AAPT's 8th International Workshop-Conference on Teaching Philosophy will be held at Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, August 6-10, 1990.

Over the past 14 years, AAPT has sponsored workshop-conferences to help improve the quality of philosophy teaching. A special component of this summer's conference will be an intensive seminar for graduate students and beginning philosophy teachers. Conference sessions scheduled are as follows:

### Aesthetics:
- Hamlin, Phil. Participation and Interaction in Aesthetics Classes.
- Hayward, Albert W. Aesthetic Experience and Condition-Governed Terms.

### Children:
- Hoebing, Phil. Philosophy for Children.

### Computer:
- Brady, Rob. Logic Works.
- Bynum, Terry. Teaching Computer Ethics -- Two Approaches.
- Close, Daryl. Keeping a Gradebook in a Spreadsheet.
- Pole, Nelson. Teaching Logic with a Supplemental Computer Program.

### Critical Thinking:
- Decyk, Betsy N. Working with Examples.
- Klein, Ellen R. Feminism and Critical Thinking: Are They Compatible?
- Wilson, Arnold. Students' Critical Thinking Portfolio.

### Ethics:
- Annis, David B. Teaching a General Ethics Course: Its Goals, and What the Empirical Research In Moral Psychology Implies for Effectively Teaching an Ethics Course.
- Bynum, Terry. Teaching Computer Ethics -- Two Approaches.
- Cavalier, Robert. Project Theoria - The Ethics Videodisc.
- Graber, Glenn. Beyond the Headlines: A Workshop on Values & Ethics for Officials of City Government.
- Peak, Ira H. The Evaluation Menu: Humanizing the Assessment of Student Performance/Student Learning in Ethics Courses.
- Reinemith, William A. Ethics in Health Care.
- Suttle, Bruce B. The Ethics of Intolerance or Why One Has a Moral Obligation to be Biased.

(Continued on Pg. 3)
From the President
by Rosalind Elyman Ladd
Wheaton College, Norton, MA

Philosophical Heroines and Heroes

A physician I know claims that he was first inspired to go into medicine when, as a boy of 12, he read Sinclair Lewis' *Arrowsmith*. In that book, which is read by a surprisingly large number of physicians-to-be, the hero is caught in a dramatic ethical dilemma. He must choose between the demands of science and the claims of humanitarian feeling. He could save many lives by administering his newly-developed vaccine to the inhabitants of a plague-ridden island, but if he does so without withholding the vaccine from a control group, his discovery, even if efficacious, will not be accepted as "proven" by the scientific community. If he does withhold it from some, those people face certain death.

*Arrowsmith* portrays the physician as a romantic hero and the pursuit of scientific research as an exciting and rewarding career. It is also a "good read," so that people pick it up, not necessarily to learn a lesson, but for all the other reasons that one reads good novels.

Does philosophy have its Martin Arrowsmith? Are there books, especially for young readers, that portray the excitement of trying to resolve the mind-body problem, the dramatic struggle of the young philosopher forced to choose between the demands of publication and the demands of teaching? Are there even sedate stories that portray the satisfaction of a class well taught, the exhilaration of a paper well written, the overall gratification of academic life? What portraits do we have in fiction of the philosopher?

My class in Philosophy and Literature recently read Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*. One of the central characters is Mr. Ramsey, a professor of philosophy. Woolf portrays him very much as the stereotypical Oxford or Cambridge don: highly intelligent, slightly distracted and befuddled, completely wrapped up in his own work and in himself, totally insensitive to the needs of his family.

Woolf also offers what is, I think a brilliant portrayal of the philosophy graduate student, following doggedly in the literal and figurative footsteps of his mentor, learning all too well how to become a model philosopher.

Through the eyes of one of the children, Woolf tries to explain the work of philosophy, as well.

She asked him what his father's books were about. "Subject and object and the nature of reality." Andrew had said. And when she said Heavens, she had no notion what that meant, 'Think of a kitchen table then,' he told her, 'when you're not there.'

And, from his point of view:

If thought is like the keyboard of a piano, divided into so many notes, or like the alphabet is ranged in twenty-six letters all in order, then his splendid mind had no sort of difficulty in running over those letters one by one, firmly and accurately, until it had reached, say, the letter Q. He reached Q. Very few people in the whole of England ever reach Q. . . But after Q? What comes next? R is then - what is R?

In a moment of self-doubt, which all philosophers will recognize, Mr. Ramsey imagines people saying of him that he is a failure. He reassesses his work, squares his shoulders, and decides that he is not to be blamed if he now requires sympathy and whisky.

My students concluded that Mr. Ramsey is a failure, as a person and as a philosopher. This, despite the fact that he manages, as one character notes in amazement, "Imagine, to feed eight children on philosophy!"

(Continued on Pg. 12)
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Ethics (Cont.)


Evaluation:

Peak, Ira H. The Evaluation Menu: Humanizing the Assessment of Student Performance/Student Learning in Ethics Courses.

Peddicott, William J. Correct Primary Referent - You Can't Learn Without It.

Feminism:

Klein, Ellen R. Feminism and Critical Thinking: Are They Compatible?

Komen, Jane Y. Feminist Theory and Practice in the Undergraduate Classroom: Examples of Application.

Poland, Helen Dwyer. Teaching Feminist Material to Males.

Grading:

Brady, Rob. Computerized Grading in Logic.

Close, Daryl. Keeping a Gradebook in a Spreadsheet.

History:

Decyk, Betsy N. Columbus, The Quincentenary, and Philosophy Courses.

Snider, Eric W. Teaching Ancient Philosophy at the Undergraduate Level.


Introductory Philosophy:

Borody, Wayne. Introduction to Philosophy: East and West.

McConnell, Matthew. The Use of Poetry in the Introductory Philosophy Class.

Timko, Robert M. Introducing Philosophy in Composition Classes.

Logic:

Asquith, Peter D. Evaluating Arguments in Introductory Logic.

Blau, Charlie. Teaching the "Big Questions" While Teaching Critical Thinking.

Brady, Rob. Logic Works.

Brady, Rob. Computerized Grading in Logic.

Fole, Nelson. Teaching Logic with a Supplemental Computer Program.

Wilson, Arnold. Students’ Critical Thinking Portfolio.

Methods:


Evanoff, Tanya. New Method of Teaching Philosophy.

Hanagan, John I. Nurturing Quality in a Philosophy Classroom.

Hanford, Jack. Teaching Strategies for Increasing Student Motivation.


Kelly, James S. Makers of Meaning - Students as Active Participants.

Poland, Helene Dwyer. Teaching Feminist Material to Males.

Suttle, Bruce B. The Ethics of Intolerance or Why One Has a Moral Obligation to be Biased.

Thomason, Neil. Philosophy Discussions Without (Much) B.S.

Thomason, Neil. Getting Students to Philosophize with Each Other - To Teach is to Learn Twice.

Thompson, Ed. Facilitating Autonomy: A Process Approach to Teaching Philosophy.

Wilson, Eddy. Teaching Philosophy in an Ecclesiastical School Which is a Relatively Closed Community.

Social/Political:

Prend, Norm. The Role of Philosophy in Justice and Peace Studies Programs.

Hester, Joseph P. Cartoons for Thinking Utilizing Political Cartoons and Small Group Interactions to Teach Issues in Ethics.

Kultgen, John. Philosophy in Peace Studies Programs.

Mallick, Krishna. Philosophy and Nonviolence.

Moore, Alan. Philosophy and the Holocaust.

Zins, Daniel L. Making and Unmaking Enemies: Reflections of the Hostile Imagination and Nuclear Weapons After the Cold War: What are the Questions and Who Should Ask Them?

Other:


Cornwell, Grant. The Big Picture: The Goals and Structure of Philosophy Department Curricula.

Coyne, Anthony M. Teaching Philosophy and Human Sexuality.

Decyk, Betsy N. Working with Examples.

Ebenreck, Sara. Interviews as an Investigative Technique for Ethics Courses.


Woodside, Marianne. Advising Philosophy Students and Majors - The Larger Perspective.

Registration before July 1 is $90, and is $135 after July 1. Per person room rates for the week are $79 single, $61 double. All rooms are air-conditioned. Meals for the week are $52.85. Families with children are welcome. Child care is provided as needed, and programs for children are planned and coordinated with participants’ activities. More details concerning activities are contained in the registration packet mailed under separate cover in May.

If you did not receive the May registration mailing, register now by contacting Richard A. Wright, OHSU, LIB-418, P.O. Box 26901, Oklahoma City, OK 73190. Telephone: (405) 271-2111.
AAPT Board Members Meet to Discuss Conference

Four members of the board met for a long working session in New Orleans on April 28th. Joined by Paul Eisenberg, head of local arrangements for the August conference and Martin Benjamin, in charge of the special seminar for beginning teachers, the business of the day was drawing up the schedule of workshop programs and special events, both philosophical and social.

AAPT Meets at APA Pacific

The American Association of Philosophy Teachers group meeting held in conjunction with the APA Pacific Division Conference in Los Angeles took place at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 29, 1990. The session was an opportunity to meet and listen to two of the authors of Puzzles About Art, a recent book offering a new approach to the teaching of aesthetics. (See a review of the book in the October 1989 issue of AAPT News).

The authors, Margaret Battin and Ron Moore, discussed their motivations for writing the book in conjunction with two other authors and a list of "puzzle" contributors that reads like a "who's who" in aesthetics. A concern for developing an approach to teaching aesthetics and philosophy of art that would be as fascinating as the arts themselves provoked Professors Battin, Fisher, Moore and Silvers to produce a book on the model of the case approach currently used so successfully in applied ethics teaching across the country. The authors described their own uses of the material in the book, as well as a number of uses of it by elementary and secondary teachers. Material from the book has also been used in various museum contexts. The Getty Trust, long interested in fostering the development of new approaches in teaching about art and aesthetics, has had Battin and Moore as their guest lecturers on numerous occasions.

Although the audience was small (the session was the first on the first full day of the conference), those who attended were enthusiastic and engaged in animated discussion with the authors. Both authors and session participants seemed to have found the encounter to be rewarding and expressed an interest in learning more about AAPT.

Two proposals received unanimous approval:

1. there WILL be air-conditioning in all rooms;
2. there WILL be broccoli served at all meals.

In addition to a rich and varied program of workshops, the conference program will include two new elements. First, an assembly of all participants will meet each day for a talk and discussion on a theme of current concern in teaching. Secondly, we will inaugurate a system of poster sessions, i.e., times for informal discussion and sharing of ideas on a particular topic, as proposed by any participant, ad hoc and ad lib.

There was a short discussion on the perennial question of raising dues and moving to a two-year dues schedule. However, since there was no clear agreement among those present or among those polled by mail, the topic will be raised again at a later meeting and a proposal will be brought to the general business meeting in August.

Looking ahead beyond this summer's conference: plans are underway for a California conference, co-sponsored by AAPT and San Jose State University, probably in the summer of 1991. Conference topics will focus on (a) assumptions in teaching for broad ethnic diversity, and (b) teaching critical thinking. For further information, contact Cynthia Rostankowski, Department of Philosophy, School of Humanities and Arts, One Washington Square, San Jose, California, 95192-0096.

Teaching Philosophy

Teaching Philosophy is a quarterly journal which serves as a forum for the exchange of ideas and information about the teaching and learning of philosophy. Articles, discussions, reports and reviews are published on topics such as:

- theoretical issues in the teaching of philosophy
- innovative methods and classroom strategies
- experimental and interdisciplinary courses
- faculty development and student counseling

1990 Subscriptions: $19.50 individuals; $48 institutions. Add $4 for all subscriptions outside the U.S. Order from the PHILOSOPHY DOCUMENTATION CENTER, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403-0189 USA.
Edited by: Arnold Wilson, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0206.
Philosophy Teaching Exchange
A regular feature of AAPT News sharing course materials and classroom experiences. Replies to the editors or the authors are welcome.

by David H. Carey
Whitman College
Walla Walla, WA

During the lazy, hazy days of August in the summer of '85, on the last page (56) of the Chronicle of Higher Education, a short opinion piece appeared that I might well have missed: "Professors, Students, and the Syllabus" by Sharon Rubin (CHE 8/7/85). Rubin, by raising some pointed questions about the content (or lack of content) of my syllabi, provoked me to design syllabi that are not merely lists, threats, and those quasi-legal documents that students sometimes invoke to hoist the instructor by his own petard—with all the parsimonious shrewdness of a taxpayer combing the Tax Code for a loophole. Rather, I now aim to make the syllabus a thoughtful expression of the best pedagogy I can muster.

First, I'll present the bare schema of my syllabus. Then I'll instantiate it for an introductory course in philosophy, and then for a more advanced undergraduate seminar. The schema echoes the questions which Rubin raises. Rather than repeat her discussion, which is widely available, I refer the reader to her article for a commentary on my syllabus. (I hope in turn that my examples serve to illustrate her article, with specific reference to undergraduate philosophy courses.)

**********

THE BARE SCHEMA

Course description:

Course content (basic concepts in outline):

Why the parts of the course come in the order that they do:

Why take this course?:

Objectives (what is to be gained by the end of this course):

(1) Content:

(2) Skills:

Methods of instruction (how to meet these objectives):

Purpose of the assignments:

Prerequisites (what’s needed as a basis for doing well):

Student responsibilities (how to do well in this course):

Required Texts:

Why the readings come in the order that they do:

Course Schedule:

**********

EXAMPLE SYLLABUS #1:

Philosophy 128 Spring 1990

Social and Political Philosophy

Time & Place of Classes: T & Th. 1:00-2:20 P.M. Olin 340

Instructor: Dr. David Carey

Office: Olin 153 Office Hours: M T W Th 11-12,
Course description:

This is an introductory examination of social and political problems from a philosophical perspective. The course deals with themes such as the nature and foundation of the state, law, justice, liberty, conscience, war, alienation, and rights. Philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Locke, Rousseau, Mill, Marx, Rawls, and Nozick are read.

Why take this course?

A primary purpose of liberal education is to prepare people to exercise the most important office in a republic, namely, the office of citizen. To do this, you need two things: skill and ideas. This course aims at both. (See below.)

Objectives (what is to be gained by the end of this course):

1. Content: A familiarity with some major philosophical ideas which shape our social and political thinking. (See the outline below.)

2. Skills:
   a. Reading more intelligently
   b. Discussing more fruitfully
   c. Writing more clearly
   d. Listening more attentively

Prerequisites (what's needed as a basis for doing well):

The main thing needed is skill in reading carefully, word for word. You should be able to find the key thesis of a passage, state it in a sentence, and set out the author's argument for that thesis. You should be able to do this orally in a class discussion, as well as on paper. You should have already mastered standard English grammar, punctuation and spelling. You needn't have any prior familiarity with the content of the readings, but you should have the habit of looking up unfamiliar words and allusions in standard reference works (dictionaries, encyclopedias, etc.). Of course, the more familiar you are with the readings, the better. They are such that they grow more interesting with increased familiarity.

You should also have the habit (virtue) of studying on a regular schedule.

Student responsibilities (how to do well in this course):

It is essential that you do the assigned reading prior to each discussion. I consider normal homework to be two hours of study per week per credit and have chosen the assignments accordingly—that is, about four hours per reading. Sometimes the readings will go quickly for you; sometimes they will seem dense and tedious. You may often have to read a passage over and over again to understand it. In any case, stick to your scheduled eight hours each week; if you finish an assignment early, read ahead or work on your next paper (note the due dates below). Plan your work; then work your plan.

Methods of instruction:

1. assigned reading
2. class discussion
3. writing
4. lecture

Purpose of the assignments:

The astute student will have noticed that there is a close connection between these methods and the objectives of the course.

1. The main work of this course will be careful study and discussion of the assigned readings. It is helpful to think of the authors as the primary teachers in this course. Their ideas are the content; their writings exemplify the skills that you are to develop. Hence, dialogue with these authors is the essence of this course.

2. This dialogue is enhanced when shared with friends. Hence, class attendance is required. This is because the course takes the form of an ongoing conversation, from one meeting to the next. To miss a meeting is to be left out of a substantial part of that conversation. This will impair your participation in, and enjoyment of, subsequent meetings.

3. Thought often achieves its greatest clarity when put in writing. So each student will write two
papers (due February 22 and March 29) approximately 3-5 typed double-spaced pages in length; there will also be a final exam (May 14) consisting of several essays.

(4) Last and least, the instructor will lapse into lecturing from time to time, as occasion warrants. During these moments you should at least look awake; they are meant to provide further opportunities for you to practice attentive listening.

Course content (basic concepts in outline):

Ideas and themes
- Declaration of Independence
  - Epistemology: self-evident truth
  - Ethics: unalienable rights, happiness
  - Metaphysics: nature, equal creation
- Preamble of Constitution
  - Union
  - Justice
  - Tranquillity
  - Defense
  - Welfare
  - Liberty
- Origin of the state
  - Plato: Republic, Books I & II
  - Aristotle: Politics
  - Aquinas
  - Rousseau: The Social Contract
- Liberty vs. Justice
- Liberty and Law
  - Liberty in general
    - Locke: Second Treatise
  - Conscience and tragedy
    - Melville: "Billy Budd"
    - Sophocles: Antigone
    - Aquinas
- Justice
  - Justice and expediency
    - Review Plato: Republic, Books I & II
    - Thucydides: History of the Peloponnesian War
    - Aquinas
    - Machiavelli: The Prince XVII-XXIII
- Concept of justice
  - Aristotle
  - Aquinas
  - Benn
  - Rescher
- Conceptions of justice
  - Liberal

Why the parts of the course come in the order that they do:

We start with the political situation we find ourselves in: the American form of constitutional democracy. To understand it, we look at the founding documents (specifically, the Preamble and a key paragraph of the Declaration). Here we encounter a wealth of philosophical ideas. The rest of the course is meant to trace some of these ideas in detail. First we look backwards to origins. Then we examine the tension between two of the key ideas: liberty and justice. (As an interlude, a play and a short story powerfully dramatize this tension.) We see how law tries to embody these two ideals. The rest of the course focuses on justice from the top down: how the general concept of justice gets specified in various conceptions of justice, and in particular, one aspect of justice, namely, the economic. We conclude with the related idea of property.

Required Texts:

- Baumgarth & Regan, Aquinas: On Law, Morality and Politics (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1988)

In addition, there will be several readings from books that I imagine you already own. These are starred (*) in the schedule below. (They are also on reserve in
**Why these books?**

They contain primary sources of the ideas mentioned above. They are, for the most part, excellently written—exemplifying skills (a)-(d) above. (They are also relatively cheap.)

They are not the only books that meet these criteria, but we can't read everything worthwhile in one semester.

**What the test will test and how the papers will be graded:**

Your final exam will be evaluated on (1) how clearly you answer each question and (2) how accurately you represent the authors that you cite. Since the papers are a way of practicing for the final exam, they will be graded by the same two criteria: clarity and accuracy. The papers are to be typed, on 8.5" x 11" paper, using standard English grammar, punctuation and spelling. Plagiarism is punishable by a zero grade and is bad for the soul; clear and accurate essays merit good grades and the pleasures of virtue. Late papers will be refused or penalized at the discretion of the instructor.

After a paper is returned you may rewrite it and resubmit it within one week. If you do so, the grade of the revised paper will replace the grade of the earlier version. Each of the two papers will count for 20% of your course grade.

The final exam will count for 20% of your course grade. (I mention these sordid details now to allay anxiety, but I heartily recommend that you forget about grades altogether and ignore the exam until the end of the semester. Working at the course all along is the best preparation for the exam. For now, merely reserve the date!)

The rest (40%) of your course grade will be based on class discussion. This emphasis is intended (1) to encourage you to work at the course consistently throughout the semester (rather than sporadically or in binges) and (2) to ensure that class discussions will be based on prior study. I value the quality of participation, not the quantity. Attentive listening counts as meritorious participation; talking without listening does not. You needn't be straining to show me that you've done the reading. Do the reading well, and let the discussion unfold naturally. Over the course of the semester, the quality of your daily participation tends to become evident.
While I am careful to include enough "legalistic" detail to protect myself against charges such as, "You never told us we couldn't plagiarize!" or "I didn't know there was going to be a final exam. I'll be out of town that day," I strive to present requirements in such a way that they wear their plausibility upon their sleeves. So, for instance, I don't just list courses numbers under "Prerequisites" but describe what prior knowledge and skills I think are needed as a basis for doing well in the current course.

In a course where I have very specific expectations for a particular assignment, I spell those out in a supplement to the syllabus. Breaking the matter up into separate documents, I think, makes it more digestible—as long as the syllabus acts as a map or master document for integrating all aspects of the course. The following syllabus plus hand-out is an example.

*******

EXAMPLE SYLLABUS #2:

Philosophy 338 Spring 1990

Philosophers and Philosophical Movements:
Plato's Republic

Time & Place of Classes: M & W 1:00-2:20 P.M.
Olin 155

Instructor: Dr. David Carey

Office: Olin 153

Office Hours: M T W Th 11-12, and by appt.

Telephone Number: 527-5594

Course description:

In this course we will explore the entire text of Plato's Republic—leisurely and in depth: the quantity of reading for each class will be modest to permit thorough study, reflected in short writing assignments each week, culminating in a final paper.

Course content (basic concepts):

Epistemology: knowledge and opinion
Metaphysics: being and becoming
Ethics and Politics: the just psyche and the just polis

Why take this course?

The best argument for taking this course is the Republic itself. In brief it is this: You already want to be happy. But to be happy you want to be just. To be just, you must rule your soul by reason. To do this you must either be a philosopher or follow one. In either case, the study of philosophy is very important. Hence, you already have a very good reason to study philosophy.

As working hypotheses, let's make two assumptions: (1) Plato is an excellent philosopher. (2) The Republic is his philosophical masterpiece. The course will test these two hypotheses. To the extent that they are confirmed, you have excellent reasons for taking this course.

As for the central topic of justice, "what subject would a [person] of sense talk and hear about more often with enjoyment?" (358d)

Objectives (what is to be gained by the end of this course):

(1) Content: A thorough familiarity with a philosophical masterpiece.

(2) Skills:
(a) Reading more intelligently
(b) Discussing more fruitfully
(c) Writing more clearly
(d) Listening more attentively

Methods of instruction (how to meet these objectives):

(1) assigned reading
(2) class discussion
(3) an incremental writing project
(4) written responses to/from other students

Purpose of the assignments:
The astute student will have noticed that there is a close connection between these methods and the objectives of the course.

(1) The main work of this course will be careful study and discussion of the Republic. It is helpful to think of Plato as the teacher in this course. Your own dialogue with him through his text is the essence of this course.

(2) This dialogue is enhanced when shared with friends. Hence, class attendance is required. This is because the course takes the form of an ongoing conversation, from one meeting to the next. To miss a meeting is to be left out of a substantial part of that conversation. This will impair your participation in, and enjoyment of, subsequent meetings.

(3) Thought often achieves its greatest clarity when put in writing. Hence the term paper.

(4) In keeping with the dialogic and communitarian nature of our enterprise, each student is to help each other by sharing and commenting on work in progress. Hence the weekly classroom presentations.

Prerequisites (what's needed as a basis for doing well):

The main thing needed is skill in reading analytically, interpretively, and critically. For instance, you should be able to find the key thesis of a passage, state it in a sentence, and set out the author's argument for that thesis. You should be able to do this orally in a class discussion, as well as on paper. You should have already mastered standard English syntax and the basics of composition (e.g., organization and precision). In short, you should be skilled in the liberal arts of grammar, rhetoric, and logic.

The more familiar you are with Plato's writings, the better. If you have not read any Plato before, it would be helpful to read the Apology, the Crito, and the Meno for background.

You should have the habit (virtue) of studying and writing according to a regular schedule.

Student responsibilities (how to do well in this course):

Reading: It is essential that you do the assigned reading prior to each discussion.

Papers: See the separate handout.

Required Texts:

Plato’s Republic (preferably in the original Greek; otherwise, in a good translation. I recommend Grube’s.)


Why the readings come in the order that they do:

We are following the ancient method of text and commentary: first the one, then the other. (This holds both for the readings and for class presentations). Books I & II set up the problem for which the remaining books propose a solution. Reeve’s commentary has a parallel structure: Chapter I sets out the problem; his remaining four chapters trace Plato’s solution by following “four different routes through the Republic” (p. xxi). Accordingly, we’ll read Book I (followed by Reeve’s commentary), then Book II (followed by Reeve’s commentary), then the rest of the Republic, a book at a time. Finally, with the whole Republic thus in view, we’ll look at each of Reeve’s “routes”--a chapter per week.

How the papers will be evaluated:

See the separate handout.

COURSE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS MEETING:</th>
<th>READING ASSIGNMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/18/90</td>
<td>Introduction to the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/90</td>
<td>Book I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/90</td>
<td>Reeve 3-24 student presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/90</td>
<td>Book II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/90</td>
<td>Reeve 24-42 student presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/90</td>
<td>Book III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/90</td>
<td>student presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/90</td>
<td>Book IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/90</td>
<td>student presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/19/90</td>
<td>Book V: no class; holiday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAPERS

Procedures:

Written work will consist of (1) a paper first presented in class, in draft form, and later elaborated into a term paper and (2) a brief comment (3 pp. max.) on a classmate's paper. (Those who have taken Politics 320 with Prof. Kaufman-Osborn may recognize much of this, and the following procedure, as his own.) By noon of the day before you present your paper, deposit one copy at the Student Hold Shelf of the Reserve Desk of Penrose Library and another copy in my mailbox in Olin's main office. If it is your turn to comment on a paper, pick it up at the Reserve Desk after the noon deadline (i.e., 25 hours before class). At the next class, the presenter should have a one-page handout for each participant (15), stating (a) the thesis and (b) the main premises in support of that thesis. The presenter has 15 minutes to present the argument. (While the paper may still be rough—particularly for those presenting early in the semester—the presentation should be clear enough for the rest of us to follow the main line of argument.) Then the commentator has up to 10 minutes. Next the presenter may (or may not) respond. Afterwards, the discussion is open for general class participation. At the end of the class, the commentator gives one typed copy of the prepared commentary to the presenter and another to me. The final (expanded, revised) version of each paper is due in my mailbox in Olin by noon on May 14. I expect the final version to be between 10-15pp. (Significant excess or deficiency in length should be negotiated with me by May 7 at the latest.) Only the final version will be graded. Late papers will be refused (or in exceptional circumstances penalized, at my discre-

What I look for when grading:

See the attached sheet of UNC criteria.

Steps in writing your paper:

I. Explore the issue before you write.
   A. Pick a belief (doxa) expressed in the reading.
   B. Explore the arguments on both sides
      1. the strongest argument for the doxa
      2. the strongest argument against it
   C. Question and defend each argument's premises
   D. Revise and rethink arguments as they emerge

II. Outline the main points of the essay
   A. Explain the question
      1. State it
      2. Motivate it
   B. Make a definite claim (thesis)
      1. "In this essay I will argue that ..."
   C. Develop your arguments fully
   D. Consider objections
   E. Consider alternative beliefs (doxai)

III. Write a draft
   A. Follow your outline
      1. "My main argument will be ..."
      2. Develop one point per paragraph; use premises as lead sentences.
   B. Keep the introduction brief
   C. Give your arguments one at a time
   D. Clarify
   E. Support objections with arguments
   F. Don't claim more than you have shown

IV. Revise your draft in the light of comments, class discussion, new insights, etc., as the course goes on.
NOTE: These steps are adapted from Anthony Weston, *A Rulebook for Arguments* (Hackett 1987), which I order in large quantities and urge my students to buy. The reference to "UNC criteria" is to a set of criteria for grading papers; it was developed at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Someone passed on to me a copy of a copy, and I don’t know its author—otherwise I’d reproduce it here. (I’m trusting that the unknown author will deem it "fair use" if I continue to pass out the sheet to my students.)

Philosophical Heroines and Heroes

(Continued from Pg. 2)

My students recognize the barrenness of the image of the scrubbed kitchen table with no one looking at it. Success means, on the one hand, managing to get from Q to R, finding answers to philosophical questions, and on the other, achieving satisfying personal relationships with family and colleagues. Mr. Ramsey fails on both counts.

If we leave fiction and turn to recent biography, the picture of the philosopher is not much complimentary. Writing in the *New York Times* (April 29, 1990), the columnist Anna Quindlen comments on Deirdre Bair’s life of Simone de Beauvoir: “smart woman, dumb choices.” Successful as a philosopher arguing for woman’s freedom, de Beauvoir, it could be concluded, was a failure in the sense that she did not practice what she preached: subservient to Sartre, she “stooped when she was with him so he wouldn’t seem so short,” and “bought him leather-bound books in which to write and then used cheap children’s exercise paper for her own work.”

In real life, our students learn about philosophy and philosophers from watching us. What image do we project? Do we show in our teaching, in our scholarship, in our personal relations, the excitement and the satisfactions of our work and lives?

Those who have it in them to be philosophers will discover these joys for themselves. For the rest of them, the great majority, their life-long impressions of what philosophers are like are formed by their observations of us. We would do well, then, for a moment here and there, to see ourselves as others see us.

Have you registered for the 8th IWCTP?

Do it TODAY!!
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"Out of the Mouths of Babes"

or

"Quotable Quotes"

This column is under the supervision of Mary Ann Carroll, Appalachian State University. Readers are urged to share their own QQs with or without commentary. Responses to commentaries and QQs are invited.

It is our duty at the Q.Q.s Center to remind you that you can become pretty boring if all you ever talk about are technical points in philosophy. You thereby run the risk of not being invited to really fun parties, not to mention the fact that at least some of you will provide confirming evidence of this picture one student has of philosophers.

"I think that philosophers are lonely, selfish, old men."

Those of you who fall into the "old men" category as well as the rest of you who are boring at parties will then find yourselves party-begging, groveling about for invitations and you will be compared to statements that engage in question-begging; this is

"A statement that is 'begging' for a conflicting view"

which of course means that the statement also is groveling even if it is for a conflicting view and not a party invitation, and we all know that groveling is unfit behavior for both philosophy teachers and statements.

However, your narrow-minded dedication to fine philosophical points might be interpreted by the hoi poloi as attempt to make others wonder what makes you tick, in which case you are inadvertently begging for questions about you. That too makes you resemble a question-begging statement which, on another account, is

"A statement that is made that leaves the person wondering. It begs for a question about it."

Of course this shows how students too are like question-begging statements since they, like the sort of statement defined above, can leave a person -- namely you -- wondering. For example, do you wonder whether some students are thinking and how much intelligence they have and if what intelligence they do have is real or simulated and how is a person to tell? Fortunately we can help you out:

"I feel that the way people simulate the thought process and imagination to be important. I mean think for a moment: when you know a person you look for how he or she answers a question or what type of question is asked by the person. For example, if you give a person a problem to solve no matter how easy or hard you look at the way they begin to solve the problem. You look to see if they go about answering in an abstract way. If they do you can pretty well assume that they are thinking and have a lot of intelligence in order to think and act in an abstract way."

So there you have it.

But naturally you realize you might be deluded here; oi' Descartes' evil genius might be lurking about and

"the evil genius has a deception to deceive all of our delusions."

Therefore, since you don't know whether you are being deluded and if you are then your delusions could be deceptive because of the evil genius' deception which causes you to be deceived by your delusions but of course you won't know if you are or aren't and you're right back to how students can be like that question-begging statement because they keep on begging for questions about them.

We just realized that we seem to have gotten carried away here -- sometimes the materials at the Q.Q.s Center can cause delusions which cause us to wonder about the condition of our mental state which, according to the following Q.Q., means we're not showing much about ourselves (which is OK by us because we like to keep a pretty low profile anyway):
"Personally I guess I agree more with the Cartesian interactions because the conditions of your mental state can show a lot about yourself."

But the dubious nature of the condition of our mental state isn't something we worry about; at the Q.Q.'s Center we prefer to worry about problems like this one:

"How can a non-believer use money if he does not believe, because on the bills is printed 'In God We Trust'. If he does not believe, his money would appear to be of no value."

If there are any non-believers out there, please send us your solution to this puzzle. This is a tough problem and we'll publish them in a future column; whoever sends us the best one will win a no-expense-paid trip to the Q.Q.'s Center and will receive eighty introductory philosophy papers to read.

Here are some other worries we had that were keeping us awake until we discovered solutions that were unwittingly provided to us by students.

Worry #1: How can the interaction between mind and body be explained?
Solution:
"... thinking is a definite process involved with intelligence."
(This is consistent with our belief that stupid people don't think.)

Worry #2: What happens if we get infected by a piece of art?
Solution:
"Tolstoy thinks that when others feel the emotions of the artist along with the emotions of each other, that they have been infected by the art. This is in no way a bad infection."

(Now that takes a load off our mind, what with the rising costs of health care and a phobia about needles.)

Worry #4: What is the distinction between art and pornography?
Solution:
"The great sculptures and many great artists would say that the body is art, but if you asked a pornographer if the body was pornography, he would probably say it can be if it isn't already."

(Thanks for finding that solution to this worry, Frans. What we want to know is whether your body is already pornography, or if it merely has the potential. Why don't you send us a picture for our column and let readers judge for themselves?)

No doubt you too have numerous worries so if you let us know what they are, we feel confident that the Q.Q.'s Center will be able to find solutions to them so you don't have to stay awake at night worrying.

Book Reviews are Requested

AAPT News recently initiated a book review section. Review submissions in the following categories are requested: (1) books directed at philosophy teachers, or (2) books that you have used in your classroom either successfully or unsuccessfully (the focus here should be on the book as a teaching tool, and explicit reference should be made to students' experience with it), or (3) books designed for classroom use (the focus here should be an assessment of the book's likely success in the classroom).

In addition, we will print reader requests for comments on the classroom success of specific volumes.

Finally, any reader who is willing to review books is urged to submit his or her name to the editors. As we receive books from publishers, we will contact you regarding a review.

ISETA Annual Conference Set

The International Society for Exploring Teaching Alternatives (ISETA) Twentieth Annual Conference will be held in Indianapolis, October 11-13, 1990.

The conference theme is "Teaching as a Creative Activity." Contact Dr. Bonnie Johnson, ISETA-90 Program Chair, Department of Education, California State University -- Chico, Chico, CA 95929-0222, telephone (916) 895-6402.

ISETA publishes a newsletter, Connexions, on alternative teaching. Contact Christine Campbell, Editor, at the following address: Defense Language Institute, FLC/ATFL:ES-T (Dr. Campbell), Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006.
The American Association of Philosophy Teachers announces

The 8th International Workshop - Conference on Teaching Philosophy

PLACE: Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
DATES: August 6-10, 1990

***
WORKSHOPS DISCUSSIONS PANELS
LECTURES DEMONSTRATIONS ETC.

ON MOST AREAS AND ASPECTS OF PHILOSOPHY

***
For further information about IWCTP-VIII contact as soon as possible:

Richard A. Wright
University of Oklahoma HSC
P.O. Box 26901, LIB-418
Oklahoma City, OK 73190

---

Invitation to Join AAPT

If you teach philosophy or are interested in teaching philosophy, join us. Mail this coupon along with $12 annual dues to Richard Wright, Executive Director, AAPT, University of Oklahoma HSC, LIB 418, P.O. Box 26901, Oklahoma City, OK 73190.

NAME: __________________________
ADDRESS: _______________________
CITY: ___________________________
STATE & ZIP: ____________________
Calendar of Events

August 5-8, 1990 - Conference on Critical Thinking and Educational Reform, Sonoma State University. Contact the Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA 94928.

August 6-10, 1990 - AAPT's 8th International Workshop-Conference on Teaching Philosophy will be held at Indiana University in Bloomington, IN. Contact Richard A. Wright, University of Oklahoma HSC, P.O. Box 26901, LIB-418, Oklahoma City, OK 73190 for registration details.

August 9-11, 1990 - Fifth International Conference on Computers and Philosophy, Stanford University. Sponsored by AAPT, APA Committee on Computer Use in Philosophy, Dept. of Philosophy, the Symbolic Systems Program, CSLI, and IMSSS at Stanford University. Contact John Etchemendy, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Ventura Hall, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305. ARPNET: etch@csli.stanford.edu.

October 4-6, 1990 - A Bouwsma Retrospective: The Teacher as Philosopher, Drake University. Contact Jon N. Torgerson, Philosophy and Religion, Drake University, Des Moines, IA 50311-4505.

October 11-13, 1990 - The International Society for Exploring Teaching Alternatives (ISETA) Twentieth Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN. The conference theme is "Teaching as a Creative Activity." Contact Dr. Bonnie Johnson, ISETA-90 Program Chair, Department of Education, California State University - Chico, Chico, CA 95929-0222, telephone (916) 895-6402.

American Association of Philosophy Teachers Officers

Rosalind Ekman Ladd
Wheaton College
Norton, MA 02766
President

Terrell Ward Bynum
Southern Connecticut State University
New Haven, CT 06515
Vice President

Frans van der Bogert
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608
Treasurer

Richard A. Wright
University of Oklahoma HSC
Oklahoma City, OK 73190
Executive Director
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