THE COLLEGE OF
WOOSTER

The 2025-26 Philosophy Major's Handbook

Department of Philosophy
The College of Wooster

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

Part I: Philosophy at Wooster

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

10000	Ethics, Justice, and Society [AH, SJ]
10001	Ethics, Justice, and Society [AH, EL, SJ]
21000	Jurisprudence: Law and Society [AH]
21200	Race, Gender, and Justice [AH, D, PPRE, SJ]
21300	Decolonial Philosophy [AH, D, GE, PPRE]
21400	Health and Illness [AH, HSS]
21500	Biomedical Ethics [AH, SJ]
21600	Environmental Ethics [AH, SJ]

Philosophy and the Liberal Arts

22000	Logic and Philosophy [AH]
22100	Philosophy and the Religious Life [AH, R, GE]
22200	Scientific Revolutions and Methodology [AH]
22201	Science, Knowledge, and Power
22300	Philosophical Issues in Education [AH]
22400	Art, Love, and Beauty [AH]
22600	Philosophy and Sports [AH]

Comparative Philosophy

23000	World Philosophies [AH, GE, W]
23100	South Asian Philosophical Traditions [AH, GE, W]
23200	Chinese Philosophy [AH, GE]

Historical Foundations

25000	Ancient Greek Philosophy [AH, GE]
25100	Early Modern European Philosophy [AH]
26100	Themes in Continental Philosophy [AH]
26400	Existentialism [AH]
26600	American Philosophy [AH]
26700	Africana Philosophy [AH, D, GE, PPRE, SJ]

Special Offerings

19900	Philosophy Cinema
29900	Philosophy Of and In Literature
29910	Wittgenstein [AH]
29913	Philosophy, Science & Psychology of Intelligence
29915	Action, Knowledge, & Skill
29917	Ethics of New Technology
29918	Philosophy of Punishment
29919	Ethics and Business
29920	Alternatives to Capitalism
29921	W.E.B. Du Bois and Sylvia Wynter
29923	Philosophy of Happiness
29928	Political Animals: Truth, Lies, Selves and Others
43000	Experience in Discipline: Sapere Aude

Advanced Seminars in Philosophy

30100	Ontological Commitments [AH]
30200	Epistemology: Rationality and Objectivity [AH]
30300	Language and Meaning [AH]
30400	Mind and Cognition [AH]
31003	Marx's Das Capital [AH]
31100	Ethical Theory [AH]
31200	Political Philosophy [AH]
43001	Medical Ethics Case Studies [EL]

Independent Study

40100	Junior Independent Study
45100	Senior Independent Study
45200	Senior Independent Study

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

Philosophy Department Classes and Learning Goals

Courses	Ethics, Justice, and Society	Jurisprudence	Race, Gender, and Justice	Biomedical Ethics	Environmental Ethics	Logic and Philosophy	Philosophy & the Religious Life	Science, Knowledge, & Power	Philosophical Issues in Education	Art, Love, and Beauty	World Comparative Philosophies	South Asian Philosophical Traditions	Chinese Philosophy	Africana Philosophy	American Philosophy	Ancient Greek Philosophy	Early Modern European Philosophy	Topics in Continental Philosophy	Existentialism	Ontological Commitments	Epistemology	Language and Meaning	Mind and Cognition	Ethical Theory	Political Philosophy	Junior Independent Study	Senior Independent Study	Learning Qualities and Goals
																												Philosophical Qualities
	I		E				E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	- Skeptical vs Open to new ideas
																				E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Strategic overview vs Attention to Details
																		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Systematic vs Creative
	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Reasoning for oneself vs Learning from Others
	I		E	E	E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E					E	E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Cultivating one's own passions etc.
																												Interpretation and Analysis
	I	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Identify & describe aims, strategy, assumptions and argument of a text
	I	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Separate understanding & evaluation of text
							E				E	E									E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Analysis of key terms and identify problematic statements
																												Argumentation
	I	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E			- Identify and summarize arguments
	I					E														E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Use informal and formal logic
	I	E			E	E	E	E								E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Formulate strong objections
	I	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	- Formulate arguments for and against a position
																												Philosophical Knowledge and Methodology
	I	E	E	E	E		E	E						E	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	- Explain methodology of philosophy compared to other disciplines
	I	E	E	E	E		E	E									E			E	E	E	E			A	A	- Distinguish a priori and empirical claims
	I	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	A	- Understand key concepts and areas of philosophy
		E				E	E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E		E	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	- Connect areas of philosophy
	I	I					E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E					E	E	A	A	- Fluency with major historical traditions
																												Communication
	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I	E	E	E	E	E			E	E	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	- Listen well and discuss with respect in group
											E	E								E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Research, plan and structure a paper
	I	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	E						E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Stick to point with appropriate word choice
																										E	E	- Deliver an oral presentation
																												Philosophical Independence
	I	E	E	E	E																			E	E			- State one's own position and understand its importance for ethical social & political issues
	I	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Support one's position
																				E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	- Formulate novel non-empirical questions
																												Personal Development
																										E	E	- Critical and appreciative self-assessment
		E					E	E	E	E											E		E					- Apply philosophical skills to other disciplines
		E		E				E	E																			- Apply philosophical skills to social professional and everyday problems

I = Introduced E = Emphasized in Class A = Assumed

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 Philosophy major consists of ten total course credits in Philosophy:

1. Phil 220: *Logic & Philosophy*

2. Phil 250: *Ancient Greek Philosophy*

3. Phil 251: *Early Modern European Philosophy*

4. Phil 311: *Ethical Theory*

5. One additional elective Philosophy credit

6. One of the following courses:

- Phil 213: *Decolonial Philosophy*
- Phil 230W: *Self, Truth, and the Good Life: World Philosophy*
- Phil 231W: *South Asian Philosophical Traditions*
- Phil 232: *Chinese Philosophy*
- Phil 267: *Africana Philosophy*

7. One of the following 300-level courses:

- Phil 301: *Ontological Commitments*
- Phil 302: *Epistemology: Rationality and Objectivity*
- Phil 303: *Language and Meaning*
- Phil 304: *Mind and Cognition*

8. Phil 401: *Junior Independent Study*

9. Phil 451: *Independent Study Thesis*

10. Phil 452: *Independent Study Thesis*

[Note: PHIL 10000 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 10000)
One Historical Foundations Course: Either PHIL 25000 or PHIL 25100

Sophomore Year

One Historical Foundations Course: Either PHIL 25000 or PHIL 25100
Logic and Philosophy (PHIL 22000), or one Continental Philosophy course (PHIL 26100 or PHIL 26400)
One Philosophy course from beyond the dominant paradigms: either PHIL 21300, 23000W, 23100W, 23200 or 26700.

Junior Year

Advanced Seminar in Philosophy
Junior I.S.
Ethical Theory

Senior Year

Senior I.S. Semester One
Senior I.S. Semester Two
Philosophy elective

This sequence will help effectively develop your philosophical skills and knowledge. Since the two historical foundations courses (PHIL 25000 – Ancient Greek Philosophy and PHIL 25100 – Early Modern European Philosophy) provide important background for other courses, they should be completed in your sophomore year. 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 whom 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 Double Major Proposal. 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 (40100)—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://wooster.edu/academics/apex/global/.

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

AFRICA
Botswana (SIT)
Ethiopia (SIT)
Ghana (SIT)
Kenya (SIT)
Morocco, Rabat (IES)
South Africa, Cape Town (SIT)
Uganda Development Studies (SIT)

NORTH AMERICA
USA, Philadelphia, The Philadelphia Center
USA, Washington, American University Washington Semester

MIDDLE EAST
Jordan, Amman (SIT)

OCEANIA
Australia, Melbourne (IES)
Australia, Sydney (Arcadia)
New Zealand, Auckland (IES)
New Zealand, Christchurch (Arcadia/IES)
New Zealand, Dunedin (Arcadia)
New Zealand, Wellington (Arcadia)
New Zealand, Wellington (IFSA Butler)

LATIN AMERICA
Argentina, Buenos Aires (SIT)
Chile, Santiago (IES)

ASIA
China, Bejing (CIEE)
India, Bodh Gaia (Antioch)
Nepal, Kathmandu (SIT)
Thailand, Chiang Mai (ISDSI)

EUROPE

Austria, Vienna (IES)
Denmark, Copenhagen (DIS)
England, Oxford (Arcadia)
England, London (Wooster TREK)
France, Toulouse (Dickson)
France, Paris (IES)
France, Nantes (IES)
Germany, Berlin (IES)
Greece, Athens (Arcadia/College Year in Athens)
Greece, Athens (College Year in Athens)
Hungary, Pécs (Wooster TREK)
Ireland, Dublin (IES)
Ireland, Cork (Arcadia)
Italy, Florence (Syracuse University/API)
Italy, Florence (API)
Italy, Rome (IES)
Iceland, Reykjavik
Netherlands, Amsterdam (IES/API)
Netherlands, Amsterdam (SIT)
Netherlands, Leiden
Scotland, University of Aberdeen (Butler)
Scotland, University of St. Andrews (Arcadia/Butler)
Scotland, University of Edinburgh (Arcadia)
Spain, Granada (Arcadia in Granada)
Spain, Cordoba (PRESHCO)

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 six learning goals in philosophy, the Junior Independent Study Seminar will focus upon helping students integrate all six 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
https://philosophy.byu.edu/aporia

Canadian Undergraduate Journal of Cognitive Science
Simon Fraser University
https://www.sfu.ca/cognitive-science/news.html

The Dualist
Stanford University
https://philosophy.stanford.edu/academicsundergraduate-program/dualist

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

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
https://undergraduateresearch.princeton.edu/news/publications

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

Prometheus
Johns Hopkins University
https://prometheus.students.jh.edu

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, 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/

2025

- Agency, Autonomy, and the Fairy Tale: Exploring *Sleeping Beauty*
- Applications and Understanding of Grieving
- The Confusion Philosophy Influence on the Modern Society
- Athletes Nearing the Finish Line: Exploring Narrative and Socially Constructed Identity in the Context of Athletic Retirement.
- Authenticity: A Life Project
- The Whole Process of Justice: Dangers and Opportunities in Post-socialist China
- Ontological Relativism

- In Balance with This Life, This Death: An Analysis of the Evil of Death and the Ways in Which Death Leads to Meaning
- How Should We Respond to Life's Senselessness? Absurdity, Stoicism, and Playfulness
- Emotional Labor in Applied Ethics Work
- Hellenistic Ideals and Actual Well-Being in a Contemporary World: A Comparison of Epicureanism and Early Stoicism

2024

- Disentangling Purpose and Meaning: A Critical Analysis of Purpose Methodology and an Empirical Study of Purpose Orientations
- Garos: A Displaced Community's Fight for Epistemic Justice
- Consuming our Future: The Ideology of Contemporary Fossil Capitalism & Related Ethical Concerns.
- Taking Bows & Batting Zero; an Inquiry Into Mothers' Selfhood as Represented in Narrative and Film
- Waves of Absurdity: Investigating Real-Time Ocean Renderings and Their Relationship with Absurdism
- In Balance with This Life, This Death: An Analysis of the Evil of Death and the Ways in Which Death Leads to Meaning
- The Thinking Machine: An Exploration of Consciousness and its Compatibility with Artificial Intelligence

2023

- Divinity's Secret Love Song: An Investigation Into the Relationship Between Humanity and the Divine Through the Lens of Sacred Narratives
- A Critical Theory of the Internet: The Demand for Infinity
- The Necessary Inclusion of Historical Trauma in Trauma-Based Diagnoses and Subsequent Alternative Therapies Informed by Decolonial Philosophy: An Indigenous Perspective on the Kinzua Dam Removal
- Understanding Frantz Fanon's l*e schéma épidermique racial*: The Implications on Post-Colonial Black Conciousness and Identities
- Is it absurd to be Moral?
- It's a Wonderful Life: Value monism and obligations to the future
- Hope and Mourning in an Age of Immanent Extinction: Grief as a Framework for Revolutionary Ethics
- Authenticity as a Virtue
- Red Sword-White Canvas: The Past, Present, and Future of the Avant-Garde and Avant-Garde Aesthetics
- Seeds of Liberation or Spheres of Domination: Role-Playing Games and Alternative Social Formation
- Who We Are: Queerness under Lockdown
- Polarized Insurrection? An Ethical and Empirical Analysis of the January 6th Insurrection and the Media Coverage Surrounding It

2022

- Dichotomous Logic and the Failings of Girlboss Feminism: Multiplicity Beyond Man's Episteme
- Ethnic Nationalism in Postcolonial Disputes: The Epistemic Reevaluation
- of Interest-Driven Knowledge Claims
- "Pretty Privilege" and Survival: Recognizing the Difference in Social Treatment, Most Notably in Healthcare, Towards Those Who Are Highly Attractive
- Distributive Justice and Economic Inequality in the United States
- An Inquiry in Human Flourishing: Alasdair MacIntyre and John Dewey in Dialogue
- Ethical Considerations of Wilderness Spaces
- On the Origin of Political Obligation
- Who Gets to Know? Combating Colonial Epistemic Oppression

2021

- The Flourishing Financial System: The Foundations of an Economic Doctrine that Promotes Social Equality
- Liberty & Justice for All*
  * certain exclusions may apply
- Derivative Intentionality & Gricean Meaning
- Knowledge of Intentional Action as Essential for It An Epistemological and Action-Theoretical Investigation
- Normative Bastardy
- The Effects of Meditation, if Any, on Pain awareness
- Contextual Questions: The Worldly Implications of an Insufficient Philosophical Stance
- Abstract Unity in Material Diversity: An Introduction to Category Theory and a Phenomenological Defense of Mathematical Realism

§ 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.

§ Academic Integrity and Research

Academic Integrity from the Scot's Key

An atmosphere in which each student does their own work, except when the instructor indicates that additional aid is legitimate and profitable, is necessary for genuine academic mastery. It is each student's responsibility to be mindful of the difference between appropriate academic resources and support (such as services offered through the Academic Resource Center, Writing Center, and Math Center, as examples), versus inappropriate or unauthorized academic aid (such as plagiarism of another's work). It also places on each student an obligation not to offer or make available unauthorized sources of aid to other students, knowing that such aid is detrimental to those students and to the college community. Finally, each student must be responsible for the maintenance of an atmosphere of academic integrity by confronting violators or reporting any actions that violate its principles, since such violations ultimately harm all members of the community. These principles merely carry out the general purpose of the college to be a community in which the members find it right and necessary to promote the fullest

learning by everyone. In other words, a violation of the Code of Academic Integrity conflicts with the values, work, and purpose of the entire college community and is not merely a private matter between an individual faculty member and a student.

Principles of Academic Integrity
A student will not:

- give, offer, or receive aid other than that specifically allowed by the professor on any course work or examination
- knowingly represent the work of others, including materials from electronic sources, as their own
- falsify or fabricate data
- submit an assignment produced for a course to a second course without the authorization of all the instructors involved
- deny other students access to necessary documents/materials by stealing, misplacing, or destroying those materials
- give false reasoning to a faculty member or Dean when requesting an exam change or an extension on a paper/project
- violate the spirit of the code

HSRC statement

The College of Wooster's Human Subjects Research Committee (HSRC), or "Institutional Review Board (IRB)" for federal purposes, is a specially constituted review body established or designated to protect the welfare of human subjects recruited to participate in research studies or assessment projects. Any member of The College of Wooster community planning to conduct research using human participants (this includes student projects such as Independent Study and other research projects involving human participants.). Information about how to apply can be found at https://inside.wooster.edu/hsrc/

IACUC Statement

The College of Wooster's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) is a federally mandated committee that oversees the college's animal programs, facilities and procedures to ensure the appropriate care, use, and humane treatments of animals being used for research, testing and education. The IACUC serves as a resource to faculty, students, and staff, providing guidance in meeting applicable guidelines for animal care and use.
All college students and personnel participating in animal research should complete IACUC training, and all research protocols involving the use of vertebrate animals must be reviewed and approved (or classified as exempt) by the committee before they can be implemented. Information about how to apply can be found at https://inside.wooster.edu/iacuc/

§ 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 encouraged to create a handout or visual aid as part of your presentation.

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 copy of the thesis to the College Registrar's Office before the I.S. deadline. Please cc your advisor on your submission. You will also need to upload a copy to OpenWorks. 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 45100, 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 45200, 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 these 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
____ Epistemology
____ Philosophy of Math
____ Philosophy of Mind
____ Philosophy of Science
____ Philosophy of Language
____ Philosophy of Religion

____ Ethical Theory
____ Applied Ethics
____ Biomedical Ethics
____ Political Philosophy
____ Philosophy of Law
____ Aesthetics
____ Logic

____ Ancient Philosophy
____ Modern Philosophy
____ Environmental Philosophy
____ Comparative Philosophy
____ Existentialism
____ Continental Philosophy
____ 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. 6/6/2023

§ Important Deadlines

Classes Begin Fall Semester	Wednesday – 20 August, 2025
First Philosophy Roundtable ***Brief Presentation of Topic & Senior Independent Study Proposal Due*** (see Senior I.S. Proposal Form)	*Thursday – 28 August, 2025
Revised Thesis Proposal with Bibliography Due (To be submitted to the Philosophy Department Administrative Coordinator.)	*Friday - 19 September 2025
Last Day of Classes Fall Semester First Semester Thesis Components Due • Title page; • Abstract; • Outline of the entire project; • Working bibliography; and • Minimum of 20 pages which must include at least one polished chapter. (To be submitted to the Philosophy Department Administrative Coordinator)	*Friday – 5 December, 2025
Classes Begin Spring Semester	Wednesday – 14 January, 2026
Final Draft of Thesis for Advisor Due	*Friday – 27 February, 2026
Spring Break	Friday – 13 March 2026 to Sunday – 29 March, 2026
Turn Thesis into Registrar's Office (Submit electronic copy to Registrar's Office and cc your advisor. Also upload copy to openworks.)	*Monday – 30 March, 2026
Target Date for Completing I.S. Orals	Friday – 24 April, 2026
Last Day of Classes	Tuesday – 5 May, 2026
Graduation	Saturday – 16 May, 2026

*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. 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.

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

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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

An Inquiry in Human Flourishing: Alasdair MacIntyre and John Dewey in Dialogue

By: Nicole Benya

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of Senior Independent Study

Advisor: Lee A. McBride III, Ph.D.

Department of Philosophy
The College of Wooster
March 2022

§ 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.*)
- Philosophical Independence: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to use independent thinking to form their own philosophical views.)*
- Personal Development: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to cultivate philosophical virtues or qualities and apply philosophical skills.)*

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.)
- Philosophical Independence: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to use independent thinking to form their own philosophical views.)*
- Personal Development: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to cultivate philosophical virtues or qualities and apply philosophical skills.)*

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.)

- Philosophical Independence: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to use independent thinking to form their own philosophical views.)*

- Personal Development: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to cultivate philosophical virtues or qualities and apply philosophical skills.)*

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.*)

- Philosophical Independence: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to use independent thinking to form their own philosophical views.)*

- Personal Development: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to cultivate philosophical virtues or qualities and apply philosophical skills.)*

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.*)
- Philosophical Independence: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to use independent thinking to form their own philosophical views.)*
- Personal Development: 0 1 2 3 4
  (*The thesis demonstrates an ability to cultivate philosophical virtues or qualities and apply philosophical skills.)*

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.

§ The Henry B. Kreuzman III Roundtable Prize

The Henry B. Kreuzman II Round table prize was established by the Department of Philosophy to honor Professor Hank Kreuzman's lifelong commitment to the practice of philosophy in the context of a liberal education. This commitment was manifested in his long teaching career at the College, his dedicated stewardship of the department, and his reliable posing of penetrating questions and insightful comments at Philosophy Roundtable discussions. The prize is endowed in 2024 by Henry B. Kreuzman, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, and Mary Joan Kreuzman, former Visiting Assistant Professor of Mathematics. Income from the fund is awarded annually to a student or students in philosophy who have contributed significantly to the 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

Graduates in philosophy have found employment in a wide range of 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 that students visit https://dailynous.com/value-of-philosophy/ for other readings regarding the philosophy community and career avenues that a major in philosophy can create.

§ Selected Alumni Careers

Public Policy and Politics

Johann Weber
PhD Public Policy (Georgia Tech); Program Manager @Perimeter Connects

Josh Lewis
Leadership Development/Grassroots Political Organizing Trainer @ Working America

James Owens
Strategist in Politics, Media and Tech: Chief Strategy Officer @ INTRVL

Military

Carlton Shaff III
Major USMC Reserve, Director of National Helicopter Museum

Tamari Farquharson
Administrative Chief USMC

Ronald E. Hustwit, Jr.
PhD, 2nd Lieutenant, USAF

Journalism and Communications

Isaac Scher
Journalist (LA Times, The Intercept, The American Prospect, Jacobin, The Progressive)

Dylan Reynolds
MA, Science Writing at Johns Hopkins; Sr. Editor Association of State and Territorial Health Officials

Meredith Wilson
MA in Journalism (Northwestern); Communications Specialist at Intermountain Healthcare, Salt Lake City

Jonah Comstock
MS in Journalism (Columbia); Editor in Chief @ pharmaphorum

Law

Mae Manupipatpong
JD UC Berkeley, Associate Atty at EarthJustice

Michael Young
JD Ohio State, LL.M (Legal Theory) NYU, Partner at Morris, Manning and Martin LLP

Abigail (Kline) Jacobs
Principal Assistant Attorney General (Ohio A.G.'s office)

Alex Downs
JD Pittsburgh, Associate at Troutman Pepper

Jacob Abramo
J.D. Candidate at Boston College

Robert Dinkins
JD Candidate, Cleveland State

Brianna Schmidt
JD Candidate, Case Western

Blake Pecoraro
JD (Elon Univ.); Document Review Atty. @ Dauntless Discovery

Brian Lock
JD (U. Kentucky), Staff Attorney, Office of Judge Libby Messer

John Obery
JD (Case Western); Senior Legal Counsel at Cenovus Energy

Skyler Ruprecht
JD (Stanford), Law Clerk, U.S. District Courts (Milwaukee)

Michael McMaster
JD (Colorado); Assistant Solicitor General, Colorado Attorney General's Office

Samuel VanFleet
JD (Seattle University), Public Defender at Everett Law Association

Tiffany Speegle
JD (Mississippi), Managing Attorney at Young Williams

Laura Munro
JD (Seattle University); Attorney at Kirshenbaum & Goss

Social Work and Cognate fields

Coral Ciupak
MSW student at Ohio State (Child and Youth Services)

Aaron Smith
Substance Abuse Counselor at St. Joseph's Addiction Treatment

Meghan Hough
M.S.W. (Pittsburgh); Licensed Clinical Social Worker @ Northeast ARC

Media and Arts & Culture

Dev Dharm Khalsa
Multimedia Producer & Wellness Advocate

Maxim Elrod
Co-Owner, Fatslab Records

Ainslee Alem Robson
Director, Writer, Media Artist (recently selected as a Sundance Institute / NEH Sustainability Fellow).

Christian Haupt
Masters Degree in Fine and Studio Arts, Art Teaching (Lucrne University of Applied Sciences and Arts); Engineering Culture and Engagement @ Swiss Marketplace Group (Zurich)

Evelyn Yu Yu Swe
Freelance Photographer, content producer, and voice-over/on-air talent / founder of Myanmar Women's Self Defense Center

Amy Hagedorn
Associate Publicist at Alfred A. Knopf/Pantheon/Schocken

Tech

Karl Smith
Software Engineer at Greenhouse Software (NYC)

Lindsay Neff
Product Manager at SMART Technologies

Ian Carlin
Director of Technical Services, MKB Company

Christina Shiroma
Epic Project Manager, Johns Hopkins Medicine

Peter Parisi
Strategy, Google Maps Platform at Google

Education

Mylo Parker-Emerson
MA in Cultural and Educational Policy Studies at Loyola (Chicago) Reading & Writing Program Assoc. @ Schuler Scholar Program

Max Gregg
Admissions Counselor, Allegheny College

Jordan McNickle
MA in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education (Michigan State); Interim Director of Planned Giving and Major Gifts Officer at The College of Wooster

Tom Loughead
Regional Director of Staffing, IDEA Public Schools

Robert Ippolito
MBA (University of Cambridge), Partner@ English4Kids (El Salvador), Co-Founder Cupón Club)

Data Science / Analytics

Colleen Gilfeather
Team Lead and Senior Analyst, Nationwide Insurance

Melissa Griffith
Data Services Associate @ Aclaimant

Chris Miller
Data Strategy & Digital Transformation

Matt Buranosky
Data Operations Engineer @ Pareto Intelligence

Seth Stuck
MS in Public Relations (Boston University); Director, R&D Analytics at Cox Automotive Inc.

Development, Sustainability, Urban and Community Planning & Problem Solving

Ramses Clements
MS (Community Social Development, Public Policy and Community Engagement) Case Western; Assistant Administrator, City of Cleveland.

Anders Kirstein Møller
Masters in Development Studies, Oxford; PhD Student in Urban Geography, National University of Singapore

Kinsey Walker
Program Analyst @ Appalachian Regional Commission

Matthew McNaughton
Master of Public Administration (Harvard); Principal and Co-founder @ SlashRoots Foundation (Jamaica)

Katy Allen
Senior Advisor, Business Development at Cardno International Development

Deedre Turner
Diversity and Inclusion Lead, Strategic HR Business, Corporate Management Division @ Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks

Business

Zachary Towner
Sales Professional, W.B. Mason (Retail Office Equipment)

Deanna Langer
Social Media Strategist, Nestle

Bryan Matyi
FP&A Manager, Pepsico Food Service Sales & Support

Abbas Sabur
Senior Product Marketing Manager @ Audible

Dustin Sheppard
Managing Director, Unum

Muhammad Daud
Senior Marketing Analyst at WeTransfer

Cory Smith
Email, Retention and Lifecycle Marketing @ AMB Interactive

Justyn Gostlin
Account Executive at Open Practice

Jake Fisher
MBA (Oakland University); Buyer @ General Motors

Charles Ritchie
Head of Operations at Tank Utility

Benjamin Gummoe
Engineering Manager at Policygenius, Inc.

Matt Blint
President at Red House Communications, Inc.

Graduate Study and Beyond in Philosophy

Megan Mitchell
MA in Philosophy (Howard University), MA & PhD in Philosophy (UNC Chapel Hill); Associate Professor of Philosophy, Gender & Sexuality Studies Program Director, Stonehill College

Mark Wells
PhD in Philosophy (Bowling Green); Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Northeastern University

Ben Schwan
PhD (Wisconsin); faculty member in Department of Bioethics at Case Western Reserve University and a clinical ethics consultant for The MetroHealth System in Cleveland, OH

Andrew Russo
PhD Philosophy (Oklahoma); Lecturer, University of
Central Oklahoma

Sophia Derugen-Toomey
MA in Philosophy (Tufts); Software Engineer II at Wayfair

Kalyn Kappelman
MA in Philosophy (Iowa), Masters in Library and Information Sciences (Kent State); Branch Services Supervisor, Adult Department at Cuyahoga County Public Library

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

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. 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.

7. 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.https://yb7zk3sd3g.search.serialssolutions.com/ejp/?libHash=YB7ZK3SD3G#/?language=en-US&titleType=JOURNALS.

- ***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://www.ohiolink.edu>.

- ***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: <https://dewey2.library.denison.edu/>.

through another electronic database. You can access JSTOR from this site: <https://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>

8. 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>

9. 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 on locations that contain 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

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

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

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 B are C.
Therefore, all A are C.

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

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

All A are C.
Some B are A.
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: ~ , • , ∨ , ⊃ , ≡
  The following chart shows the logical operators and corresponding symbols and .

Logical Operator	Symbol	Description
Negation	~	not
Conjunction	• or & or ∧	and
Disjunction	∨	or
Conditional	⊃ or →	if . . . then . . .
Biconditional	≡ or ↔	. . . 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	~ P
T	F
F	T

P	Q	P oo Q	P v Q	P D Q	P m 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: (∃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 :: ~(∃x) ~ Fx	(∃x) Fx :: ~(x) ~ Fx
~(x) Fx :: (∃x) ~ Fx	~(∃x) Fx :: (x) ~ 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 U (or L) for Necessarily and 0 (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.
N o t 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 threatening 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 pity 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 nothing has been proven about something as evidence in support 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 diverts the attention 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 suppresses or ignores relevant evidence which outweighs the presented evidence and supports a different conclusion.