

# PHIL 244 Social and Political Philosophy II

Sandrine Berges

FA114C

berges@bilkent.edu.tr



## **This pack includes**

Course particulars

Assessment

Reading list

Syllabus

How to interpret a text

Weekly homework

Outline document

Essay writing guidelines

Essay submission FAQ

# Course Particulars

## Course details:

Before coming to class you will need to read the required text, as specified in the readings section of the syllabus. You will also need to prepare the relevant homework for that week, i.e. answer the questions (in note form) which are included in this pack. This will count towards your participation grade.

I will be available for consultation regarding any aspect of this course during my office hours Mondays at 10.40 and 11.40. If you cannot see me at these times you can either write me an email (berges@bilkent.edu.tr) or ask for an appointment at another time.

## Course objectives:

### *Guarantee and Disclaimer:*

These objectives may seem daunting. Remember that you're not meant to be able to do all these things at the beginning of the course: it's our job to teach them to you! We can guarantee that if you work reasonably hard and come to us when you have a problem, you will go quite a long way towards achieving these objectives. If you don't do the work, however...

### *Critical Thinking*

One of the main purposes of this course is to develop your critical thinking skills. This includes analysing philosophical texts, putting forward your own arguments orally and in writing, and responding to the arguments of other students.

### *Doing Philosophy*

You will learn to recognise philosophical questions, to put forward reasoned answers to them, and to assess other people's answers (famous philosophers' and other students!).

### *Reading*

You should develop an ability to read reasonably long philosophical texts in depth, i.e. you should be able to answer the following questions for most parts of the text:

- What is the thesis?
- How is it being argued?
- How does it contribute to the author's main conclusion?
- What problems are there in this passage?
- What do I think?

### *Writing*

You should be able to write clear and well structured philosophical papers of some length (2500 words) in which you:

- identify a philosophically interesting thesis and defend it by argument
- identify possible objections to your arguments/thesis and reply to them
- use examples effectively.

### *Class Participation*

You should be prepared to:

- discuss the texts after reading them
- identify problems in a text and ask questions about these problems in class
- put forward your own ideas about the text or issue discussed
- listen to other students' ideas and respond to them philosophically

### *Why should you do all this?*

Philosophy is good for the soul! It's also good for winning arguments with friends and family...

By studying philosophy you will acquire skills which will be valuable throughout your life, in and out of academia. You will also learn to think independently about some important questions which you will face in your studies and afterwards.

Philosophy is relevant to almost every academic subject (there's even a philosophy of sport and a philosophy of quantum mechanics!). In particular, philosophy is relevant to your studies in two ways:

- philosophical questions will arise out your academic studies
- Many academic subjects rely on certain philosophical accounts of the state and human nature. This is particularly true of politics and international relations but also applies to disciplines such as education and even literature.

# Assessment

You will be assessed on the following:

Test	Due date	Specifications	%
Essay 1	15 March	1000 words long	20% essay 5% outline (27/2)
Essay 2	19 April	1500 words long	20% essay 5% outline (3/4)
Final exam	See SAPS for conditions		20%
Participation		Includes evidence of reading, willingness to discuss the texts and questions <u>in class</u> ; up to day coursepack. See course objectives for more detail.	30%

## Submission policy:

All material submitted must be typed and word-processed.

With each term paper you must submit an outline and a progress report . I will not grade papers which do not include those.

You must submit a copy of your work electronically through moodle and one hard copy.

See also the essay submission FAQs at the end of this pack.

## Plagiarism

For the university's plagiarism policy see:

<http://www.provost.bilkent.edu.tr/procedures/AcademicHonesty.htm>

## Grading criteria

I will make an overall judgment of the quality of your work, but in forming my judgment I will pay particular attention to the following criteria:

Content: Knowledge and understanding of the relevant texts, facts, philosophical concepts and theories.

Argument: Quantity and quality of reasoning used in support of, or criticism of the positions discussed; consistency and coherence; depth of analysis.

Clarity: Clarity of essay structure and verbal expression; succinctness; use of language; and quality of presentation.

Independence: The extent to which you think for yourself, rather than regurgitating what you have read or heard; imaginative use of examples.

Relevance: Have you answered the question as set? Is everything you have written relevant to the conclusion you wish to establish (whether in support of it, or as an objection to be answered)?

# Readings

*You must read and bring the relevant text to each class (as specified on the schedule). Failure to do so will result in points being taken off your participation grade. It is compulsory for this course to have the complete texts i.e. not photocopies.*

Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (any edition).

Bentham and Mill, *The Classical Utilitarians*, edited by J. Troyer, Hackett (2003)

Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of the Morals*, edited by T.E. Hill, translated by A. Zweig, Oxford University Press (2003)

Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo*, edited by W. Kaufmann, Vintage (1989)

Hobbes, *Leviathan*, edited by C.B. MacPherson, Penguin (1981)

Weekly Syllabus

week	date (thur)	topic	text	
1	5/2	Intro	Kant "What is enlightenment"	Text in course pack
2	12/2	Hobbes 1	Book I chapter 13-15	
3	19/2	Hobbes 2	Book II chapter 21	
4	26/2	Wollstonecraft part 1	Rights of Women: Preface, intro, chapters 1-3	Outlines for essay 1 due Friday 27/2 in class
5	05/3	Wollstonecraft part 2	Rights of Women: chapters 4 and 5 (section on Rousseau only)	
6	12/3	Kant 1	Groundworks: preface and section 1	Essay 1 due Sunday 15/3 on Turnitin
7	19/3	Kant 2	Groundworks: sections 2 and 3 (first page only)	
8	26/3	Mill 1	Utilitarianism chapters 1-3	In Bentham and Mill
9	02/4	Mill 2	Utilitarianism chapters 4 and 5.	Outlines for essay 2 due Friday 3/4 in class
10	09/4	Writing week	No classes (I am away at a conference).	
11	16/4	Mill and Kant	See exercises in course pack	Essay 2 due Sunday 19/4 on Turnitin
12	23/4		No classes Thursday	
13	30/4	Nietzsche 1	Genealogy, Preface, essay2	
14	07/5	Nietzsche 2	Genealogy, essay 1	
15	14/5	Revisions		

# How to interpret a philosophical text

When you present a piece of philosophical work, you will need to *evaluate* the material you have been reading. However, you can only evaluate something if you understand it.

In order to understand a philosophical text, you need to be able to answer two questions:

1. What is the author saying, i.e. what does he/she want you to believe?
2. How is the author defending his/her view? What reasons does he/she give you to believe that this view is right?

To answer question 1 you need to identify the author's *thesis* (there might be more than one in the text, but always work on one at a time).

A thesis is a statement of what the author wants the reader to believe is the case.

e.g. "There is no such thing as a just war"

"Plato's claim that the soul has three parts is not defensible because it is psychologically unsound".

When you state a thesis, whether your own or your interpretation of someone else's, must always be stated clearly and succinctly, i.e. one sentence long rather than one paragraph. Try to distinguish the actual thesis statement from contextual information the author gives.

e.g.: "Much has been argued in favour of a distinction between just and unjust wars", "One of the most interesting arguments in Plato's Republic is that for the division of the soul".  
These remarks are **not** part of the thesis.

You should also try to find a quotation from the text in which the author states the thesis. However, this may be difficult if the author does not write in a clear and succinct manner. The thesis may be broken down and spread over several sentences. In this case you may quote parts from each of the sentences and link them this way:

"part 1 [...] part 2 [...] part 3 [...]."

The thesis statement may also be ambiguous. This means that the sentence which expresses the thesis may have several distinct meanings. The author may only intend to mean one thing, or he/she may intend to mean more.

For example Plato says in the Republic that it is always in one's interest to be just. However, if one reads the entire text, it appears that being just means either of two things. The first is the conventional meaning, i.e. to treat others fairly. The second is a Platonic meaning, i.e. achieving harmony of the soul. One could argue that it is possible to achieve harmony without treating others fairly. By disambiguating Plato's thesis, we find that there is a need for further argument. Is Plato right to believe that conventional justice and psychic harmony always go together? If so does he give reasons?

This is how you can end up 'doing philosophy' by identifying a thesis.

When you state the thesis in your own words (which you must always do), you must do so clearly even if the author doesn't.

To answer question 2 you need to identify the author's **argument**.

An **argument**, in the critical thinking sense, is a set of statements which together provide good reasons for believing something.

The reasons are called **premises**, and what you give reasons for is called the **conclusion**.

Hence, when asked to identify an argument in a text, you should identify a set of statements some of which you will call premises and one of which you will call the conclusion.

Your answer to the question 'what is the argument presented?' should look like this:

Premise 1: ..... Premise 2: ..... (Premise 3, 4, etc:....) Conclusion:....
---

Each statement, premise or conclusion, should be **no longer than one short sentence**.

There are ways to recognise which part of a text constitutes premises and which part is a conclusion: look for **argument indicating expressions**.

There are two kinds:

**Conclusion Indicating Expressions - CIE**

**Premise Indicating Expressions - PIE**

When you see a CIE, it probably means that a premise comes before it, and a conclusion follows:

**Premise 1 (and 2 and 3) CIE Conclusion**

When you see a PIE, it probably means that a conclusion comes before it, and a premise follows:

**Conclusion PIE Premise 1 (and 2 and 3).**

Here are some CIE:

Premise	CIE	Conclusion
The little cat is dead	Therefore Hence So Thus It follows that	I am sad

Here are some PIE:

Conclusion	PIE	Premise
I am sad	Because As Since For Follows from	The little cat is dead

**Note:**

Not all written or spoken arguments contain argument indicating expressions. Sometimes you just need to look at the meaning and context of a set of statements to realise that it is an argument.

The expressions listed above do not always indicate arguments.

E.g. the word 'so' in the sentence 'this is so boring' does not indicate an argument.

Again, you need to look at the meaning, context, and **use your common sense**. But also, Interpreting an argument is an exercise in charity. Give your opponent the strongest, clearest, and overall best argument you can find for them. Almost everyone we read is not stupid. Do them the courtesy of believing it of them.

# Weekly homework

The following pages give you the weekly readings and homework.

You should prepare answers to the questions in the spaces provided and bring them to class with you each week.

Your answers should be in note form. You will be asked to discuss them in class in small groups and in short, individual presentations.

Not doing the homework will lower your participation grade significantly.

You will have the opportunity of working on your answers in class.

Note that when I ask students to discuss a question in small groups, this never means that you should offer a group answer to the question. After discussing the question in your group, you should attempt to formulate your own answer, and copy it out in this document (or on pages that you will later attach to it).

I will check your coursepack at the end of the semester and it will contribute to your participation grade.



# Kant “What is Enlightenment?”

## Questions on "What is Enlightenment"

Read the note on interpreting philosophical texts, above, and Kant's text included on the next pages. carefully. Then try to answer the following questions:

- 1) What is Kant's thesis?

In the text: “

In your own words: “

- 2) What are Kant's arguments?

Highlight the argument indicating expressions in the text.

How many arguments can you find?

Choose two arguments and list the premises and conclusions.

Argument 1

Premise1

Premise2

Premise

Conclusion

- 3) Do you think Kant's arguments are good arguments? i.e. find objections to what he says and then attempt to reply to the objections.

We will work on your answers in class.

## IMMANUEL KANT

An Answer to the Question:  
What is Enlightenment? (1784)

Enlightenment is man's emergence from his self-imposed immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one's understanding without guidance from another. This immaturity is self-imposed when its cause lies not in lack of understanding, but in lack of resolve and courage to use it without guidance from another. *Sapere Aude!* [dare to know] "Have courage to use your own understanding!"--that is the motto of enlightenment.

Laziness and cowardice are the reasons why so great a proportion of men, long after nature has released them from alien guidance (*natura-liter maiorenes*), nonetheless gladly remain in lifelong immaturity, and why it is so easy for others to establish themselves as their guardians. It is so easy to be immature. If I have a book to serve as my understanding, a pastor to serve as my conscience, a physician to determine my diet for me, and so on, I need not exert myself at all. I need not think, if only I can pay: others will readily undertake the irksome work for me. The guardians who have so benevolently taken over the supervision of men have carefully seen to it that the far greatest part of them (including the entire fair sex) regard taking the step to maturity as very dangerous, not to mention difficult. Having first made their domestic livestock dumb, and having carefully made sure that these docile creatures will not take a single step without the go-cart to which they are harnessed, these guardians then show them the danger that threatens them, should they attempt to walk alone. Now this danger is not actually so great, for after falling a few times they would in the end certainly learn to walk; but an example of this kind makes men timid and usually frightens them out of all further attempts.

Thus, it is difficult for any individual man to work himself out of the immaturity that has all but become his nature. He has even become fond of this state and for the time being is actually incapable of using his own understanding, for no one has ever allowed him to attempt it. Rules and formulas, those mechanical aids to the rational use, or rather misuse, of his natural gifts, are the shackles of a permanent immaturity. Whoever threw them off would still make only an uncertain leap over the smallest ditch, since he is unaccustomed to this kind of free movement. Consequently, only a few have succeeded, by cultivating their own minds, in freeing themselves from immaturity and pursuing a secure course.

But that the public should enlighten itself is more likely; indeed, if it is only allowed freedom, enlightenment is almost inevitable. For even among the entrenched guardians of the great masses a few will always think for themselves, a few who, after having themselves thrown off the yoke of immaturity, will spread the spirit of a rational appreciation for both their own worth and for each person's calling to think for himself. But it should be particularly noted that if a public that was first placed in this yoke by the guardians is suitably aroused by some of those who are altogether incapable of enlightenment, it may force the guardians themselves to remain under the yoke--so pernicious is it to instill prejudices, for they finally take revenge upon their originators, or on their descendants. Thus a public can only attain enlightenment slowly. Perhaps a revolution can overthrow autocratic despotism and profiteering or power-grabbing oppression, but it can never truly reform a manner of thinking; instead, new prejudices, just like the old ones they replace, will serve as a leash for the great unthinking mass.

Nothing is required for this enlightenment, however, except freedom; and the freedom in question is the least harmful of all, namely, the freedom to use reason publicly in all matters. But on all sides I hear: "Do not argue!" The officer says, "Do not argue, drill!" The tax man says, "Do not argue, pay!" The pastor says, "Do not argue, believe!" (Only one ruler in the World says, "Argue as much as you want and about what you want, but obey!") In this we have examples of pervasive restrictions on freedom. But which restriction hinders enlightenment and which does not, but instead actually advances it? I reply: The public use of one's reason must always be free, and it alone can bring about enlightenment among mankind; the private use of reason may, however, often be very narrowly restricted, without otherwise hindering the progress of enlightenment. By the public use of one's own reason I understand the use that anyone as a scholar makes of reason before the entire literate world. I call the private use of reason that which a person may make in a civic post or office that has been entrusted to him. Now in many affairs conducted in the interests of a community, a certain mechanism is required by means of which some of its members must conduct themselves in an entirely passive manner so that through an artificial unanimity the government may guide them toward public ends, or at least prevent them from destroying such ends. Here one certainly must not argue, instead one must obey.

However, insofar as this part of the machine also regards himself as a member of the community as a whole, or even of the world community, and as a consequence addresses the public in the role of a scholar, in the proper sense of that term, he can most certainly argue, without thereby harming the affairs for which as a passive member he is partly responsible. Thus it would be disastrous if an officer on duty who was given a command by his superior were to question the appropriateness or utility of the order. He must obey. But as a scholar he cannot be justly constrained from making comments about errors in military service, or from placing them before the public for its judgment. The citizen cannot refuse to pay the taxes imposed on him; indeed, impertinent criticism of such levies, when they should be paid by him, can be punished as a scandal (since it can lead to widespread insubordination). But the same person does not act contrary to civic duty when, as a scholar, he publicly expresses his thoughts regarding the impropriety or even injustice of such taxes. Likewise a pastor is bound to instruct his catechumens and

congregation in accordance with the symbol of the church he serves, for he was appointed on that condition. But as a scholar he has complete freedom, indeed even the calling, to impart to the public all of his carefully considered and well-intentioned thoughts concerning mistaken aspects of that symbol, as well as his suggestions for the better arrangement of religious and church matters. Nothing in this can weigh on his conscience. What he teaches in consequence of his office as a servant of the church he sets out as something with regard to which he has no discretion to teach in accord with his own lights; rather, he offers it under the direction and in the name of another. He will say, "Our church teaches this or that and these are the demonstrations it uses." He thereby extracts for his congregation all practical uses from precepts to which he would not himself subscribe with complete conviction, but whose presentation he can nonetheless undertake, since it is not entirely impossible that truth lies hidden in them, and, in any case, nothing contrary to the very nature of religion is to be found in them. If he believed he could find anything of the latter sort in them, he could not in good conscience serve in his position; he would have to resign. Thus an appointed teacher's use of his reason for the sake of his congregation is merely private, because, however large the congregation is, this use is always only domestic; in this regard, as a priest, he is not free and cannot be such because he is acting under instructions from someone else. By contrast, the cleric--as a scholar who speaks through his writings to the public as such, i.e., the world--enjoys in this public use of reason an unrestricted freedom to use his own rational capacities and to speak his own mind. For that the (spiritual) guardians of a people should themselves be immature is an absurdity that would insure the perpetuation of absurdities.

But would a society of pastors, perhaps a church assembly or venerable presbytery (as those among the Dutch call themselves), not be justified in binding itself by oath to a certain unalterable symbol in order to secure a constant guardianship over each of its members and through them over the people, and this for all time: I say that this is wholly impossible. Such a contract, whose intention is to preclude forever all further enlightenment of the human race, is absolutely null and void, even if it should be ratified by the supreme power, by parliaments, and by the most solemn peace treaties. One age cannot bind itself, and thus conspire, to place a succeeding one in a condition whereby it would be impossible for the later age to expand its knowledge (particularly where it is so very important), to rid itself of errors, and generally to increase its enlightenment. That would be a crime against human nature, whose essential destiny lies precisely in such progress; subsequent generations are thus completely justified in dismissing such agreements as unauthorized and criminal. The criterion of everything that can be agreed upon as a law by a people lies in this question: Can a people impose such a law on itself? Now it might be possible, in anticipation of a better state of affairs, to introduce a provisional order for a specific, short time, all the while giving all citizens, especially clergy, in their role as scholars, the freedom to comment publicly, i.e., in writing, on the present institution's shortcomings. The provisional order might last until insight into the nature of these matters had become so widespread and obvious that the combined (if not unanimous) voices of the populace could propose to the crown that it take under its protection those congregations that, in accord with their newly gained insight, had organized themselves under altered religious institutions, but without interfering with those wishing to allow matters to remain as before. However, it is absolutely forbidden that they unite into a religious organization that nobody may for the duration of a man's lifetime publicly question, for so do-ing would deny, render fruitless, and make detrimental to succeeding generations an era in man's progress toward improvement. A man may put off enlightenment with regard to what he ought to know, though only for a short time and for his own person; but to renounce it for himself, or, even more, for subsequent generations, is to violate and trample man's divine rights underfoot. And what a people may not decree for itself may still less be imposed on it by a monarch, for his lawgiving authority rests on his unification of the people's collective will in his own. If he only sees to it that all genuine or purported improvement is consonant with civil order, he can allow his subjects to do what they find necessary to their spiritual well-being, which is not his affair. However, he must prevent anyone from forcibly interfering with another's working as best he can to determine and promote his well-being. It detracts from his own majesty when he interferes in these matters, since the writings in which his subjects attempt to clarify their insights lend value to his conception of governance. This holds whether he acts from his own highest insight--whereby he calls upon himself the reproach, "Caesar non eat supra grammaticos."--as well as, indeed even more, when he despoils his highest authority by supporting the spiritual despotism of some tyrants in his state over his other subjects.

If it is now asked, "Do we presently live in an enlightened age?" the answer is, "No, but we do live in an age of enlightenment." As matters now stand, a great deal is still lacking in order for men as a whole to be, or even to put themselves into a position to be able without external guidance to apply understanding confidently to religious issues. But we do have clear indications that the way is now being opened for men to proceed freely in this direction and that the obstacles to general enlightenment--to their release from their self-imposed immaturity--are gradually diminishing. In this regard, this age is the age of enlightenment, the century of Frederick.

A prince who does not find it beneath him to say that he takes it to be his duty to prescribe nothing, but rather to allow men complete freedom in religious matters--who thereby renounces the arrogant title of tolerance--is himself enlightened and deserves to be praised by a grateful present and by posterity as the first, at least where the government is concerned, to release the human race from immaturity and to leave everyone free to use his own reason in all matters of conscience. Under his rule, venerable pastors, in their role as scholars and without prejudice to their official duties, may freely and openly set out for the world's scrutiny their judgments and views, even where these occasionally differ from the accepted symbol. Still greater freedom is afforded to those who are not restricted by an official post. This spirit of freedom is expanding even where it must struggle

against the external obstacles of governments that misunderstand their own function. Such governments are illuminated by the example that the existence of freedom need not give cause for the least concern regarding public order and harmony in the commonwealth. If only they refrain from inventing artifices to keep themselves in it, men will gradually raise themselves from barbarism.

I have focused on religious matters in setting out my main point concerning enlightenment, i.e., man's emergence from self-imposed immaturity, first because our rulers have no interest in assuming the role of their subjects' guardians with respect to the arts and sciences, and secondly because that form of immaturity is both the most pernicious and disgraceful of all. But the manner of thinking of a head of state who favors religious enlightenment goes even further, for he realizes that there is no danger to his legislation in allowing his subjects to use reason publicly and to set before the world their thoughts concerning better formulations of his laws, even if this involves frank criticism of legislation currently in effect. We have before us a shining example, with respect to which no monarch surpasses the one whom we honor.

But only a ruler who is himself enlightened and has no dread of shadows, yet who likewise has a well-disciplined, numerous army to guarantee public peace, can say what no republic may dare, namely: "Argue as much as you want and about what you want, but obey!" Here as elsewhere, when things are considered in broad perspective, a strange, unexpected pattern in human affairs reveals itself, one in which almost everything is paradoxical. A greater degree of civil freedom seems advantageous to a people's spiritual freedom; yet the former established impassable boundaries for the latter; conversely, a lesser degree of civil freedom provides enough room for all fully to expand their abilities. Thus, once nature has removed the hard shell from this kernel for which she has most fondly cared, namely, the inclination to and vocation for free thinking, the kernel gradually reacts on a people's mentality (whereby they become increasingly able to act freely), and it finally even influences the principles of government, which finds that it can profit by treating men, who are now more than machines, in accord with their dignity.

I. Kant

Konigsberg in Prussia, 30 September 1784

# Hobbes 1 - Nature and State

Reading: Hobbes, *Leviathan* ch 13 – 16

Discussion questions (discuss in small groups, but you should each write down your answers individually)

1. a What does Hobbes think life would be like if there was no political power? Why do you think he thinks it matters?

1.b Do you think Hobbes is right about what life would be like if there was no political power? Explain your answer with an argument.

2. Is right to say that on Hobbes's view scarcity of material resources is the main reason why there would be a state of war if there was no state? Are there any other factors which he thinks might be involved? What do you think?

3. What kind of evidence might we have for what life would be like without a state? What evidence does Hobbes think we have?

4. What do you think Hobbes means when he says it is a 'law of nature' that people should keep their 'covenants'? Why does Hobbes think this is true? Do you agree with him? How good are his arguments for this view?

5. Does Hobbes think that it is all right for people to break covenants if there is no power to enforce them? Find evidence from the text to support your answer. Explain why you think he holds the view that he does. Do you agree with him?

6. According to Hobbes, it is impossible to make a covenant in which I give up my right to self-defense. Why does he think this? Do you agree?

What consequences might this view of Hobbes' have?

## Hobbes 2 – Liberty and Authority

### Reading: Leviathan, ch.18-21. (Discussion questions for chapter 21: The Liberty of Subject)

Notes on the central concepts:

'Liberty' or 'freedom' is defined either as negative or positive – see Isaiah Berlin's famous 1958 inaugural lecture “Two Concepts of Liberty”. ([http://www.wiso.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/wiso\\_ywl/johannes/Ankuendigungen/Berlin\\_twoconceptsofliberty.pdf](http://www.wiso.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/wiso_ywl/johannes/Ankuendigungen/Berlin_twoconceptsofliberty.pdf))

**Negative freedom** means freedom from obstacles or interference.

**Positive freedom** means that one is in control of one's actions.

**Covenant:** In Chapter 14, Hobbes claims that in order to leave the chaos of the state of nature, we must enter into a covenant with one another, whereby we transfer our natural rights and liberty to a sovereign, an 'artificial person' (see chapter 16) who represents the common will and the common good.

**Common wealth:** this is the English translation of *res publica*, the public thing, or the public good, which is a central concept for the Greek and Roman authors Hobbes refers to.

Questions for small group discussions.

Note: for every question, you need first to identify the relevant part of the chapter and then rephrase it in your own words.

Examples should be your own, not taken from the text.

1. How does Hobbes define liberty at the beginning of the chapter? Illustrate his definition with an example. Do you think the definition captures everything that is important about liberty? If not, what is missing?
2. What does Hobbes mean when he says that liberty is compatible with necessity? Paraphrase his argument and find an example of your own to illustrate it.
3. Why is the liberty of the subject consistent with unlimited power of the sovereign? Do you agree? What do you think Hobbes means when he says that the subject is the author of every act the sovereign does – you can look at chapter 16).
4. Hobbes says that the liberty of the Greeks and Romans 'is not the liberty of particular men but the liberty of the common-wealth'. Explain what he means, and illustrate using example of Greek or Roman authors you studied last semester.
5. In Chapter 14, Hobbes argues that we cannot transfer the freedom to defend our own bodies. What are the implications for a subject's liberty in chapter 21?
6. “As for other liberties, they depend on the silence of the law”. What does this mean? Do you agree? Illustrate your answer with examples of your own.

# Wollstonecraft 1 - Arguments for equality

## Reading:

Mary Wollstonecraft: A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, Preface (Letter to Talleyrand), introduction, chapters 1-3.

Compare the following two passages:

1. “Contending for the rights of woman, my main argument is built on this simple principle, that if she not be prepared by education to become the companion of man, she will stop the progress of knowledge and virtue – for truth must be common to all or it will be inefficacious with respect to its influence on general practice”. (Letter to Talleyrand)
2. “I will allow that bodily strength seems to give man a natural superiority over woman and this is the only solid basis on which the superiority of the sex can be built. But I still insist that not only the virtue but the knowledge of the two sexes should be the same in nature, if not in degree, and that women, considered not only as moral, but rational creatures, ought to endeavour to acquire human virtues (or perfections) by the same means as men. (Chapter 3).

Each of these passages contains an argument. Try and analyse these arguments carefully, contrasting the ways in which they arrive at the same conclusion.

Here are some steps you can follow in order to facilitate your analysis.

- 1) try to find other passages which relate to the extracts A and B. Carefully write down their reference. See if they help you understand the passages.
- 2) What are the conclusions Wollstonecraft is drawing in each of the passages? Are those conclusions made explicit or do you have to infer them from the context? Are those conclusions similar?
- 3) Read the question and answer section at the beginning of Chapter One: how does it shed light on B? Note in particular what Wollstonecraft says about reason and virtue.

Now try and reconstruct the arguments:

A

Premise 1:

Premise 2:

Conclusion:

B:

Premise 1:

Premise 2:

Premise 3:

Conclusion:

Do you find either of the arguments unconvincing? If so explain why, as clearly as possible.

If you find them convincing, ask yourself what somebody who did not agree with you might object. Remember that although Wollstonecraft's book was a best seller in its day, it had many objectors even then, and its message was not taken into account until much later.

Once you have formulated an objection to one, or both, of the arguments, reply to it, i.e. think what Wollstonecraft herself, or somebody who agreed with her might say to the objection, and formulate this reply in your own words, as clearly as possible. (write your answer below).

As an example, see Rousseau's objection, in footnote 7: "Researches into abstract and speculative truths, [...] is not the proper province of women." See also Wollstonecraft's reply in ch.3.

Objection to argument (A or B):

Reply to the objection:



## Wollstonecraft 2

### Reading:

Mary Wollstonecraft: *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Chapters 4 and 5 (section on Rousseau)

1) Throughout the book, but especially in chapter 4, Wollstonecraft draws an analogy between class inequalities, and gender inequalities.

What is this analogy?

Refer to several passages in which the analogy is made, and explain what role the analogy plays in these passages.

Can we extract an argument from the analogy such as Wollstonecraft uses it?

Try and construct your own argument, using some of the points she makes about the aristocracy.

Start by formulating the conclusion you want to argue for.

Then find at least two premises which will lead to that conclusion.

Set them out below:

Premise 1:

Premise 2:

Premise 3:

Conclusion:

Is this a persuasive argument? Can you make it stronger?

2) In Chapter 4, Wollstonecraft explains that although women are enslaved and are in fact capable of rising to a position equal to men in society, they might not see that this is the case, and they might not want to change. Again, you should try and extract an argument for her view from her comments, and if you cannot find one in the text, you should try to construct one which you think Wollstonecraft would accept. Set it out as above.

Premise 1:

Premise 2:

Premise 3:

Conclusion:

Now find contemporary examples of the phenomenon described by Wollstonecraft, such as the one below.

An example from Amartya Sen (philosopher and economist):

Women in African countries where there is malnutrition tend to eat even less food than the men. As a result, they suffer from more severe malnutrition. They have become used to this state of affairs, and even regard as normal. They believe that they need much less food than men (a difference greater than what is regarded as normal by nutritionists), and they believe that they are well fed. As a result, they are reluctant to receive the help they need.

Your example:

### 3) Femininity

That something is not 'feminine' is often used as an argument against gender equality. Feminist thinkers have had to rebuke objections to that effect from the very beginning. In her book, Wollstonecraft gives us several examples of how to deal with this.

Please find and read carefully the passages in which Wollstonecraft talks about the following:

- women and dress (in chapter 2)
- whether little girls should play with dolls or run outside (chapter 3)
- whether women have more power of attraction than men (chapter 5)
- whether women are better conversationalist than men (chapter 5).

Note that in chapter 5, Wollstonecraft is quoting from and commenting on Rousseau's Emile. The quotes are long, but you should not confuse them with her text – Wollstonecraft does not agree with Rousseau!

Now give your own example of a way of behaving that is commonly regarded as 'feminine'. Is this a way of behaving that is preventing women from achieving equality? Is this a way of behaving that is not in any way essential to women's well being? Write out your answers to these questions in paragraph form.

# Kant 1 – The Good Will.

## Reading:

Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Preface, and Section I.

### 1: The Good Will

Explain the first sentence of the first section in your own words.

What is Kant's argument for the conclusion that only a good will can be good in itself? State the premises in your own words, and find quotations in the text to illustrate them. *Do you think Kant is right? Argue for your answer.*

Compare this sentence with the first paragraph of chapter 1 of the *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. What light does Wollstonecraft's text shed on Kant's?

### 2: Actions and Duty

At 397-399 Kant distinguishes between four kinds of actions and illustrates the differences between them with examples.

State clearly (in your own words) what is distinctive about each of the four kinds of action, and which examples illustrate which kinds.

Which kind(s) of action does Kant regard as having true moral worth and why? *Do you agree with Kant? Give reasons and illustrate them with examples of your own.*

### 3: The Universal Law Principle.

At 402 Kant writes: "I should never act except in such a way that I can also will that my maxim should become a universal law".

Read through Kant's examples and then explain in your own words what the principle means.

According to the principle, are either of the actions below morally acceptable? If so why, if not why not?

*A student is late with her homework. She copies her friend's work and presents it as her own.*

*You lie to the police in order to protect a friend or relative who is suspected of murder.*

Would Wollstonecraft agree with Kant's principle? Can you think of an example she might give?

## Kant 2 – The Categorical Imperative.

### Reading:

Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Section II, and Section III (first page).

1: Read 416-421.

Kant distinguishes between the categorical and the hypothetical imperatives. State clearly what they are and what the difference between them is.

Which of the imperatives below are hypothetical, and which are categorical? If they are hypothetical, find the condition which makes them imperative (e.g. You must diet *if you want to be fit*). If they are categorical, explain why this is so.

You must eat!

You must keep your promise!

You must pay your taxes!

You must stop smoking!

You must study philosophy!

You must treat this woman with respect!

You must do your homework!

2: The formula of the end in itself

428-429. What does Kant mean when he says that men are ends in themselves? (Say why they are not just means, or subjective ends).

In the following examples, is A treating B as an end in himself, a means only, or a subjective end?

A gets out of B's taxi and runs off without paying the fare.

A buys an expensive diamond collar for her dog, B.

A refuses to participate in the killing of B who is innocent of the crime he is accused of.

A goes to visit B in hospital because she is her friend.

*Do you agree with Kant that we should always be guided by the principle of the end in itself? Argue for your answer.*

3: Free will.

Read Section III, 446-447.

"A free will and a will subject to moral law are one and the same"

What is Kant's argument for the above conclusion? State the premises in your own words and refer to quotations from the text.

According to Kant, if someone takes the divine law, or the law of the state as their moral law, can they be truly moral? Do they have free will? Give reasons.

*Do you agree with Kant? Argue for your answer.*

Consider the following objection. *What would Kant's reply be?*

"If Kant is right, then nobody can be held responsible for acting immorally. It follows from what Kant says that if someone acts immorally they do not have free will. However, without free will, one cannot be held responsible for one's actions. So someone who acts immorally is not responsible. This is clearly an absurd conclusion."

# Mill 1 – Utilitarianism Introduced

## Reading:

Mill *Utilitarianism* chs 1-3

### 1: What makes actions right or wrong.

Read Chapter II of Utilitarianism, in particular, pp.98-104.

According to Mill, what makes an action right or wrong?

*Think of an example of an action which Mill would think morally right but which on a more 'traditional' moral outlook would appear to be morally wrong, and explain why in each case.*

*Do you agree with Mill or 'traditional' morality or neither about the example? Argue for your answer.*

*Consider your arguments and try to explain what is unusual about Mill's conception of moral right and wrong.*

### 2: The Nature of Pleasure

What does Mill say his view about right and wrong is based on? What objections does he consider?

What is the point of Mill's distinction between different sorts of pleasure?

*Which sorts of pleasure should we categorize as higher/lower?*

*Is Mill's distinction convincing? Is he right to think that we should prefer higher to lower pleasures? Does this help him with the objection he is trying to answer?*

### 3: The experience machine: a modern objection to Mill

Read the following paragraph, and answer the questions which follow.

'Professor X has just invented a remarkable machine. It has the following effect. Individuals who are plugged into the machine will be put to sleep and kept in suspended animation indefinitely. But they will seem to experience life carrying on as normal - but with one small difference. The difference is that the effects of any unpleasant experiences will be halved. In other words, individuals who are hooked up to the machine will seem to be living a normal life, but with only half as much pain as a normal person would experience. But in actual fact they will be in suspended animation'

(With apologies to the writers of Vanilla Sky, and to Robert Nozick, who first made this example popular in philosophical discussions.)

*Would you be prepared to be hooked up to such a machine? Why/Why not?*

*Would your answer be different if you experienced no pain at all while hooked up to the machine? Would it be different if you experienced a normal amount of pain?*

*Do your answers pose a problem for Mill's view that human beings are only motivated by a desire for happiness?*

*How might Mill reply?*

#### 4. Could we all be Utilitarians?

What question is Mill trying to answer in chapter 3 of Utilitarianism?  
(Give a quotation and a paraphrase )

What are the main points of his answer? *How convincing do you find it?*

Consider one of the following objections to Mill's view.

*Say how convincing you find it, how Mill might reply, and whether you consider the reply convincing.*

Objection 1: Utilitarians think that everyone's happiness matters equally. So if I'm going to be a utilitarian, I need to give everyone's happiness equal weight in my thinking. But this is impossible - even if I am not a selfish person, I am bound to care more about the happiness of my family, friends, and countrymen than about the happiness of complete strangers. So Utilitarianism must be false.

Objection 2: Utilitarianism is too demanding. If it is true, then every time I buy a cup of coffee in a café or go to the cinema, I am acting immorally. After all, instead of spending the money on myself, I could have given it to a charity that would feed starving people. And that would probably increase the total amount of happiness in the world by a greater amount than if I spent the money on myself. After all, I might not enjoy the cup of coffee or the film - the coffee might be cold, and the film not very good. But a starving person will always enjoy food.

## Mill 2 – Pleasure, Goodness and Justice

### Reading:

Mill *Utilitarianism* chs 4-5

#### 1: Arguing for Utilitarianism

Read chapter 4 of 'Utilitarianism'

What is Mill's argument for the claim that general happiness is desirable?

*Does it succeed in showing that I ought to do things which will increase other people's happiness as well as my own? Is it supposed to?*

"The only evidence that is possible to produce that something is desirable is that people desire it" (p122) *Is this true? Why/Why not?*

#### 2: Utility and Virtue

Consider the following statement: 'A truly virtuous person wants to be virtue for its own sake, not because of any consequences that being virtuous might have'

*Can one believe this statement and still be a utilitarian? How does your answer compare with Mill's*

#### 3: Utilitarianism and Justice

Read p127 - 137. What is Mill discussing here?

*How does Mill analyse the notion of justice on p136? Why does he analyse it like this?*

*How does his account differ from that of Plato?*

*Is it a good definition? Why/why not?\_*



# Mill and Kant - workshop

## 1. Do personal relationships matter morally?

John is accompanying his brother Dan (6) on a school trip. The bus in which they are traveling, together with thirty other children and three teachers is run off the road by a truck. The bus looks like it might explode. The door at the back of the bus is the only possible exit. A lot of people are too hurt to move, including the three teachers. The collision threw John to the back of the bus and he is able to get out, but there is not much time. John can either go and get his brother who is at the other end of the bus, or help the six children who are closest to him. He cannot do both.

a) What would be the right thing for John to do?

b) What would Mill say he should do? (think hard about what a utilitarian would really say and how they would justify it).

c) What would Kant say he should do? (try to apply both the universal law and end in itself formulas).

## 2) Is Utilitarianism too demanding?

There are currently two famous political philosophers trying to help us solve world poverty:

Peter Singer (Utilitarian)

Thomas Pogge (Kantian - ish)

Peter Singer believes that in order to solve world poverty, rich people who care ought to give up everything but the strict minimum (what they need to stay alive) until everyone has reached a satisfactory level of well-being. so we must live in poverty and give away all our earnings until there is no more world poverty.

Thomas Pogge believes we should lobby our governments to stop practices that harm poor countries, i.e. lift burdens that we currently impose on them for our own benefit: we must reduce, revise, or remove protectionist barriers, structural adjustment programs, rents for use of our 'intellectual property', and the international resource, borrowing, treaty, and arms privileges.

a) Which of these options is morally sound?

b) Which of these options is more likely to work?

c) If you thought neither was sound or practical, explain what should be done instead: is your solution Kantian or Utilitarian?

3) Does the end justify the means?

Last year, the German police held prisoner a man who had kidnapped and killed several children. His latest victim had not yet been found, and the police wanted to find him as soon as possible in case he was still alive. The police officer in charge decided the best way to make the prisoner talk was to threaten to torture him. He said later he had had no intention of actually torturing him. The threat worked, and the prisoner talked - unfortunately it was too late and the boy was dead. His parents were able to recover his body and bury him which somewhat brought them closure.

Later, the officer was criticised for having used the threat of torture. What he did was described by some as unacceptable in any circumstances and worse because he was German and this might bring back memories of Nazi treatments of war prisoners in the second world war. The officer replied that he did what he did to try and save a child's life. He received a warning.

a) Was the officer right to do what he did? And did he act on utilitarian principles?

b) If he was right, does this mean that it is always all right to threaten to torture when we need to get important information out of somebody?

c) What would Kant and Mill say to b)?

(note that the question is not about whether it's acceptable to use torture but about whether it's acceptable to use the *threat* of torture.)

# Nietzsche 1 – Cruelty, Punishment, Mercy

## Reading:

Friedrich Nietzsche *On The Genealogy of Morals*, Essay II

Read the whole of Essay II first, and then re-read the selected passages in the order of the questions below.

### 1: Cruelty

Read Book II, sections 5, 6, 7.

According to Nietzsche, what is the relationship between cruelty and morality? (Give answers which make reference to specific moral concepts, i.e. duty, guilt, etc..)

*Can you think of any other ways in which our pleasure in the spectacle of cruelty influences our morality? (you may refer to the sections on punishment, or you may put forward ideas which are not in the text at all).*

Nietzsche criticises our tendency to want to eradicate suffering. Is he saying that we should tolerate it? Encourage it? Why? *Do you agree?*

### 2: Punishment

Read Book II, sections 12,13,14.

What is the 'origin' of punishment according to Nietzsche?

*What light does this 'origin' cast on the morality of punishment?*

Which forms of punishment most clearly reflect its origins? Are they good forms of punishment?

### 3: Mercy

Read Book II section 10.

'Mercy remains the privilege of the most powerful man' - explain this sentence and *give examples to illustrate it.*

According to Nietzsche, when the power of community increases, how will the community's attitude to punishment be affected? *Do you think Nietzsche's answer is plausible? Illustrate your answer with examples.*

Is Nietzsche saying that those who are truly powerful do not enjoy making others suffer as much as those who are not so powerful do? How does this fit with what he says at the top of p.67?

## Nietzsche 2 – Ressentiment and Bad Conscience

### Reading:

Friedrich Nietzsche *On The Genealogy of Morals*, Book I, sections 13, 14, Book II  
Additional text: Plato Gorgias 483a-484a

#### Callicles's speech

For the truth is, Socrates, that you, who pretend to be engaged in the pursuit of truth, are appealing now to the popular and vulgar notions of right, which are not natural, but only conventional. Convention and nature are generally at variance with one another: and hence, if a person is too modest to say what he thinks, he is compelled to contradict himself; and you, in your ingenuity perceiving the advantage to be thereby gained, slyly ask of him who is arguing conventionally a question which is to be determined by the rule of nature; and if he is talking of the rule of nature, you slip away to custom: as, for instance, you did in this very discussion about doing and suffering injustice. When Polus was speaking of the conventionally dishonourable, you assailed him from the point of view of nature; for by the rule of nature, to suffer injustice is the greater disgrace because the greater evil; but conventionally, to do evil is the more disgraceful. For the suffering of injustice is not the part of a man, but of a slave, who indeed had better die than live; since when he is wronged and trampled upon, he is unable to help himself, or any other about whom he cares. The reason, as I conceive, is that the makers of laws are the majority who are weak; and they, make laws and distribute praises and censures with a view to themselves and to their own interests; and they: terrify the stronger sort of men, and those who are able to get the better of them in order that they may not get the better of them; and they say, that dishonesty is shameful and unjust; meaning, by the word injustice, the desire of a man to have more than his neighbours; for knowing their own inferiority, I suspect that they are too glad of equality. And therefore the endeavour to have more than the many, is conventionally said to be shameful and unjust, and is called injustice, whereas nature herself intimates that it is just for the better to have more than the worse, the more powerful than the weaker; and in many ways she shows, among men as well as among animals, and indeed among whole cities and races, that justice consists in the superior ruling over and having more than the inferior. For on what principle of justice did Xerxes invade Hellas, or his father the Scythians? (not to speak of numberless other examples). Nay, but these are the men who act according to nature; yes, by Heaven, and according to the law of nature: not, perhaps, according to that artificial law, which we invent and impose upon our fellows, of whom we take the best and strongest from their youth upwards, and tame them like young lions, -charming them with the sound of the voice, and saying to them, that with equality they must be content, and that the equal is the honourable and the just. But if there were a man who had sufficient force, he would shake off and break through, and escape from all this; he would trample under foot all our formulas and spells and charms, and all our laws which are against nature: the slave would rise in rebellion and be lord over us, and the light of natural justice would shine forth.

### 1: Ressentiment

Read Book I, sections 13, 14 and Book II, section 11.

What is the role of ressentiment in Nietzsche's history of morality?

Nietzsche's genealogy of morals, and in particular his theory of ressentiment presupposes that there are two kinds of people - the naturally strong, and the naturally weak. *How plausible is this? Would his theory still be viable without this presupposition? Argue for your answer.*

According to you are there any moral concepts which cannot be traced back to ressentiment? Give examples. *Does this constitute an objection to Nietzsche's view? Argue for your answer.*

## **2: Callicles**

Read Book I, sections 13, 14 and Book II, section 11, and Callicles' speech (above).

Callicles is often compared to Nietzsche. Give a point by point comparison, showing the following:

- how Callicles is offering a genealogy of the moral concepts of 'right' 'wrong' 'just' and 'unjust'.
- how Callicles is appealing to the concept of resentment in his exposition of his views.

Do you think there are any differences between Nietzsche's and Callicles's views? If so what are they?

## **3:Bad Conscience**

Read Book II sections 16, 17, 18, 19.

What is bad conscience? How is it related to resentment, and how does it differ from it?

Nietzsche seems to be saying that bad conscience can have good (active) as well as bad (reactive) aspects. What does he mean? Give examples of what he might consider a good manifestation of bad conscience and a bad one. Explain the difference between the two as clearly as you can.

If bad conscience can have good manifestations, then what consequences does this have for Nietzsche's overall view of morality?

# Outlines

Before you hand in your essay, you should submit an outline. The outline will be graded, and I will only accept essays from students who have submitted an outline on time.

- 1) Read the question carefully.
- 2) Do the reading specified in the question you have chosen. You will read the text by yourself first, and discuss it in class after you have completed your outline. Class discussion will contribute to your first draft, but the outline calls for independent work.

For the first essay, your outline should contain:

- An analysis of the argument you are asked to discuss, in terms of premises and conclusions. You should write down each premise both in your own words, and copy the text which you identified as expressing that premise.
- An example of your own illustrating the argument (or part of the argument).
- An objection to the argument and a reply.

For the second essay your outline should contain the same plus a second argument, you own, in which you put forward your own conclusion defended with your own premises.

## Jack Woods' Advice on Writing Philosophy Essays.

1. Use clear, simple prose. There is a temptation in philosophy to try to sound deep, grand, sophisticated, or literary. Resist! These sorts of touches come later. Professional philosophers should also aim for clear, simple prose. But often they fail at this. It is partially your job to make up for their failure by explaining their point clearly and simply in your own words. For example, if their name is "the highest one", do not write "that than which no higher can be conceived" as (a) this does not mean the same thing and (b) makes the reader do far too much work.
2. Less is more. Do not attempt to kick out the chocks from underneath, say, Rationalism or Theism in your first paper. Rather, pick a small issue which makes a major point and go after it with tweezers and a scalpel. Be clear about what the issue is, what is plausible about some solution to it, what is not and then decide on the basis of reasons whether or not this solution is tenable. I guarantee you that you will learn far more about the entire topic in this way.
3. Give examples. Philosophers love examples. A freshly thought-up accurate example of your own is incontrovertible proof that you understand something. For every claim you make, give an example to illustrate it (within reason!) This will make me happy.
4. Similarly with counterexamples. Whenever you make a claim, think about how someone might respond (again, within reason!). Then modify your position or include a pair of responses and your rebuttal.
5. Minimize long quotations---though be generous with citations to the work that you draw on, both explicitly and implicitly. It will serve you better in the long run to be able to paraphrase arguments in your own words. An eye for when to include a quote and when to paraphrase is a valuable and difficult thing to develop. Start early.
6. Be generous. Most philosophers are not left speechless at objections; try to respond on the behalf of the person or view you are raising problems for. Again, among the valuable skills you should endeavor to develop is the sense for what is appealing about a view that you find false. It is a good assumption that the people we will read are NOT STUPID. Do them the service of believing it of them.
7. Keep the structure simple. If you are arguing that Q on the basis of P, then structure your essay thus: I will argue that Q because P. Here is an argument that Q on the basis of P. I am arguing Q on the basis of P. Here are objections to Q because of P or just to Q. These objections don't work. I am rebutting criticism of my thesis: Q on the basis of P. In this essay, I have argued that Q on the basis of P and then addressed some criticisms of this claim. The end. This might sound too simple. It is not. Philosophy can be incredibly difficult; it is thus important to be as clear as possible as to what you are doing while you do it.
8. Finally, everything in your essay should be aimed at establishing your conclusion. Do not waste words. If it doesn't support your thesis, have to do with an objection to it, or serve to inform the reader where they are in the paper, delete it. Except your name. Keep this at the top left of the first page.

See also Angela Mendelovici's Prezi on how to write a philosophy essay: [http://prezi.com/z4h1\\_fwilbxj/a-sample-philosophy-paper/](http://prezi.com/z4h1_fwilbxj/a-sample-philosophy-paper/)

ESSAY SUBMISSION FAQ:

1) *When should I submit my essay?*

**The deadline for final drafts is written on the syllabus, and on moodle.**

2) *Can I submit my hard copy later if I submit on time on Moodle?*

**Yes: you can bring the hard copy the next day before 12.30.**

3) *What should I upload on moodle?*

**Please upload the final draft only on moodle.**

4) *Should I submit my outline/first draft t on Turnitin?*

**No.**

5) *What else should I submit?*

**You should submit hard copies of your final draft, and your outline.**

6) *How should I submit the hard copies?*

**Please slide them under my office door, even if you see that I am in my office.**

7) *If I'm not on campus, can I ask my friend to bring my essay to you?*

**Yes: provided you tell them to slide it under my door.**

8) *Can I show you a draft?*

**If you would like to show me a first draft, please feel free to come and see me in my office hours or other appointed times.**

9) *How long should my essay be?*

**As stated in the course pack, essay1 should be 1000 and essay 2 1500 words long. As is customary, you have a 5% margin.**

10) *Can I submit my essay late?*

**No: unless you have agreed on an extension with me previously. I need to grade all your work by a certain date in order to submit FZ grades.**

11) *What are the grading criteria?*

**They are stated in the coursepack.**

12) *Will my essay be graded if I don't submit an outline?*

**Yes, but you will not get feedback and you will lose 5 points.**

13) *What is an outline?*

**Please check the coursepack.**

14) *What is the plagiarism policy?*

**It's the same as the university's policy.**

15) *Can I submit handwritten work?*

**No: everything must be typed, including the outline.**

16) *How should I do the bibliography?*

**However you like, provided you cite all relevant information (author, title, edition, page numbers).**

17) *What shall I do if something goes wrong when I try to submit my essay on Turnitin?*

**You should contact BCC as soon as possible and they will help you sort it out.**

18) *What do I do if I forget the bibliography/ conclusion/ a footnote/ etc. on the version I submit on Turnitin?*

**Submit the full version as a hard copy, with a note as to which parts are not in the Turnitin version.**

19) *Can I contact you if I have a problem with my submission?*

**Yes, of course, provided it's a question that is not answered in this document or in the coursepack.**