

# PHIL 216: ETHICS

DAMIEN STOREY | SPRING 2021 | VERSION 1.0

WHEN: TUTH 11:30–12:45

## CONTENTS

Course particulars	2
Course description	2
How to contact me	2
Student responsibilities	2
Assessment methods	2
Course policies	3
Lecture outline	5
Background.	5
Part 1: Metaethics	5
Part 2: Normative ethics	5
Part 3: Political philosophy	6
Some essay & writing advice	8
Writing philosophy	8
Some basics of typography	10
Referencing	10
Plagiarism	11

## COURSE PARTICULARS

### COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course will introduce you to the three related areas of philosophy:

*Metaethics*: the study of (e.g.) the epistemological, metaphysical, and psychological questions raised by the phenomena of ethics.

*Normative ethics*: the (usually) more practical study of what our ethical commitments actually are and how they can best be explained.

*Political philosophy*: the study of ethical questions that concern how we live collectively, in communities, countries, or collections of countries.

### HOW TO CONTACT ME

*Office hours*: Fridays 12.00–14.00 | *Office*: THE INTERNET | *Email*: dstorey@ku.edu.tr

I'm always happy to answer questions by email and I can usually make time to see students outside my office hours, either in my office or via video conference.

*Please always refer to me as 'Damien', whether in person or by email. Please never call me Dr. Storey, and certainly not Mr. Storey (I'm not a bank manager).*

### STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

For each lecture there is assigned reading and, some weeks, a lecture-prep task. You'll find these in the [Lecture Outline](#) below. Your most important responsibility is to do the assigned reading and task (if you find the reading is too much or too difficult, please let me know). In addition, in lectures, students are expected to take an active role: listening carefully, asking questions, and engaging in discussion with each other and me.

### ASSESSMENT METHODS

The course is assessed by:

1. (50%) Lecture-prep tasks and reading quizzes. These are short tasks that you'll do before, after, or in specific lectures. Many of them aim to give you some practice writing philosophy and they'll be marked with this in mind. Assessment: letter grade, F to A+.
2. (50%) An essay of about 2000 words, due in the third quarter of the course. You'll be given a choice of essay questions and reading. Assessment: letter grade, F to A+.

I'll keep you updated about what's required for each assessment well in advance—but, as always, make sure that you have the latest version of this document (by checking the version

number on the first page).

Your grades will always be given to you as one of the following letter grades.

A+	—	Exceptional
A	4.00	Superior
A-	3.70	Above Average
B+	3.30	Above Average
B	3.00	Average
B-	2.70	Average
C+	2.30	Below Average
C	2.00	Below Average
C-	1.70	Borderline
D+	1.30	Deficient
D	1.00	Deficient
F	0.00	Failing

*Marking criteria:* For many of you, philosophy is a new subject and you might be wondering about the marking criteria for written work. The very best way to understand this is to look carefully at the writing advice and the linked guides below.

#### COURSE POLICIES

*Course material.* All required reading will be on Blackboard at least a week prior to the relevant lecture. Optional reading will *not* usually be on BB, but both the library and the internet exist.

*Late work.* Late essays will often not be accepted. If they are accepted, they will lose marks at the rate of one full letter grade per week (e.g. a B- essay will get a C- if it is two days late and a D- if it is ten days late). Tasks will be marked as failed if they are later than the lecture for which they are due.

*Extensions and exemptions.* Extensions and exemptions are possible (though not guaranteed) if *both* of two conditions are met: (a) they are for official academic or medical reasons (with appropriate documentation) and (b) I am made aware of the request *before* the due date.

*Assessments and grades.* All students have the opportunity to attempt the same work load and their final grade reflects the academic merit of the work they produce. Students cannot achieve grades in any other way.

*Referencing and plagiarism.* Plagiarism is a *very* serious offence even if it is just a couple of lines and *even if it is accidental*: it is entirely *your* responsibility to learn what plagiarism is. See the end of this document for guidance.

*English coherence rule.* From your first day as a fresher, you are expected to be able to write in English, even if it is bad English. We are typically forgiving about language errors, and they do not effect your grade except insofar as they make your writing imprecise or unclear. However, if your English is highly unusual, so that it appears not to have arisen from a normal

process of writing—i.e. not to have arisen from you using what English you have to try to say what you mean—there will be a marking penalty. Examples might be the incoherent sentences sometimes produced by Google Translate or by paraphrasing with a thesaurus.

# LECTURE OUTLINE

## BACKGROUND.

### 0.1 Ethics and philosophy

Week 1: Lecture 1 & 2

- No reading: but begin reading for week 2.

## PART I: METAETHICS

### 1.1 Egoism vs. altruism

Week 2: Lecture 3 & 4

- Robert Shaver ‘Egoism’ *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
- *This American Life* (podcast), segment: ‘Flight vs. Invisibility’

### 1.2 Cognitivism vs. non-cognitivism

Week 3: Lecture 5 & 6

- A. J. Ayer *Language, Truth, and Logic*, chapter 6 [Short. A classic statement of ‘emotivism’]

### 1.2 Objectivism vs. relativism

Week 4: Lecture 7 & 8

- David Enoch (2014) ‘Why I am an Objectivist about Ethics (And Why You Are, Too)’ in Russ Shafer Landau (ed.), *The Ethical Life* 3rd ed. (Oxford: OUP)

## PART 2: NORMATIVE ETHICS

### 2.1 Mill’s Utilitarianism

Week 5: Lecture 9 & 10

- J.S. Mill, *Utilitarianism*, chapters 1 & 2 [but read whole book if possible]
- Roger Crisp (1997) *Guidebook to Mill on Utilitarianism*, chapter 2 [and chapter 3 if possible]

### 2.2 Consequentialism

Week 6: Lecture 11 & 12

- Roger Crisp (1997) *Guidebook to Mill on Utilitarianism*, chapter 6
- B. Williams ‘A Critique of Utilitarianism’, in J.J.C. Smart & B. Williams (eds) *Utilitarianism: For and Against* (CUP, 1973), sections 3–5
- *Optional*: Peter Railton, ‘Alienation, consequentialism and the demands of morality’ *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 13 (1984) 134–171 [Defence of a sophisticated form of consequentialism, which, he argues, avoids the alienation objection]

### 2.3 Kant and deontology

Week 7: Lecture 13 & 14

- Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* [This is relatively short; read at least the first two of its three sections.]
- *Optional*: Robert Johnson & Adam Cureton ‘[Kant’s Moral Philosophy](#)’ *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

### 2.4 Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*

Week 8: Lecture 15 & 16

- [Podcast: History of Philosophy Without Any Gaps](#): episodes 44–46
- Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, book I [look especially closely at I.7]

### 2.5 Contemporary virtue ethics

Week 9: Lecture 17 & 18

- Elizabeth Anscombe ‘Modern Moral Philosophy’ *Philosophy* 33 (1958)
- Rosalind Hursthouse & Glen Pettigrove [Virtue Ethic](#), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

### 2.6 Topic: Animals and morality

Week 10: Lecture 19 & 20

- Short film: [Save Ralph: A short film with Taika Waititi](#)
- Podcast: [Love and Radio: Necessary Measures](#)
- Lori Gruen ‘[The Moral Status of Animals](#)’ *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
- *Optional*: Peter Singer ‘Are All Animals Equal’ in In Tom Regan & Peter Singer (eds.) *Animal Rights and Human Obligations* (OUP: Oxford, 1989), pp. 215–226

## PART 3: POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

### 3.1 Nozick and libertarianism

Week 11: Lecture 21

- John Locke, *Two Treatise of Government*, essay 2, chapter 5
- Robert Nozick *Anarchy, State and Utopia* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), chapter 7 [and try to read 3, 4, and 8]

### 3.2 Rawls I

Week 11: Lecture 22

## BREAK

Week 12: Lecture 23 & 24

### 3.2 Rawls II

Week 13: Lecture 25

- Samuel Freeman ‘Introduction: John Rawls—An Overview’ in Samuel Freeman (ed.), 2003, *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls* (CUP: Cambridge, 2003)

### 3.3 Topic: Free speech

Week 13: Lecture 26

- David van Mill [Freedom of Speech](#) *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

### 3.3 Topic: Free speech

Week 14: Lecture 27 & 28

- Judith Lichtenberg (1987) 'Foundations and Limits of Freedom of the Press' *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 16: 4, pp. 329-355
- Eric Barendt *Freedom of Speech* (OUP: Oxford, 2005), chapter 12

## SOME ESSAY & WRITING ADVICE

### WRITING PHILOSOPHY

Please pay close attention to the following advice, especially 1 and 2. They try to cater for the most common and most easily solved problems I find in students' writing. Please take them seriously.

1. *Explain.* In short: explain *everything*. It should be possible for an intelligent peer who hasn't studied philosophy to *fully* understand your essay without needing to read the authors you're writing about. For example: if you use a technical term that has particular significance for an author, make sure you clearly define it. Similarly, for any argument or position you discuss, you must clearly and fully explain it to your reader. This is partly because good academic writing should be explicit and easily understood, but it is also because your ability to explain the ideas you're discussing—clearly, precisely, and succinctly—is what you're being assessed on. Your readers, including your grader, know that you understand something only if, and to the extent that, you've successfully explained it. Don't expect anyone to just assume you understand something that you've failed to explain. You might well know, for example, what a categorical imperative is, but you need to *show* that you know it and how precisely you know it. Explaining even small, simple ideas well is a lot harder than you might think; don't underestimate how important it is, and how much work it takes.
2. *Justify.* Assume that for every claim you make, the reader is asking 'why on earth should I believe that?' In a philosophy essay, there should always be an excellent answer to this question. You should consider this to be, above all else, your aim when writing an essay. The worst thing you can do is to make bold assertions without defending them, and the second worst is to make bold assertions and defend them weakly. Note that this includes interpretive claims: if you write 'Plato believes that p', you need to show your reader, perhaps by giving a supporting quote, that this is indeed something Plato believes.  
  
*A bad essay:* 'p'  
*A good essay:* 'For reasons x, y, and z, it seems that p.'  
*An excellent essay:* 'Reasons x, y, and z give us good grounds for thinking that p, although someone might offer an objection along the following lines ... However, I think there is a promising response to this objection ...'
3. *Use headings.* Before you start writing, sketch a structure for your essay. When writing, use headings that reflect this structure. A typical essay might have 2–4 headings.
4. *First understand, then assess.* Be careful not to rush into criticisms of what you read before you've fully understood it. Approach everything you read with charity. That is, assume that the author has thought intelligently and carefully about what they've written, so is unlikely to have made obvious mistakes. For example, if you notice a *prima facie* objection to something you're reading, read it again carefully to see if there's a way



to understand it that avoids the objection or try to think of a plausible implicit assumption the author might have made that caters for the objection.

5. *Be sufficiently detailed.* The topics you'll consider are broad. Someone could write hundreds of pages about them, but you have at most a few pages. This presents a challenge: on the one hand, you want to show that you're familiar with the whole topic; on the other hand, you want to do more than simply scratch the surface, never looking at any one issue in detail. This can be a difficult balance to achieve, but in general it is much better to *err on the side of detail*. One approach might be to devote about the first third of your essay to a more general introduction of the topic and then use the last two-thirds to examine one or two smaller points in much greater detail—you might, for example, focus on *one* argument, premise, or objection that you think is especially important or interesting.
6. *Ensure your conclusions reflect your arguments.* You might have been taught that strong, persuasive prose requires confident assertions, rather than hesitant, qualified ones. But in philosophy your assertions should reflect the actual degree of confidence that is warranted by the evidence you've provided. Decisive arguments are rare—even rarer are decisive arguments in just a few lines of a student's essay. So be careful not to mistake considerations that give us a good reason for believing that p for an argument that shows conclusively that p. A good essay is likely to have a large range of (appropriate) qualifying phrases: 'this shows decisively that p'; 'this is a strong reason to believe that p'; 'this suggests that p'; 'this makes it less implausible that p'; and so forth. Be especially careful with strong success verbs like 'refutes', 'proves', or 'shows'.
7. *Show 'independence of thought' rather than 'originality.'* You might think that philosophy encourages you to express your own unique opinions, ones different from those of the authors you read. But originality—the simple fact that an idea is new—has little value by itself and it should not be your aim. After all, an idea can be both original and obviously false. What *has* value is independence of thought. For example, if you agree with the conclusions of a certain author because you fully understand them, have thought critically about their arguments, and carefully assessed alternative possibilities, then you believe nothing original, but you are showing admirable independence of thought.
8. *Use quotes correctly.* Especially in historical subjects, including quotes from relevant primary texts can be an excellent way to illustrate, justify, and give some focus to your discussion. One way (of many) to use a quote is the following: make a claim; present a quote that supports the claim; and then explain and interpret the text of the quote in order to *show* that and why it supports your claim. But two cautions: first, quotes from secondary sources are rarely useful; second, *never use a quote as a way of saying something*—rather, a quote should be presented as evidence *about which* you have something to say.

For more guides to essay writing, see Jim Pryor, [Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Essay](#), and James Lenman, [How to Write A Crap Philosophy Essay](#).

The following are a few typographic conventions worth learning.

1. *Indent paragraphs.* But do not indent the opening paragraph of the document or the first paragraph after a section heading. You may instead—not in addition—separate paragraphs with a blank line, although this is better suited to list-like texts, such as legal documents, than continuous prose.
2. *Use single line spacing.* It's easier to read. Double spacing is only necessary when a printed copy of your work will be annotated.
3. *A footnote mark is always placed after punctuation.*<sup>1</sup> It is almost always best to place a footnote at the end of the sentence, *after* the sentence-ending full stop, even if you are referring to something earlier in the sentence. Avoid consecutive footnotes; instead, place all information in one footnote if possible.
4. *Correctly indicate titles.* The titles of books and journals should be italicised; the title of articles should be in inverted quotes.
5. *Indicate quotes with either quotation marks or by using a block quote.* Extra flourishes, such as italicising, are unnecessary. And never place a block quote within quotation marks.
6. *Learn the difference between a hyphen (-), en-dash (–), and em-dash (—).* Use an en-dash like 'to' in ranges of dates or numbers (e.g. 87–142) and to express certain relationships between words: for example, an 'on–off switch' or 'Irish–American relations'. Either an en- or em-dash can be used to indicate a parenthetical phrase. If you use an en-dash, add a space either side – like so – but em-dashes are always unspaced—like so.
7. *Make ellipses with three full stops separated by spaces.* Like this . . . , with a space either side. You will most commonly use an ellipsis to indicate portions of text that you've omitted from quotes. Don't omit any sentence-ending full stops that precede an ellipsis (i.e. together they make four stops). For example:

[P]articlar care needs to be exercised when eliding text to ensure that the sense of the original is not lost . . . A deletion must not result in a statement alien to the original material. . . . Accuracy of sense and emphasis must accompany accuracy of transcription. (CMS, 16th, 13.49)

8. *Use a single space after full-stops.* A double space, once common, is now rightly recognised as unnecessary.

## REFERENCING

In your essays you should reference both quotes and claims or arguments that originate from one of the authors you've been reading. You should also have a bibliography of all the works you've referred to in the text.

You can use whatever bibliographical style you choose, so long as it's consistent. The following is an example of a typical author–year referencing style, starting with what the bibliography will look like:

1. This includes full stops, commas, colons, semi-colons, and quotations marks.

**Book:** Author (Year) *Title*, Place: Publisher.

Fine, G. (1993) *On Ideas*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freeman, S. (ed.) (2003) *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Article:** Author (Year) 'Title', *Journal*, Volume, pp. Pages.

Irwin, T.H. (1977) 'Plato's Heracleiteanism', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 27, pp. 1–13.

**Article in book:** Author (Year) 'Article Title' in Editor(s) (ed(s).) *Book Title*, Place: Publisher.

Scanlon, T.M. (2003) 'Rawls on Justification' in S. Freeman (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

**In-text citation:** (Author, Year, Page(s))

It has been argued that the charge of conservatism laid against Rawls' idea of reflective equilibrium is unsound (Scanlon, 2003, pp. 150–151).

Scanlon argues that the charge of conservatism laid against Rawls' reflective equilibrium is unsound (2003, pp. 150–151).

## PLAGIARISM

Koç University does not tolerate plagiarism of any kind or degree, whether deliberate or accidental.

### Definition

The presentation of someone else's work—such as their ideas or phrases—without acknowledgement, so that it is presented as your own work. It is entirely *your* responsibility to learn what plagiarism is and how to avoid it.

### Degree of plagiarism

No amount of plagiarism is acceptable: a single plagiarised line in an essay will result in failure, and could result in disciplinary procedures.

### Quotation marks

Quotations need to be in quotation marks; otherwise, it is plagiarism, whether or not you cite the author. If you fail to know this after your first week of undergraduate, you are unfit for any role in academia.

### Accidental vs. deliberate

Students accused of plagiarism invariably claim that it was accidental. This is irrelevant: the problem is the plagiarism itself, not the motivation behind it. The consequences of allegedly accidental plagiarism are no different from deliberate plagiarism. Frankly, if you are unable to avoid plagiarism even while sincerely trying, you should not be in a university, just as you should be allowed to drive if you accidentally run people over.

If you are worried that you might be plagiarising, you can ask me before you submit your work.

## Paraphrasing

Read this section very very carefully.

Paraphrasing an author is repeating what they say, but in your own words. Some forms of paraphrasing are acceptable, others are not. One reason to paraphrase is simply to state the author's ideas in your essay, perhaps to support your argument: if you genuinely use your own words and reference the author, this is perfectly acceptable. But if you paraphrase because you are unable to describe what they say by yourself—since you do not trust your English, for example, or fully understand them—then you are probably plagiarising, *even if you cite the author*.

Never use paraphrasing as a *writing* tool. Directly using an author's words to construct your own sentences or paragraphs—looking back and forth at what they wrote as you write—will almost certainly result in plagiarism, even if you try to change the words. What should guide you when you are writing about an author's ideas is not the words they use, but your understanding of what they mean. As a rule of thumb, ask yourself 'could I have written what I wrote even if I had entirely forgotten the original author's original words?' If your answer is no, then you are probably plagiarising their writing, since a genuine understanding of their ideas will be independent of the words and phrases they use to express them.