NAME & COLLEGE: ……

PHIL 100: INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

Welcome to the Centre for Philosophy. This booklet contains all the information you need to know about the course, so please keep in a safe place for future reference.

PHILOSOPHY CONTACT POINTS

Postal Address:
Centre for Philosophy
Institute for Environment, Philosophy and Public Policy
Furness College
Lancaster University
Lancaster LA1 4YG

Tel: (01524) 592490
Fax: (01524) 592503

Email: philosophy@lancaster.ac.uk

World Wide Web: http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/philosophy/

Director, Centre for Philosophy and Institute for Environment, Philosophy and Public Policy (IEPPP)
Mr Vernon Pratt, Room C.20, Furness College, ext. 94196
(email: v.pratt@lancaster.ac.uk)

Teaching Programmes Co-ordinator:
Mrs Helen Shaw, Room C.18, Furness College, ext. 92490
(email: h.shaw@lancaster.ac.uk)

Part-time Secretary:
Room C.19, Furness College, ext. 92491
(email: philosophy@lancaster.ac.uk)

Part I Director of Studies:
Michaelmas Term: Dr Emily Brady-Haapala, Room C38, Furness College, ext. 92495 (email: e.brady@lancaster.ac.uk)
Lent & Summer Terms: Mr Vernon Pratt, Room C20, Furness College, ext. 94196 (email: v.pratt@lancaster.ac.uk)

THE TEACHING STAFF ON PART 1 PHILOSOPHY

Mr Vernon Pratt, Senior Lecturer, Head of Centre for Philosophy, Postgraduate Director, trained in Philosophy at Manchester University in the early sixties, took the B.Phil. at Oxford with Gilbert Ryle as his supervisor, and worked for nine years at Cardiff, before the Philosophy Department there was merged with Journalism. He spent formative time at the University of Ife in Nigeria just after the Civil War (*Nigerian*). He came to Lancaster in 1976, joining the neonate School of Independent Studies, where he became "Happy as a sandboy" (Christopher Driver, *The Guardian*). He was Dean of The County College, its Principal and the University Provost of Colleges before moving to the Department of Philosophy in 1994. Books include *Thinking Machines* (1986) and *The Philosophy of the Social Sciences* (1976). He has also written in the history and philosophy of biology, to which he is still trying to contribute. He relaxes by lounging about.

Dr Emily Brady-Haapala, Lecturer, studied in the USA, in Scotland (Edinburgh and Glasgow Universities), and taught at the Open University and Kent State University before coming to Lancaster. Her main philosophical interests are aesthetics, philosophy of mind, especially theories of imagination, and Kant. Outside Philosophy, she enjoys listening to jazz, cycling and riding.

Professor John O'Neill, studied at Lancaster University and taught in Beijing and the University College of North Wales and Sussex University before returning to Lancaster. His philosophical interests are in social and political thought, especially concerning socialism and the market, environmental ethics and economics, and the history and philosophy of science and mathematics. His publications include *Ecology, Policy and Politics* and *Worlds without Content*. He is on the editorial boards of *Capitalism, Nature and Socialism* and *Anarchist Studies*. His main non-philosophical activity is climbing rock, snow and ice.

Professor Alan Holland, studied at Oxford before coming to Lancaster. His philosophical interests are broad, ranging from ancient Greek thought to modern environmental issues and the implications of Darwinian theory. He was a founding member of the British Society for the History of Philosophy, is active in the Society for Applied Philosophy, and is founding editor of the journal *Environmental Values*. His recreations include cycling, fell-walking and nature watching.

Dr Clare Palmer, studied at Oxford, and taught at the University of Greenwich and Stirling University before coming to Lancaster. Her philosophical interests include ethics and environmental philosophy, especially animal ethics. She edits the journal *Worldviews: Environment, Culture and Religion*.

ABOUT THE COURSE

1. COURSE TEXT

It is essential to buy a copy of the course text: *Introduction to Philosophy,* edited by James E. White (West Publishing Company) price £15.99, which is available at Waterstones Bookshop on campus. You may be able to pick up second-hand copies from the Second-Hand Bookshop located in Pendle College. There are also 9 copies in the library.

2. LECTURES

There are two lectures per week:

MONDAYS & TUESDAYS
4.00pm in George Fox Building, Lecture Theatre 1

3. SEMINARS

You attend one seminar group per week. You will have been allocated a group on enrolment day. The full list of groups will be on the noticeboard in the Centre for Philosophy (which is part of the Institute for Environment, Philosophy & Public Policy) in the Reception Area on C.floor, Furness College from the first week of term if you need to check your group and room number etc. Tutors, times and places of seminars may be changed from one term to another, so you should check the seminar lists on the noticeboard of Week 1 in the Centre for Philosophy at the beginning of each term.

Attendance at seminars is compulsory, and seminars are conducted on the assumption that you have attended lectures and prepared the required reading and seminar exercises. Seminar tutors are required to keep records of seminar attendance. If you need to change your seminar time please consult Helen Shaw, Teaching Programmes Co-ordinator in C18, Furness (ext. 92490, email: h.shaw@lancaster.ac.uk), or the Part-Time Secretary in C19, Furness (ext. 92491, email: philosophy@lancaster.ac.uk). If you cannot come to the seminar because of illness etc., you must let Helen know who will inform your seminar tutor. If you have a prolonged illness we require a sick note from your doctor, or you can obtain a self-certification form from the Centre's Office (C.18/C.19).

If you wish to change any of your Part I courses you must obtain a change of enrolment form from the Undergraduate Registry, University House and obtain

signatures from the relevant department offices, checking that they will allow you on their Part I course, because many of the courses are full after initial registration in intro week. You are allowed to change courses up to the end of the second week of the Michaelmas Term. After that you are not allowed to change because you would be behind on the course you would be moving to.

4. AIMS

- This course aims to introduce students who have not previously studied the subject at University level to some of the central problems of philosophy, and to its technical concepts and forms of analysis.

By the end of the course you should be able to:

- explain in outline what is involved in (most of) the problems listed below;
- set out some of the influential argumentation that has been developed in relation to each;
- begin an independent evaluation of it and so make some progress towards developing authoritative views of your own.

5. STRUCTURE OF THE COURSE

This course offers an exploration of five central areas of the subject.

Section 1: Michaelmas Term (Weeks 1-4) **Freedom, Causality and Determinism:** we begin by looking at one important difference between our attitudes to people and our attitudes to (other) things: it is only people who are held responsible for what they do. People are responsible because they choose what to do and are free to choose not to do it. But doesn't science more and more reveal that what people do results from factors beyond their control? So are we as free as we may suppose?

Section 2: Michaelmas Term (Weeks 6-9) **Mind and Body:** concerns the differences between bodies and minds, and the problems which arise when one tries to give a clear account of how the two are related to each other. We then ask what, if anything, is special about creatures which have minds, humans being the prime example. Are we just complicated organic computers, and could computers think and feel as we do?

Section 3: Lent Term (Weeks 1-5) **Religion and Argument:** covers two topics in Philosophy: the study of reasoning, and philosophical questions about religion. We shall look at deductive and inductive types of reasoning, and their application to the issue of the existence of God.

Section 4: Lent Term (Weeks 6-9) **Personal Identity and Knowledge:** covers two areas of what is sometimes called "metaphysics" – namely personal identity and theory of knowledge. The first part looks at criteria of identity in general, and at the problem of how to define personal identity in particular. The second part considers the extent to which we can rely on our senses to give us knowledge, and raises the sceptical question of whether we can claim to know anything at all.

Section 5: Summer Term (Weeks 1-4) **Morality:** concerns one important human activity, valuing. Humans often criticise selfishness for being immoral, debate the principles upon which conflicts between interests are settled, condemn the violation of rights, the deliberate infliction of pain, the breaking of promises, and so on. We shall examine how, if at all, the judgements people make about these matters can be justified.

In each term there is a reading week in which there are no lectures or seminars. This is to punctuate the course and give time for you to read and work on your essay.

For each week of the course there is a seminar question, set out in the list: "Topics, Readings and Seminars" below. They are related to ideas and issues introduced in that week's lectures, so it is probably not worth addressing them until that week. But you should make an attempt at answering all of them, and be prepared to state your thoughts about them in the relevant seminar - even if this consists in the expression of puzzlement. Don't spend more than a couple of hours working on each of them (and it may often take less); but do write down whatever answers you come up with, since otherwise you'll probably forget what they were, and in any case writing things down is a good habit to acquire (it often helps one think more clearly, for instance). However, your answers to these seminar questions do not form any part of the assessment for the course - they are purely to aid understanding, and to provide some basis for seminar discussion.

It is usually worth taking notes from lectures, and from things that you read, and there will be an opportunity in the seminars to raise any points you wish to from these. So please come prepared, and make sure, for instance, that you have done the 'basic' reading and looked over your notes before the seminar.

6. BOOKS & READINGS

As you will see from the list of "Topics, Readings and Seminars", the recommended readings for each week are usually divided into "Basic" and "Further". You should read all or most of the "Basic" items, and certainly those from *Introduction to Philosophy*, and dip into some of the "Further" items for at

least some of the topics. All the "Basic" items are on short-loan in the Library, together with those "Further" items marked with an asterisk. Please take note of any comments we make about them on the reading list, since this may save you time and unnecessary difficulties. But don't feel yourself restricted to this list - do, for instance, browse around the Philosophy shelves in the library (class-marks A...), and look at other material in *Introduction to Philosophy,* and its suggestions for further reading.

We endeavour to post teaching materials - details of assignments, any special handouts, etc. - on our web pages, so that they are readily available at all times. We also provide some links there to introduce newcomers to the other resources - contributed by philosophy departments and philosophers world-wide. Many classic texts in philosophy are available there in electronic (and downloadable, and searchable) form (though copyright restrictions preclude the appearance of recent works), and there are various discussion groups (some, if there is enough interest, specifically for members of the Centre for Philosophy), biographies, bibliographies, portraits and so on. Our pages are at: http:/www.lancs./users/philosophy. The pages specifically for this course are at: http:/www.lancs./users/philosophy/100r.htm. Other useful philosophy sites: http:/www.epistemelinks.com; http./www.liv.ac.uk/Philosophy/philos.html; http://plato.stanford.edu/

You will probably find reading philosophical writings pretty difficult and slow-going, especially to begin with; and this is one of several reasons why it is usually better to read a little, carefully, than a lot, carelessly. Expect to have to read things several times over; and try noting down what you don't understand as well as what you do. (It is often more helpful to take notes just after you have done the reading rather than as you go along.) But do not get bogged down by a single sentence or paragraph or page that you cannot follow, if that is going to stop you getting to the end. You can always go back to the unintelligible bit later on, and it may make more sense the next time round.

Other books you might like to buy are M. Hollis, *Invitation to Philosophy* and T. Nagel, *What Does it All Mean?* A recent attempt to interest newcomers in philosophy is Adam Morton's, *Philosophy in Practice* (Oxford, 1996, Blackwell). A graspable picture of the whole panorama of Western Philosophy is offered by *The Oxford Illustrated History of Western Philosophy* (Oxford, 1994, OUP), edited by Anthony Kenny.

Like other disciplines, Philosophy has a lot of its own technical terms, including strange names for (often strange) ideas; and it also sometimes uses common terms but with its own technical meanings. *Introduction to Philosophy* contains a useful Glossary (page 343 onward). One volume dictionary/encyclopaedias of

philosophy have been, happily, in spate recently. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1995, CUP), edited by Robert Audi is by a large panel of experts and has an American style; *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy* (Oxford, 1994, OUP), edited by Simon Blackburn is a lively one-man band. *A Dictionary of Philosophy* (London, 1979, Pan) edited by Anthony Flew is older, well-established, and excellent value for money. A.R. Lacey's, with the same title, is also very helpful; and both include brief entries on famous philosophers. Less like other disciplines, no philosopher will altogether agree with another philosopher's dictionary-entries; and some of the entries in Flew, e.g. on certain political topics, are not unquestionable. (You will have to get used to there being no 'absolute authority' in Philosophy.) There is a very helpful *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* (ed. P. Edwards, 8 volumes) located near the Philosophy journals in the Library, at A1, and also the shorter *Concise Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy.*

7. ASSESSMENT

The assessment of the course consists of coursework written during the Michaelmas and Lent Terms, and a written examination in the Summer Term. The coursework assignments will be on Sections 1-4 of the course, and the examination will require you to answer 3 questions, one on Section 5 of the course and two on sections 1-4 of the course. The assignments consist of an essay or the like of about 1,500 words in length. The schedule for these assignments is set out below, with the deadlines, the handing-out and return dates. Guidance on what you are expected to do, and instructions on how and where it is to be handed in, etc., will be provided for each assignment, so please read these carefully when you receive them. They normally will be given out in lectures. It is your responsibility to make sure you receive the handouts. Copies of all handouts can be obtained from the Centre for Philosophy's Offices (C.18/C.19 Furness).

For your final mark at the end of the year, your coursework mark counts for two-thirds and your exam mark for one third. Omissions in coursework, however, or failure in the examination, count more heavily than they would on a straightforward application of this ratio. You are cautioned that anyone who is seriously in arrears with coursework risks exclusion from the University. The relationship between numerical marks and final Part I grades is fully explained in the Examinations section of the University Undergraduate Courses Handbook. (As a rough guide, you must have a final aggregate after the examination of over 35 to qualify for a minimum pass, and over 45 in a subject for admission to Part II major or combined major in that subject. See appendix 3).

For guidance on Part I essay writing and examination guidelines please see Appendix 1 and 2 at the end of this booklet.

8. REVISION

There will be two revision lectures in week 5 of Summer Term to help you with your exam.

9. QUERIES

Finally, if you have any queries about anything to do with the course, please ask your seminar tutor, or the person giving the lectures during that part of the course, or the Director of Part I Studies. Office hours of when they are available are posted on noticeboards outside their rooms. A list of Philosophy Part I seminar tutors is posted on the Part I noticeboard in the reception area of the Centre for Philosophy.

If you are unsure who to contact or have a problem call in at the Centre for Philosophy's Offices and see Helen (email: h.shaw@lancaster.ac.uk) or (email: philosophy@lancaster.ac.uk) in C.18/C.19, Furness

10. COMPLAINTS

If things have gone wrong or are going wrong, we very much want to hear about them: you will be doing us a service if you keep us informed. Please have a word with whoever is easiest for you: your seminar tutor, the person giving the lectures, Helen in the Centre's offices, Emily Brady, or your Part I tutor, or Vernon Pratt, Head of the Centre. Student reps. are elected at the beginning of the session, and their names are posted on the board: this gives you a way of making your point without revealing your identity to Philosophy staff.

11. WHAT YOU CAN EXPECT OF PHILOSOPHY STAFF

- Professionally competent lectures
- Professionally run seminars
- Professional departmental administration
- Professional assessment of your coursework, which should be returned by the due date, annotated so as to help you with learning points
- Professional assessment of your exam scripts
- Access to your tutor during their office hours for informal discussion related to the course
- Access to those lecturing on the course during their office hours as a back up to your tutor

- Access to the Part I tutor during their office hours as a back-up to your tutor
- Social and intellectual exchange with human beings who from time to time may be at large in the Centre.

12. DATES FOR ESSAYS

Based on	Essay title handed out	Deadline for essay	Essays to be returned in Seminars
Section 1: Freedom, Causality & Determinism	Michaelmas Term, week 1 in lectures	12 noon, Wed. of Michaelmas Term, Week 6 (15th Nov. 00)	Michaelmas Term, Week 8
Section 2: Mind & Body	Michaelmas Term, week 6 in lectures	12 noon, Wed. of Michaelmas Term, Week 10 (13th Dec. 00)	Lent Term, Week 1
Section 3: Religion & Argument	Lent Term, Week 1 in lectures	12 noon, Wed. of Lent Term, Week 6 (21st Feb. 01)	Lent Term, Week 8
Section 4: Personal Identity & Knowledge	Lent Term, Week 6 in lectures	12 noon, Wed. of Lent Term, Week 10 (21st March 01)	Summer Term, Week 1

No essay is required for Section 5: Morality, but there is a compulsory question to do in the exam on this part of the course. Do not post essays in the essay box after the deadline given above unless you have seen the Part I Director of Studies or Helen in C.18/C.19, Furness. Extensions for essays will not be given unless you have a valid reason - all illnesses should be covered by a sick note/self-certification note. If you are granted an extension you will be allowed normally no longer than the week the marked essays are given back to students. Once the marked essays have been given back and you still need an extension you will have to work on a different essay title which can be obtained from the Centre for Philosophy office. Extensions of this kind will, however, only be granted in exceptional circumstances.

13. SUBMISSION AND COLLECTION OF ESSAYS

Essays should be handed in via the essay box which is on the wall in the Reception area near the Part I Board in the Centre for Philosophy (IEPPP) on C. Floor in Furness College. Please fill in a cover sheet for your essay and attach it to your essay before posting in the box. The cover sheet that you should use will be attached to the essay question when it is given out, but spares will be available by the essay box. Please do not put your essay in a plastic folder. This is because we have to date stamp each essay and record them in - taking them out of folders is time consuming for us. Essays should normally be word-processed. Please do not hand in essays directly to your seminar tutor.

SYLLABUS IN SHORT

MICHAELMAS TERM

SECTION 1 (weeks 1-4): FREEDOM, CAUSALITY AND DETERMINISM
Lecturer: Vernon Pratt

SECTION 2 (weeks 6-9): MIND & BODY
Lecturer: Emily Brady

LENT TERM

SECTION 3 (weeks 1-5): RELIGION & ARGUMENT
Lecturer: to be announced

SECTION 4 (weeks 6-9): PERSONAL IDENTITY & KNOWLEDGE
Lecturer: Alan Holland

SUMMER TERM

SECTION 5 (weeks 1-4): MORALITY
Lecturer: Clare Palmer

SYLLABUS (IN FULL DETAILS)

TOPICS, READINGS AND SEMINARS FOR EACH TERM

SECTION 1: WEEKS 1-4, MICHAELMAS TERM – FREEDOM, CAUSALITY AND DETERMINISM

(* - on short loan in the Library)

Lecturer: Vernon Pratt

Recommended readings are mainly in James E. White: *Introduction to Philosophy*, West Publishing Company, Chapter 4 (hereafter: *Introduction to Philosophy*). Other useful introductory works on short loan:

Richard Taylor *Metaphysics*.
Martin Hollis *Invitation to Philosophy*.

Useful collections available on short loan:

Martin Curd *Argument and Analysis.*

WEEK 1: THE SCIENTIFIC WORLD - VIEW AND HUMAN FREEDOM

Basic Reading: B.F. Skinner, "Science and Human Behaviour", in *Introduction to Philosophy*, Ch. 4.

This is also the time to have a quick first read of the Introduction to Ch. 4 of *Introduction to Philosophy*. It should read more clearly and helpfully at the end of the half-term.

Further Reading: Martin Hollis, *Invitation to Philosophy*, Ch. 9. Martin Curd, *Argument & Analysis*, Introduction to Part IV, pp. 355-359.

Seminar: please bring with you a list of three features of human beings which you think are the most difficult for the scientific approach to account for.

WEEK 2: THE HUMAN BEING "AS A SUBJECT TO SCIENCE"

Basic Reading: John Hospers, "Psychoanalysis and Free Will" in *Introduction to Philosophy*, Ch. 4.

Further Reading: Review B.F. Skinner, "Science and Human Behaviour" in *Introduction to Philosophy*, Ch. 4, recommended for Week 1.

Seminar: in your own experience, do you feel there have been times when you have arrived at a decision freely? If so, what would persuade you this had been an illusion? Have you ever taken a decision, believing it to be "free" and later discovered that it hadn't been?

WEEK 3: ATTEMPTS TO RECONCILE FREEWILL WITH SCIENTIFIC DETERMINISM

Basic Reading: Kai Neilsen, "The Compatibility of Freedom and Determinism", *Introduction to Philosophy*, Ch. 4.

Further Reading: David Hume, "Of liberty and necessity" in Martin Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, Reading 30. Edwards, "Hard and Soft Determinism" in Martin Curd, Reading 31.

Seminar: what difference would it make to the way we behave if we came to believe we were mechanisms? Is this a trick question? Have you ever met anybody you suspected was a mechanism? What was happening to Arnie as he began to understand why people sometimes wept?

WEEK 4: THE PRINCIPLE OF CAUSALITY

Basic Reading: David Hume, excerpt in *Introduction to Philosophy*, Ch. 4, headed "Scepticism about Causation".

Further Reading: Taylor, *Metaphysics*, Ch. 9. Hume on "necessary connection" in Curd, *Argument and Analysis,* Reading 42. Ewing on "cause" in Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, Reading 43. The readings in Part IV of Curd's book are also to the point.

Seminar: try to imagine a world which was exactly like ours except that everything that happened in it happened *by accident*. Can you? Might our world in fact, when we come to think about it, *be* like that itself? Or would the chances against this being the case be too high? (Here is an example of an accident: your car won't start on your birthday.)

WEEK 5: REVIEW WEEK - NO LECTURES OR SEMINARS

SECTION 2: WEEKS 6-9, MICHAELMAS TERM – MIND AND BODY

Lecturer: Emily Brady

Basic readings in *Introduction to Philosophy*, chapter 5.

For a generally useful reference book, see Samuel Guttenplan's *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, in the library.

Websites: David Chalmers has a rich guide at:
www.u.arizona.edu/~chalmers/biblio.html
and www.u.arizona.edu/~chalmers/resources.html
For a helpful on-line dictionary:
www.artsci.wustl.edu/~philos/MindDict/dictindex.html
For good philosophy links: www.epistemelinks.com and then click on Philosophy of Mind.

WEEK 6: THE MIND-BODY PROBLEM

Basic readings: ch.5 Introduction, in *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 172-174; Descartes, "The Mind as Distinct from the Body", in *Introduction to Philosophy,* pp. 175-176.

Further: all the following provide good introductions to the problem: M. Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, pp. 217-223; T. Nagel, *What Does It All Mean?,* ch. 4; J. Hospers, *Introduction to Philosophical Analysis*, 3rd edition, ch.6, pp. 244-249 (2nd edn., ch. 20, pp. 378-382). P. Smith and O. Jones, *The Philosophy of Mind*, ch. I; J. Heil, *Philosophy of Mind: A Contemporary Introduction*, ch 1: Introduction; G. Graham, "What is Philosophy of Mind?", ch. 1 in his *Philosophy of Mind: An Introduction*.

Seminar: Which of the following are mental and which physical? If any seem doubtful, think why: Being six feet tall; being deep in thought; moving to the right; feeling happy; listening to music; stepping on a tack (and the pain that goes with it); being red; laughing at a joke; signing a cheque.

WEEK 7: DESCARTES AND DUALISM

Basic readings: Descartes, "The Mind as Distinct from the Body", in *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 175-176; G. Ryle, "Descartes' Myth" in *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 177-183.

Further: for Descartes' arguments for dualism, see M. Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, pp. 311-322; P. Smith and O. Jones *The Philosophy of Mind*, ch. III or the relevant chapters in J. Cottingham's *Descartes.* Several articles in *Cogito* (Philosophy serials, A6 in Library), a useful journal aimed specifically at student readers, are also worth looking at: R.S. Woolhouse, "Cartesian Dualism and its Problems", vol. 3, 1989; and J. Cottingham, "Descartes on Mind and Body", vol. 2, 1988. Princess Elizabeth's criticisms of Descartes' theory can be found in *The Essential Descartes*, ed. Margaret Wilson. For informative and critical discussions of dualism more generally, see:; M. Hollis, *Invitation to Philosophy*, ch. 6; D. Jacquette, *Philosophy of Mind*, ch. 1; J. Heil, *Philosophy of Mind: A Contemporary Introduction*, ch. 2; C.D. Broad, "The Traditional Problem of Body and Mind" in Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, pp. 232-239.

Seminar: in one of your reading selections for this week, "The Mind as Distinct from the Body" (*Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 175-176), Descartes' argues that the mind and the body are two distinct things. How does he support this claim? To be precise in answering this question, you should attempt to outline his argument by setting out its premises and conclusion.

WEEK 8: THE LIMITS OF MATERIALISM

Basic readings: P. Churchland, "Reductive and Eliminative Materialism" in *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 204-208; T. Nagel, "What Is It Like to Be a Bat?" in *Introduction to Philosophy,* pp. 208-216.

Further: for discussion of materialist theories, see: D.M. Armstrong, "The Central-State Theory" in *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 184-191; M. Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, pp. 327-333; D. Jacquette, *Philosophy of Mind*, ch. 2; K. Campbell, *Body and Mind*, chs. 4-5; Churchland, *Matter and Consciousness*, ch. 2. For criticisms of materialism and a discussion of Nagel's view see: P. Smith and O. Jones, *The Philosophy of Mind*, ch. XV, especially pp. 216-219; J. Searle, *The Rediscovery of the Mind*, ch. 2. For a discussion of 'qualia' see: J. Heil, *Philosophy of Mind: A Contemporary Introduction*, pp. 121-127; O. Flanagan, *Consciousness Reconsidered*, ch.4. Frank Jackson's argument for qualia can be found in his article, "Epiphenomenal Qualia", *Philosophical Quarterly* 32 (1982), pp. 127-136.

Seminar: What does Nagel's argument prove about our subjective experience of the world (and qualia)? Does it present a decisive argument against materialism and eliminative materialism?

WEEK 9: THE MIND-COMPUTER ANALOGY

Basic reading: John Searle, "Can Computers Think?" in *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 197-203.

Further: for discussion and criticism of functionalism see: *Introduction to Philosophy*, J. Fodor, "Functionalism", pp. 192-197; J. Heil, *Philosophy of Mind: A Contemporary Introduction*, ch. 4; P. Smith and O. Jones, *The Philosophy of Mind*, chaps. XI-XII. On philosophy and artificial intelligence: M. Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, pp. 333-345; Searle gives a fuller account of his position in his *Minds, Brains and Science*; for the "Turing Test" see A.M. Turing, "Computing Machinery and Intelligence", reprinted in A.R. Anderson, ed., *Minds and Machines;* also all the following in *Twenty Questions: An Introduction to Philosophy*, eds. Bowie, Michaels and Solomon: D. Dennett, "Artificial Intelligence as Philosophy and as Psychology", pp. 244-256; Owen Flanagan, "Cognitive Psychology", pp. 256-266; A. Zuboff, "The Story of a Brain", pp. 276-282; Margaret Boden's book, *The Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence*.

Seminar: Are machines like us? Are we like machines? The second session of this week includes a video showing of the Star Trek: Next Generation series episode: "The Measure of a Man". For seminars this week, reflect on Searle's objections to the claim that computers can think, and be prepared to discuss the questions asked on the Star Trek handout.

WEEK 10: REVIEW WEEK - NO LECTURES OR SEMINARS

SECTION 3: WEEKS 1-5, LENT TERM – RELIGION AND ARGUMENT

Lecturer: to be announced

This section of the course studies some of the arguments to be found in the philosophy of religion. Chapters 1 and 2 of the course text are relevant and should be read in advance of the lectures. Particular references are given below.

WEEK 1: ARGUMENTS IN PHILOSOPHY

Before we examine some of the arguments which have occurred in the philosophy of religion we first need to look at the nature of arguments and the methods for

their assessment. The material is summarised on pp. xi-xii of the course text and will be elaborated in detail in lectures.

Seminar: what is the definition of validity and what is the connection between validity and truth?

WEEK 2: THE DEDUCTION OF GOD: A DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

The reading is *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 1-12.

Seminar: why existence may not be a property?

WEEK 3: THE INDUCTION OF GOD

This week's lectures examine the claim that the world itself provides us with evidence that it was designed. The reading is pp. 22-32 of *Introduction to Philosophy*.

Seminar: does the world look as if it is designed?

WEEK 4: REVIEW WEEK – NO LECTURES OR SEMINARS

WEEK 5: THE CASE OF ATHEISM: THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

In this week's lectures we see that it is no more easy to disprove the existence of God by argument than it is to prove it. The reading is pp. 33-49 and 55-73 of *Introduction to Philosophy*.

Seminar: are evil and the goodness of God really incompatible?

SECTION 4: WEEKS 6-9 LENT TERM – PERSONAL IDENTITY & KNOWLEDGE

Lecturer: Alan Holland

As background reading for this section of the course you might sample: "The Cave", "Ants, Spiders and Bees", "The Web of Belief" and "The Elusive 'I'" – chs. 3-6 of *Invitation to Philosophy* by Martin Hollis; "How do we know anything at all?" and "Death" – chs. 2 & 9 of *What does it all mean?* by Tom Nagel.

As a further reading for the section you might sample: John Perry (ed.) *Personal Identity* and A.J. Ayer, *The Problem of Knowledge*.

WEEK 6: SHOES, SHIPS & SEALING WAX: CRITERIA OF IDENTITY

Reading: John Locke, "The Idea of Personal Identity", White, *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 222-225; David Hume, "Of Personal Identity", White, *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 225-228; extracts from Aristotle and Hobbes.

Seminar: Which is the *real* ship of Theseus – the one made of the original timbers, or the one that has been continually refurbished? In justifying your answer explain how you are interpreting the notion of "spatio-temporal continuity".

WEEK 7: PERSONAL IDENTITY

Reading: John Hick "The Resurrection of the Person", White, *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 243-249; Peter Geach, "Immortality", White, *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 249-254; extract from Bernard Williams.

Seminar: When did YOU begin to exist? When (i.e. under what *kind* of circumstances) will you cease to exist?

WEEK 8: THE PROBLEM OF PERCEPTION

Reading: John Locke, "Perception and Knowledge", White, *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 110-113; Bertrand Russell, "Appearance and Reality", White *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 113-117.

Seminar: Does Russell succeed in convincing you that "the real table … is not the same as what we immediately experience by sight or touch or hearing" ("Appearance and Reality", pp. 115)?

WEEK 9: DO WE KNOW ANYTHING AT ALL?

Reading: Descartes, "Mediation 1", White, *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 96-98; William James, "The Will to Believe", secs. 1-IV, VII, White, *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 76-80, extract from W.K. Clifford.

Seminar: How do you know that you are not the "star" of the Truman Show, or the victim of Descartes' "evil genius"? Do you think you know that this is at least unlikely? What kind of evidence could you have?

WEEK 10: REVIEW WEEK – NO LECTURES OR SEMINARS

SECTION 5: WEEKS 1-4, SUMMER TERM - MORALITY

Lecturer: Clare Palmer

WEEK 1: UTILITARIANISM

Basic Readings: *Introduction to Philosophy*, J.S. Mill, "Utilitarianism", pp. 314-323. *Introduction to Philosophy*, Paul Taylor, "A Problem for Utilitarianism", pp. 324-328.

Further: Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, pp. 183-195. James Rachels, "The Elements of Moral Philosophy", Ch. 8. J. Hospers, *Human Conduct*, 1st ed., ch. 12, or 2nd ed. ch. 4. R. Norman, **The Moral Philosophers*, ch. 7, is a good discussion of Mill, especially of the higher v. lower pleasures distinction. D.D. Raphael, **Moral Philosophy*, ch. 4, and P. Pettit, *Judging Justice*, ch. 11, provide decent introductions to utilitarianism; and for discussion of some standard problems, see ch. 13 of Hospers, *op.cit.* Ch. 7 of Hospers is useful on the claim that happiness/pleasure is the only intrinsic good; and for Aristotle's view of happiness, see R. Norman, *op.cit.*, ch. 3. A useful overview of issues and theories in moral philosophy is M. Hollis **Invitation to Philosophy*, ch. 7, "The Ring of Gyges" (the title refers to a passage in Plato's *Republic*).

Seminar: How would a Utilitarian decide on the rights and wrongs of:

(a) Keeping or breaking promises?
(b) Telling the truth or lying?

(c) Punishing or not punishing someone?

WEEK 2: KANT

Basic Readings: *Introduction to Philosophy*, Kant, "The Categorical Imperative", pp. 328-332.

Further: Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, pp.195-204. J. Rachels, *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, chs. 9-10. Richard Norman's **The Moral Philosophers*, ch. 6, is a helpful introduction to Kant's ethics. A difficult, but rewarding, introduction is J. Kemp's *The Philosophy of Kant*, ch. 3, esp. pp. 56-75. Discussion relevant to the applicability of Kant's supreme principle of morality are James Rachels, "The Morality of Euthanasia", in G. Lee Bowie et al, eds. *Twenty Questions,* and Onora O'Neill, "Kantian Approaches to Some Famine Problems".

Seminar: How would a Kantian decide on the rights and wrongs of:

(a) Keeping or breaking promises?
(b) Telling the truth or lying?
(c) Punishing or not punishing someone?

WEEK 3: ARISTOTLE

Basic Readings: *Introduction to Philosophy ,* Aristotle "Happiness and the Good Life", pp. 299-309.

Further: A clear introduction is J.O. Urmson's, *Aristotle's Ethics*. Alasdair MacIntyre's *After Virtue* is a modern classic which defends virtue theory. J. Rachels, *Elements,* "The Ethics of Virtue". R. Norman, *The Moral Philosophers,* Part I "Aristotle".

Seminar: How would an Aristotelian decide on the rights and wrongs of:

(a) Keeping or breaking promises?
(b) Telling the truth or lying?
(c) Punishing or not punishing someone?

WEEK 4: BUT IT'S ALL RELATIVE, ISN'T IT? MORAL RELATIVISM, SUBJECTIVISM AND SCEPTICISM ABOUT VALUES

Basic Readings: *Introduction to Philosophy*, J. Rachels, "The Challenge of Cultural Relativism", pp. 274-284.

Further: A.C. Ewing, "The Objectivity of Moral Judgements", pp. 288-293. Mary Midgley, "Trying Out One's New Sword", both in*Twenty Questions*, pp. 587-590. Curd, *Argument and Analysis*, pp.171-174. P. Singer, *Practical Ethics*, 2nd ed., ch. 1, esp. pp. 4-8. The Open University, **Introduction to Philosophy* (R. Hursthouse), Units 13-15, pp. 9-20 and 47-61, are good on what's meant by 'subjectivity'; D.D. Raphael **Moral Philosophy*, chaps 2 and 3, discusses the objectivity (or otherwise) of moral judgements; and J. Mackie's *Ethics*, chap. 1, is interesting but quite difficult on this.

Seminar: do you agree with Rachels that Cultural Relativism "is not so plausible as it first appears to be?" Why, or why not?

WEEK 5: REVISION LECTURES FOR EXAM (NO SEMINARS)

APPENDIX 1

PART I ESSAY WRITING GUIDELINES

Those who mark your essays are chiefly looking for two things:

(a) your understanding of material covered in or relevant to the course, reflected in your ability to analyse arguments concisely;
(b) your ability to develop your own criticisms of arguments and to develop arguments to support your own conclusions.

Hints on achieving these two:

Philosophy is not painting by numbers, and these are not the numbers! Use them with intelligence. In philosophy, as in painting, one learns how to do it by close inspection of the work of philosophers (or painters). If in doubt about how to write, write as if to explain things to people who know less philosophy than you do – try it out on your friends.

Analysis

All disciplines involve reasoning but there is a special focus on it in philosophy. In Section 2 of the course, you will be introduced to different kinds of reasoning and a vocabulary designed for talking about reasoning and argument. It is important that you master this vocabulary and get into the habit of using it when thinking about your own and other people's arguments.

The aim of an analysis of an argument is to show what the bare bones of the argument are. This is not a précis and is often best done backwards! – read on …

Ask:

1. What question is this piece asking?
2. What answer is given to that question?
3. What reasons are given in support of that answer?
4. What reasons are given in support of those reasons - and so on until you reach 5.
5. What are the 'premises' (i.e. assumptions or reasons for which no reasons are given)?
6. What sort of support are the reasons supposed to be providing for the conclusions?

7. Bear in mind throughout that you want to sift out everything which is not absolutely vital to the case being made – you want to reveal what is essential.
8. It is a fairly natural human failing to misinterpret (more or less wilfully) arguments for conclusions you disagree with, thereby making them seem weaker than they are – be wary.

Criticism

Once you have your 'wiring diagram' of the argument, you can set about criticising it relevantly:

Internal criticisms:

How well do the reasons support the conclusion?
Are there stronger reasons than the author gives for the same conclusion?
Do the reasons equally support an alternative conclusion?
Are there reasons for not accepting the conclusion, or any of the assumptions?
Does anything follow from the conclusion, which might appear to be grounds for rejecting it?
Are there ambiguities in any of the terms or claims made?
Are there alternative interpretations of what is being argued?

External criticisms:

Are there alternative answers to the question, which the author has not considered?
What reasons could be given to support these answers?

Next:

1. How might the author respond to your criticisms – it is unlikely that any of the authors you read would just say "Oh, silly me, back to the drawing board" – philosophers are not like that!
2. How would you respond to the author's supposed response?
3. Set up a dialogue (as Plato did!).

Originality

Doing this sort of analysis of philosophical writings will prepare you for presenting your own approach to philosophical questions in a similar way. You are encouraged to be creative and use your imagination and certainly to put forward your own views on questions asked, but you need to do so within the discipline of

philosophy. It is often best to say what your conclusion is at the start of your essay (philosophy is not a detective story) then the reader knows where you are going and can better appreciate how you are getting there.

Ideally, essays should begin with an abstract – i.e. brief statement of the thesis of your argument and the main reasons you are offering in support of it. An abstract is not just a précis: it does not have to and usually should not preserve the order of presentation of the main body of the essay. Abstracts are usually better written after the rest of the essay.

Get into the habit of writing abstracts of everything you read. To discover what an abstract is, try reading abstracts (where they appear) of journal articles and short reviews of books.

Quotes

It is rarely necessary to quote at length in philosophy. Quotations should be offered only in support of a point or interpretation which you have also explained in your own words. You should never use the quote to 'do your talking for you'. Words quoted do not contribute to the word length of the essay.

Quotations should be clearly marked as such: given them lines to themselves, indent, quotation marks, and a precise reference which enables the reader to find the quote – this requires page numbers and edition number where relevant.

Inclusive Language

The Centre for Philosophy is committed to the University's advisory guidelines on Inclusive Language and Social Diversity, which are intended to raise awareness and assist staff and students in avoiding language which excludes, degrades or gives unintentional offence. *For example,* "learning difficulties" is preferred to "mentally handicapped"; "black" is preferred to "coloured"; "her/his" or "she/he" is preferred to "he"; and "humankind" or "human" is preferred to "mankind" or "man". For University guidelines see http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/equalopp/ or see guidance in the pamphlet posted on the Part I noticeboard.

Bibliographies

All texts you have referred to or used in the preparation for your essay should be listed in alphabetical order along with publishers and dates of publication. Hint: make a note of these details of everything you read as you go along. Example: Thomas Nagel, "What Is It Like to Be a Bat?" in James E. White (ed.),

Introduction to Philosophy (West Publishing Company, 1989). You do not have to stick to exactly this format, but the information should be there.

Plagiarism

Your work should be the result of your own thought. If you are rephrasing or précising someone else's thought, you should say so and cite the source. If in doubt, err on the side of avoiding plagiarism by acknowledging and citing your source.

APPENDIX 2

PART I EXAMINATION GUIDELINES & ADVICE

Exams are not simply memory tests – we have machines (or parrots) to do that. So do not just remind us of what we said to you in lectures – that is too easy.

Exams are an opportunity for you to exercise the skills of reasoning which Part I Philosophy is geared to encourage you to develop. Of course, in order to display these skills you do need to know the philosophical theories and positions about which you are reasoning (e.g. if you don't know what Cartesian Dualism is or how Ryle criticised it, you will be hard pressed to answer a question on whether the criticism is a fair one).

Examination skills are in demand in all walks of life: to be sure, you do not elsewhere have to exercise them sitting in silent straight lines – that is a privilege of academia – but you do get put on the spot – in committees, the workplace, the board room, parliament, tv, the pub, wherever – to use what you happen to know at the time in the best way you can to bear upon a question you have just been asked and not necessarily thought about in quite that form.

Revision

The best way to start is to look at some old exam papers, select questions on the areas of the course you feel happiest with or for any other reason decide to answer exam questions on. Then what you need to do is to sketch out answers to those questions. The point of this is two-fold:

1. it reveals to you gaps in your knowledge – your revision can then take the form of filling in those gaps. So, what you revise has a context and that makes it easier to remember;
2. it constitutes practice in the skill which exams test – arranging material in a way which produces a relevant answer to a question you have not had prior warning of.

Having revised one topic, it is wise to set up exam conditions for yourself and see how much you can write in one hour. This will enable you to avoid running out of time in the exam.

Revise materials in bundles and practice re-arranging the bundles to gear them to different questions – this sort of thing can be done in the bath, on a hillside … and can actually be fun. Revising should be an active process of exploring how the things you have studied during the course fit together – special things start

to happen when they all get into your head together. There are many connections between different sections of the course – the exam is an opportunity to use these connections. Do not be afraid to use material from one section of the course in an answer to a question from another section if you feel it is relevant.

You answer 3 questions in the exam. Revising only three topics is obviously cutting it much too fine. Revising the whole course is a bit excessive. Choose somewhere between the two with which you feel safe.

The Exam Format

The exam is three hours long and you are required to answer three questions which carry equal weight in terms of marks.

It is divided into two sections:

(a) on the first four sections of the course (approx. 8 questions – 2 on each section);
(b) on the fifth section of the course (on which you have not been asked to do coursework, so should be tested in some way) (approx. 4 questions).

You have to answer two questions from section A and one question from section B. Your answers should be around 4 sides long for each question, depending on handwriting. On the subject of handwriting we cannot mark what we cannot read, so do try to be legible. The pass mark is 35.

Writing Exams

Select the questions you intend to answer at the beginning. If you leave, e.g. the choice of a third question until after you have written 2 answers, you will be tired and might choose unwisely.

Sketch out plans (a bit like essay abstracts or seminar preparation) for each answer. While you are writing the first answer, extra things might occur to you to put into the later answers. Write them down – you might forget them.

So, selection and planning time is probably about 15 minutes, which leaves you with 2 hours and 45 minutes for writing – divide that by 3 and that gives you 55 minutes per answer. But then there is reading through time. This is fairly important – it is easy, in the heat of the moment to leave out the odd word, like 'not', which might be a bit crucial. So it is wise to leave 15 minutes for that which leaves you with 50 minutes for writing each answer.

Divide your time equally between the three questions. It is virtually impossible to make up for a missing or very short answer by two long ones.

This, of course, is in the ideal world. I do not expect anyone has ever been so organised in any exam!

Each answer should show:

(a) familiarity with and understanding of the relevant material;
(b) ability to engage critically with it – what is involved in this is just as in an essay – so, see those guidelines – or the sort of thing you have been doing in seminars all year.

If you seem to have run out of things to say, just imagine a seminar group challenging what you have just said and defend yourself against it.

Do ensure that you answer the question – not that there's only one way of doing that. Organise the material you have to address the question asked. Lecture material will be relevant, but not just as it was presented in lectures. You can lose marks for putting in things irrelevant to the question. If you are in doubt about what the question is getting at, or fear you have misinterpreted it, say so and justify your interpretation as a possible one.

Remember that there are always arguments for and against any thesis.
Remember that there is a BIG difference between disagreeing with something as a sort of gut reaction and giving arguments against it.

Remember, another human being is going to read what you write. If you have left something out, add a footnote. If you see any deficiency in what you have written, explain it – it shows critical awareness which is a philosophical virtue.

Finally

Do not panic. All Part 1 students have a right to resit if they fail, but it costs money and messes up your summer.

You will perform better if you are healthy, rested, and have had enough sleep and food. Do not wear yourself out revising, though it can be the best way of not panicking. If you revise just by reading your notes right up to the last minute, you might have difficulty switching from 'input' to 'output' when you get a pen in your hand. There is a tradition in Universities that the older generation tells the younger generation to take a holiday prior to exams so as to be fresh for the occasion. I doubt if any younger generation has ever taken this advice seriously.

Go into the exam with confidence that you have learnt a lot in the year and here is your opportunity to shine.

Who knows, you might even enjoy the peace and quiet of the exam room and being waited on by invigilators – no þhones ringing, no one to nag you, no worries!

APPENDIX 3

CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF MARKS ON AN ESSAY OR EXAM ANSWER

FIRST = 70%+, Part One Code: M1

The work meets the criteria for a 2.1 and in addition shows at least some of:

- exceptional lucidity of argument
- exceptional strength of structure
- exceptional mastery of problem being addressed
- a thorough and critical familiarity with challenging literature
- an original approach
- a creative line of argument

Marks within this class may vary reflecting:

- a capacity to develop arguments beyond those in the relevant literature
- depth and sophistication of the argument
- critical acumen

CLASS 2 DIVISION 1 = 60%-69%, Part One Code: M1

There is:

- clarity of thought and expression
- ability to marshal arguments into a sustained and well-organised statement
- a good grasp of the philosophical problem being addressed
- critical awareness
- a tight sense of relevance

and normally

- knowledge and understanding of relevant literature.

Particular strength under one of these heads is seen as compensating for weakness under another.

CLASS 2 DIVISION 2 = 50%-59%, Part One Code: M2

- the majority of the text is clear enough to be understood

- the answer has a structure
- a basic grasp of the question is demonstrated

There is:

- critical awareness
- some coherent argumentation
- evidence of serious study
- a sense of relevance is exercised

and normally:

- some knowledge is shown of relevant literature

Distinguished from a 2.1 therefore by

- lower level of coherence
- lower level of critical awareness

and normally

- lower level of knowledge and understanding of relevant literature

THIRD = 45%-49%, Part One Code = M3; 40%-44% = N

The majority of the text is clear enough to be understood. There is:

- a degree of structure
- some grasp of the question
- some attempt at argument
- some evidence of serious study
- some sense of relevance

and normally:

- some knowledge of relevant literature.

Particular strength under one of these heads is seen as compensating for weakness under another.

Thus distinguished from 2.2 by some of

- limited knowledge of relevant material

- limited powers of organisation of material
- absence of critical discussion
- lack of clarity
- lack of relevance

PASS 35%-39% = Part One Code: Q

The work shows:

- some clear text
- some evidence of study
- some evidence of an attempt to provide a relevant answer
- some attempt at argument

So distinguished from 3rd by

- relative weakness in the features listed
- lack of structure

FAIL = 0%-34%, Part One Code: 30%-34% F1; 0%-30% F2

Work that fails to meet the criteria for a Pass.

The work will thus be characterised by all of:

- inadequate or no knowledge of relevant material
- no critical discussion
- little or no structure argument
- endemic lack of clarity

or

- complete irrelevance

PLEASE NOTE

Every effort will be made to construe the work as relevant to the question set.

These criteria only come into play when the work is accepted as the student's own.

GLOSSARY

'critical', as in 'critical argument': argument that shows awareness that claims are open to test and evaluation.

'critical awareness': awareness that claims are open to test and evaluation.

'material': arguments and discussion on the topic derived from books or independent thought.

Centre for Philosophy
October 2000