	NA
<i>Module #1: Ancient Greek Philosophy</i>		
Jan 25	Plato, <i>Defense of Socrates</i>	Reading Question #1, turned in online by 11:59PM Jan 25: Is Socrates a criminal? Is his punishment just? Can the commission of a crime ever be just?
Jan 27	NA	Bring your printed-out response to Reading Question #1 to class
Feb 1	Plato, <i>Crito</i>	NA
Feb 3	Plato, <i>Republic</i> book I	Reading Question #2: Who gives the better argument: Socrates, or Thrasymachus? Why?
Feb 8	Plato, <i>Republic</i> book II	NA
Feb 10	Plato, <i>Republic</i> book III-IV	Reading Question #3: Is the just person truly the happiest? Why or why not?
Feb 17	Plato, <i>Republic</i> book V	NA
Feb 22	Plato, <i>Republic</i> book VI	Reading Question #4: Has Socrates successfully made the case for the rule of the philosophers? Why or why not?
Feb 24	Plato, <i>Republic</i> book VII-IX	NA
Feb 29	Aristotle, <i>Politics</i> book I	NA
Mar 2	Aristotle, <i>Politics</i> book II	Reading Question #5: How does Aristotle's conception of justice resemble and differ from Plato's? Who gives the better account, and why?
Mar 7	Aristotle <i>Politics</i> book III	NA
Mar 9	NA	Drafts of Midterm Paper due online 11:59PM Mar 8. Class meets Mar 9 in BRD 123A; have access to file with your draft to work on it. Peer review of two other students' drafts due 12:15PM Mar 9. Midterm paper due online 11:59PM Mar 11
<i>Module #2: Renaissance &amp; Early Modern Philosophy</i>		
Mar 21	Machiavelli, <i>The Prince</i>	Reading Question #6: Should rulers be bound by the same rules we "regular people" are bound by? Why or why not?
Mar 23	Hobbes, <i>Leviathan</i> Part I	NA
Mar 28	Hobbes, <i>Leviathan</i> Part II	Reading Question #7: Is it accurate to conceive of political relationships as a contract between ruler and ruled? Why or why not?
Mar 30	Locke, <i>Second Treatise of Government</i> through Ch.7	NA
Apr 4	Locke, <i>Second Treatise of Government</i> to the end	Reading Question #8: Is there a limit to what can be considered up for discussion in politics? Must the state be limited from considering certain matters? Why or why not?
Apr 6	Rousseau <i>Of the Social Contract</i> books I-II	NA
	Rousseau, <i>Of the Social Contract</i> books III-IV	Reading Question #9: What does Rousseau mean in saying that a person may be "forced to be free"? Is he correct? Why or why not?
<i>Module #3: 19<sup>th</sup> &amp; 20<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy</i>		
Apr 11	Marx, <i>Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844</i>	NA
Apr 13	Marx & Engels, <i>Communist Manifesto</i>	Reading Question #10: Have capitalism and liberal democracy failed to liberate people? Why or why not?
Apr 18	Mill, <i>On Liberty</i> ch.I-II	NA
Apr 20	Mill, <i>On Liberty</i> to the end	NA

Apr 25	Habermas, <i>Three Normative Models of Democracy</i>	Reading Question #11: How should decisions be made in politics? What determines whether a policy is good or bad?
Apr 27	Preparation for Presentations: groups meet individually with professor, schedule TBA	Drafts of Presentation Material due 11:59PM Apr 26
May 2	Presentations	Presentation (for some groups)
May 4	Presentations	Presentation (for some groups); Portfolio Collection #3 (Reading Questions #9-11)
May 9 (Mon): 11AM-12:50PM	Presentations, return of graded material	Presentation (for some groups)

C4

## Dr. Mowad's Guide to Philosophical Writing

"Any discourse ought to be constructed like a living creature, with its own body, as it were; it must not lack either head or feet; it must have a middle, extremities so composed as to suit each other and the whole work" –Plato (*Phaedrus*, 264c)

### Structure and Style

General Rules: Every word you write must be necessary to support your thesis. Do not include irrelevant information such as biographical information about the philosopher, or how much you liked or disliked it. Do not include an introduction or conclusion where you state banal platitudes. Instead, begin with your thesis succinctly stated and launch straight into your argument.

The best way to prepare for discussion or paper-writing is to take notes as you read: write down anything that seems especially important, with the page number (this saves you the trouble of finding it later when you need to cite it). When you know the prompt, go back over the reading and your notes.

I require you to adhere to a strict structure in all written work for this class: you will begin with your Thesis (its own paragraph in 1-2 sentences), followed by a few paragraphs of Argumentation, followed by your presentation of a Counterargument (an argument against your thesis) on behalf of an imagined opponent (which could be another philosopher we've studied), and concluding with your Response to the counterargument in which you show how it cannot be true. For each part, you must type out the word, underlined, before the section devoted to it, as I've done in the sample below.

### Thesis

The very first thing you write should be your thesis statement, which should be as succinct as possible: one or two sentences. Your thesis should directly address the prompt, giving your answer clearly, though not the argumentation behind your answer. Do not include any information that is not asked for. Despite what some say, it is not good to begin with a vague platitude before getting to the point. For example, it is not good when asked about a particular aspect of Plato's definition of justice to begin long-windedly: "Since the dawn of time, people

C2  
C3



have wondered what justice is." This is boring and wastes the reader's time. Instead, go *straight to the point*, and waste no words.

### Argumentation

Next, give the argumentation: this is the "body" of your post or paper. This is where you show that your thesis is correct. You may have to explain, for example, why Descartes says X. Here, you give Descartes's argument for why X is the case. You may also have to *evaluate* Descartes's argument, i.e. tell whether it is a good or bad argument. In that case, you must identify its strengths and weaknesses, and determine overall whether, given these strengths and/or weaknesses, it succeeds or fails. Whatever your thesis claims—and *all* that your thesis claims—must be justified by the argumentation. If you find that you cannot justify your thesis, you need to change your thesis to one you can justify.

When I ask you to evaluate an argument, I am not looking for whether you, with all your idiosyncrasies, *like* the argument of a certain philosopher: what you like and dislike is irrelevant for this class, except insofar as you like an argument because it is well-supported (and know how to show this), and dislike another because it is not well-supported.

### Counterargument

After this argumentation, you must consider counterarguments—this is required for this class. A counterargument is an argument *against* (counter to) your own position. You must here think: what would someone who disagrees with my thesis say? You may find this hard. Obviously, you are convinced that your thesis is correct: otherwise it would not be your thesis. Yet part of studying philosophy *well* is looking critically at *your own* position. So think of how someone might argue *against* your position. Often the conclusions of the arguments we will examine are at first glance implausible, so the counterargument may simply be defending the common opinion about what seems to be true, good, etc.

### Response

Finally, give a response to the counterargument you gave, in which you show that it does not succeed. Basically, the response is a counter-counterargument. If you have no response to the counterargument, then you need to go back and change your thesis, since you must have taken the wrong position from the beginning.

### Demonstration of an Understanding of the Text

Demonstration of understanding of the text does not mean just avoiding saying something incorrect: speaking vaguely or evasively about the topic might accomplish that, but would not demonstrate an understanding. Nor does it mean showing only that you understand *the topic discussed* in the text. For that, you might look on the internet for a simpler (but ultimately less adequate) explanation than is given in the book. In this class however you are showing that you can be given a philosophical argument and analyze and understand it *in that form*. For this reason, you must be able to refer to the argument *as given in the assigned text*, citing where what you put in your own words appears. Bear in mind also that the prompt will be brief, and may not spell out for you how it is best to go about answering the question. Part of showing you understand the text is being able to identify the important nuances to talk about, and to identify what is not important. Mentioning irrelevant information, even if it belongs to the assigned text, indicates rather that you *do not* adequately understand the text. You must also beware of

C2,  
C3

forcing the text into the preconceived notions you have of what is real, or what is just, etc. The argument in the text may require you to call your preconceived notions into question: you may not uncritically take your preconceived notions to be authoritative.

### Logic and Argumentation

An argument is not just a mess of words, it is a structure, with some parts supporting other parts. The supporting parts are the "premises" and the supported part is the conclusion, which is your thesis, what you want to prove. The premises must give reasons why the conclusion must be true, so that if we accept the premises, we must accept the conclusion. But the premises must be justified in their own right, otherwise the argument fails: it would be like "proving" that circles have corners by giving as premises that all things with at least two contiguous straight sides have corners, and all circles have at least two contiguous straight sides. If those premises are true, then the conclusion is true, but the second premise is obviously false. Thus, you should choose premises that are necessarily true, or that are accepted generally, including by those who oppose the position you are trying to prove.

When thinking about argumentation consider that there are certain formal relations between quantities. It is the business of mathematics to study these relationships. These relations are expressed very clearly in mathematics because the discipline invented an entire formal language (symbols for numbers and operators). If mathematics had not done this, but relied on the concepts that the natural development of this or that language to express the relationships between quantities (as in English we have concepts like "a lot," "a little bit," "some," "a few," etc.), people would have much more trouble seeing the objectivity of mathematics, and might even hold all matters of quantity to be mere opinion. Now consider the fact that there are also certain formal relations between claims that something is true: some ways of arranging claims succeed by making a further claim (the conclusion) necessarily true, others do not. It is the business of logic to study the formal relationships between truth claims. Yet while you have had twelve years of instruction in mathematics before arriving at college, you have had no instruction in logic. And like mathematics, logic creates its own formal language; but in this class we are leaving the arguments in the considerably less clear form of everyday language and rhetoric—and not even language as such, but the English language. This obscures the formal relations between truth claims that make some arguments true and others false, and prompts the less intrepid students to grow frustrated and despair of the objectivity of matters in philosophy. It is your job to see through the vagaries of the English language, and into the formal relationships between the claims to evaluate the argument.

The most common problem in argumentation is begging the question: this means presupposing your conclusion (taking it uncritically to be true from the beginning) rather than proving it. You may more easily avoid this outside of a philosophy class, but in philosophy it is very difficult because most people are unprepared to hold in question what philosophy requires you to hold in question. For example, we may ask whether all that is real is material (composed of matter) or whether there are things that are immaterial. For most people, "real" means simply "what I can see and touch," and to give an argument about what is real means for them simply applying this definition of reality. But to ask whether what is real is necessarily material requires that the connection between reality and materiality be called into question. A student might argue that there are no immaterial things because proofs for what is real need to be based on facts, not things we imagine. This student begs the question by presupposing from the beginning what

C2,  
C3

counts as a "fact," namely, that it must be the presence of some material object or state of affairs. Yet, what is real (in other words, what counts as a fact) is precisely what is in question. The argument the student gives in this case amounts to saying "Material things are the only real things because the only real things are material things." Put differently, the student is saying "I am right because I am right." That is not an argument.

Another example of begging the question arises due to the difficulty most students have in separating "what is good" from "what this or that person likes." To ask whether there is something which is objectively good (as in ethics) means calling into question the relation most people presuppose between goodness and the variable and subjective opinions of people about what is desirable. To fail to call this relation into question is quite simply to fail to even glimpse the subject matter of ethics. The sad truth is that most people seem to be permanently incapable of even *asking* an ethical question (much less answering one). Instead, in response to the prompt: "Is there something which is objectively good?" most people get frustrated with what they think is the obviousness of the matter, and can say only "No, nothing is objectively good, because everyone has their own opinions about it." This is not an argument because rather than giving reasons for what is claimed to be the tight relation between "good" and "a person's subjective opinion about what is desirable," the two are simply taken to be identical from the beginning.

As a rule, if you think a philosophical question is easy to answer, then you almost certainly are begging the question, and so have failed to properly consider it.

### Format

General Rules: The easiest way to comply with the format is to leave Microsoft Word in its normal settings. Here however is a complete list of formatting requirements. All work must be typed using Microsoft Word in 12 pt Times New Roman or Calibri black font 1 inch top and bottom margins, 1.25 inch left and right margins. The college has PCs for your use, and I suggest you use them. It is possible that composing your work on a Mac will make it unopenable for me. Thus you should use a Mac at your peril. Online submission of unopenable or unreadable files will result in a grade of zero. First submissions may be graded, even before the deadline, so do not submit work unless it is your final draft. The professor reserves the right to change or add to the requirements at any time.

Citation: All work must have citations according to the CMS (Chicago Manual of Style). You can find the rules for it here: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/717/01/>. Your citations must be precise: i.e. you may not cite a broad swath of text (e.g. "pp50-100" or "chapter 5") because you know that *somewhere* in there the author says what you attribute to him or her. Failure to give proper, precise, and adequate citation will adversely affect your grade. Additionally, you should not cite my lectures. If what you are saying comes from the assigned text, then whether it was covered in my lectures or not, you need to give a textual citation. If what you are saying does not appear in the assigned text, but was only covered in my lectures, you should just put it in your own words and not give a citation at all.

Assigned Sources: No unassigned sources may be used unless explicitly authorized by the professor. Unassigned sources may include the editor's or translator's introduction, prologue,

C2  
C3

or preface to the assigned text, or remarks by the editor or translator in footnotes, endnotes, or the body of the text itself.

Quotation: Do not quote the text directly. Rather, put the material in your own words. I am requiring you to explain the material in your own words, so I will not consider direct quotes to count toward an explanation of the text. When asked to explain something, you should explain it in your own words, *and* give a citation that supports your explanation. Every time you attribute something to an author, you should give a citation.

### Sample Reading Response or Paper

Disclaimer: obviously, since this is an example not based on a certain reading for a certain class, citations are not included, but they should in what you write.

Prompt: Why does Plato argue that it is better to suffer evil than to do evil? Is he correct? Why or why not?

Thesis: Plato argues that it is better to suffer evil than to do evil because suffering evil harms only one's body, whereas doing evil harms one's soul. He is correct.

Argumentation: Plato argues that the soul (that in the person which thinks and initiates action, and can be wise or ignorant, and good or bad) is distinct from the body. His reasons for this are that if we were only bodies, and did not have souls as he understands them, we would be unaware of immaterial "objects" like the forms; but we are not unaware of them, so there must be something in us which akin to them, and that is the soul.

Whereas the body is perishable, the soul is imperishable. This is because the body is a composite of parts that are in principle separable, whereas the soul does not have parts (at least not in the same way), and so is imperishable. Moreover, the soul is in touch with eternal things like the forms, and due to its affinity with the forms, we can conclude that the soul too is eternal. Since the soul is imperishable while the body is perishable, the soul is more properly what a person is. One's body on the other hand is something one *has* rather than what one is. Accordingly, greater care must be given to the soul than to the body.

Others have no power to harm our souls. Rather, others can only harm our bodies. A person can injure me with a weapon, or poison me, even kill me. In other words, someone else can, without my consent and overpowering me, put my body in a worse condition. But it is impossible for another person to change the condition of my soul in this way. The soul changes only based on the actions it performs and the knowledge it has, and I am and must always remain in complete control of both of these. Thus not only am I most properly my soul, but I am the only one who can determine the condition of my soul (i.e. myself). And since I am my soul rather than my body, it is worse for my soul to be in a bad condition (through doing evil) than for my body to be in a bad condition (through suffering evil).

Plato is not right about everything he says, including what he says about the soul and justice, but he is right about this. Distinguishing the soul from the body allows the truly good (justice) to be distinguished from the apparent goods (pleasure and comfort), and the truly evil (injustice) to be distinguished from the apparent evils (pain and discomfort).

C2  
C3

Counterargument: If there is a soul, and it is as Plato says it is, then he would be right. But if there is no soul, then his entire argument collapses. But we cannot see or touch what Plato calls the soul, so we have no confirmation that it is real. If the soul is unreal, then care for the soul over the body becomes absurd.

Response: Granted, we cannot see or touch the soul. But the soul is what sees and touches—or better, it is what *knows* what is seen and what is touched. If we had no soul, and knew things only through our bodies, we would only ever know particular objects. The eyes do not see color as such, nor even green as such, but only (for example) *this* individual shade of green and *that* individual shade of green. But if all of my knowledge is only the collection of particular data like this, where do my ideas of generalities come from? How do I know color as such? I certainly do not hear, smell, touch or taste it. How do I know existence and non-existence? I can see the colors of things that exist, but I do not see their existence; I can hear the sounds of things that exist, but I do not hear their existence. Nor do I smell, touch or taste existence. Yet I know it. This is explicable only if I have a way of knowing that is not reducible to my corporeal senses—this is the soul.



C2,  
C3



### PHI 224 Additional Clarification

Political Philosophy is a course that fulfills the literacy requirement for students planning to transfer to Arizona State University. This course drills students in the articulation and interpretation of arguments. This interpretation involves evaluating evidence, weighing the strengths and weaknesses of opposing arguments and expressing the findings in written assignments. Students are required to critically examine the arguments presented in the readings, as well as their own preconceived notions on politics and justice. The course includes two substantial writing assignments: a midterm paper of 5 pages in which students critically and comparatively evaluate two opposing arguments on a topic central to political philosophy (and preparing this paper involves first submitting a draft, peer reviews, and receiving and responding to feedback from the instructor); and a group presentation on material uncovered in class, in which each student individually turns in a summary of the text as well as their own critical evaluation of it, and the group generally presents it to the class in summary, and lead the class in critically evaluating it (this involves preparing a draft as well on which the instructor gives feedback). The prerequisites for the course are a grade of C or better in ENG 101, ENG 107, or permission of the instructor.

C1: At least fifty percent of the grade in the course should depend upon writing assignments. Group projects are acceptable only if each student gathers, interprets, and evaluates evidence and prepares a summary report.

85% of the grade in PHI 224 depends on short responses to reading questions (revised and turned in as a portfolio), a midterm paper, and a group presentation with individual work for each student.

#### List of Writing, Research & Speaking Assignments, Percent of Grade, Type, and Criteria Satisfied:

C1

Assignment	Percent of Grade	Type	Criteria Satisfied
Reading Question #1	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #2	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #3	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #4	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #5	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Midterm Paper (with prior draft, and peer reviews)	30%	Writing, Research	C1, C2, C3, C4
Reading Question #6	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #7	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #8	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #9	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #10	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Reading Question #11	2.73%	Writing, Research	C1, C2
Presentation (with prior draft)	25%	Writing, Research, Speaking	C1, C2, C3, C4
	Total: 85%		

C2: The writing assignments should involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence. They should reflect critical inquiry, extending beyond opinion and/or reflection.

The midterm paper, the presentation, and the responses to reading questions all require gathering, interpreting and evaluating evidence, as well as critical inquiry that goes beyond giving an opinion or mere reflection. I've given as a sample one reading question and the midterm paper assignment. For details on the necessary parts of the assignment and how it is scored, see pp8-13 of the syllabus (the "Guide to Philosophical Writing") and pp4-5 (the rubric).

Reading Question #8: Is there a limit to what can be considered up for discussion in politics? Must the state be limited from considering certain matters? Why or why not?

Gathering Evidence: students must assemble both Locke's own argument, as presented across several chapters, as well as (for instance) evidence from history, other readings in the course, or the reasoning carried out by the student her/himself to critically evaluate Locke's argument.

Interpret Evidence: students must interpret what Locke says about natural rights and the role of the legislature in a political society to discover what this means for what counts as political, as up for debate in politics.

Evaluate Evidence: students are required to take and defend a position for or against the argument offered in the reading. This means assessing the assigned argument for its strengths and weaknesses, and determining if the weaknesses can be shored up (and if so, how) or not.

Midterm Paper: Choose a persistent political issue in modernity (e.g. class division, inequalities cutting along racial or gender lines, the limits of property, the limits of national sovereignty, the permissibility of dissent, etc.). Choose either Plato or Aristotle, and determine what resources can be found in his political philosophy to understand and offer a solution to the problem. Then determine whether the ancient philosopher has something substantial and positive to contribute to modern political discourse on this issue, or not, and why or why not.

Gather Evidence: students must put together an account of some intractable modern political problem, and why it is so difficult for us to solve. Students must also find material in the writings of an ancient philosopher that can contribute something of value on the topic, or determine by exhaustive search that there is nothing of value the philosopher can contribute.

Interpret Evidence: students must take what an ancient philosopher wrote about justice as concretized in ancient Greek city-states and use it to shed light on political problems in large, industrial nation-states that are in most cases liberal-democratic and capitalist.

Evaluate Evidence: students must evaluate the ancient philosopher based on his ability to come to grips with a problem of justice and injustice far removed from his spatial and temporal context.

C3: The syllabus should include a minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality and quantity. Substantial writing assignments entail sustained, in-depth engagement with the material.

PHI 224 includes two substantial assignments that require in-depth writing, speaking, or both. In addition, there are eleven responses to reading questions that I do not include here only because the word count is not high (though the requirements for rigorous analysis and



evaluation are considerable). One is the midterm paper assignment, the other is the presentation. For details on the necessary parts of the assignment and how it is scored, see pp8-13 of the syllabus (the "Guide to Philosophical Writing") and pp4-5 (the rubric).

Midterm Paper: the assignment is given above. It counts for 30 % of the grade. It requires such facility with the material that the student is able to relate it to issues outside of its context, and thus requires an in-depth treatment of, and sustained engagement with either Plato or Aristotle. The paper is 5 pages, which is an appropriate length for a weighty assignment in a 200 level class. Students turn in a draft and offer peer reviews for two other students' drafts (receiving two as well for their draft), and receive feedback from the instructor on their draft before the midterm is due. The submission of a draft and the rendering of peer reviews factor into the grade for the midterm paper.

C3 - Presentation: the assignment counts for 25% of the grade, and while it is a group assignment, each student must submit the equivalent of a paper on the material (a summary of the reading and a critical evaluation of the position taken in it). The paper is of an appropriate length (5 pages), and each student must also turn in five discussion points, which are questions (s)he can pose to the class in the course of the presentation (especially if the discussion wanes) to incite greater engagement. Good discussion points are the furthest thing from platitudes: they must be incisive, making clear what is at stake in the reading, what it means if the philosopher in question is right, or wrong. The material assigned for the presentation is something we did not cover in class, so that students can demonstrate their ability to read, interpret, and critically evaluate a text largely on their own. The instructor does go over drafts and help them to improve before the day of the presentation. The submission of a draft factors in to the grade for the presentation.

C4: These substantial writing or speaking assignments should be arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments.

CA - Midterm Paper: as stated above, drafts are submitted early, and in addition to peer reviews, the instructor reviews the draft and offers advice on improvement before the final draft is due.

Presentation: as stated above, drafts are submitted early, and the instructor reviews the draft and offers advice on improvement before the final draft is due.