

PHIL 250 Fall 2007 (W. M. Kallfelz)
Paper I Assignment

Due: Thursday, October 4th (in class)

- **No emailed versions of final paper accepted.**
- **You may, however, email me a draft no later than one week before due date (i.e. no later than Thursday, September 27) for comments/feedback. However, keep in mind that:**
 1. **Anything you email to me after Thursday, September 27th I cannot promise I'll provide comments/feedback on. If I'm able to, you're lucky. If not, you've been informed/forewarned. Basically, due to my own schedule constraints, don't bother to attempt to email me a draft for comments/review after Sunday, Sept 30th. Just focus on polishing that draft and submit it as your final paper.¹**
 2. **Keep in mind that the comments/review is one-time. In other words, do not re-submit a draft for further review/comments. I will review or comment on your draft only once. Then, I will grade your final draft, which (as mentioned above) I expect will be handed in as a hard copy in class. If, for whatever reasons, you cannot make it to class to hand in your hard copy, you must submit a hard-copy of officially documented University of Maryland-approved excuse specifying the reason(s) you were unable to submit this hard copy at the date and time provided. Failure to do so will result in a subtraction of one letter grade even on the same due date. (In other words, failure to hand in a hard-copy of officially documented University of Maryland-approved excuse specifying the reason(s) you were unable to submit this hard copy at the date and time provided entails:
 - a) I will subtract one letter grade from the grade I think you deserve from your paper if I receive an emailed version or a hard copy after the class period October 4th until 11:59pm Friday October 5th.
 - b) I will subtract two letter grades from the grade I think you deserve, if I receive a hard copy/emailed version 12:00am until 11:59 pm, Saturday October 6th.
 - c) I will subtract three letter grades from the grade I think you deserve, if I receive a hard copy/emailed version 12:00am until 11:59 pm, Sunday October 7th.
 - d) I will subtract four letter grades from the grade I think you deserve, if I receive a hard copy/emailed version 12:00am until 11:59 pm, Monday October 8th.
 - e) Papers submitted after Monday October 8th will not be graded.
 - f) **IMPORTANT: I may deduct one or more letter grade(s) from your tardy paper, even if you submit a hard-copy of officially documented University of Maryland-approved excuse specifying the reason(s)****

¹ For those new to the art & science of writing philosophy papers, please consult:
http://www.philosophy.umd.edu/deptwebsite/undergraduateprogram/resources/papers_and_exams.html

you were unable to submit this hard copy if you attempt to hand it in after Friday, October 5th.

- g) Standards of academic honesty are taken with the utmost degree of seriousness and will be enforced to the utmost and maximal degree of penalty. IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO KNOW WHAT THEY ARE. For further information and clarification, please consult:

<http://www.glue.umd.edu/~wkalfel/PHIL250/Phil250SyllabusKalfelz.pdf>

<http://www.studenthonorcouncil.umd.edu/whatis.html>

- h.) In this assignment (as well as in the second paper), in addition to all the University-wide standards of academic honesty as specified in contents of the URLs specified in g.) above, you may not consult with your fellow peers, classmates, and/or other instructors regarding this assignment. You may not refer to any other material except for the textbook, posted notes, and article(s) specified in page 3 of this document.² You may ask questions during the Q&A sessions allowed during class (the first 15-20 minutes) and/or consult with me during office hours and/or appointments and/or via email. However, regarding emailing me, please note that:
- i.) Substantive questions/issues should not be addressed to me via email. My time is limited, and so is yours. I will answer simple clarification questions regarding your assignment via email. However, I will not respond to any email I consider will require a lengthy time period of writing. (And I decide what category such an emailed question may fit under.) Basically, aside from using your best judgment here, if you email me question(s) and I fail to respond to them, it is your responsibility to make an appointment with me and/or see me during office hours.
- j.) When you hand in your final paper, you must also provide a hard copy of pages 1 and 2 of this document, signed and appropriately dated below. Failure to do will result in an an automatic 0% grade of your paper.

I have read, understood and complied with all the requirements of this assignment as set forth in the contents of pages 1-2 of this document

Name (please print)

Signature

date

² You may, however, cite from other sources if you're supplying an example or counter-example to your claims.

Directions: Please choose one of the following topics below (Topic 1: page 3, or topic 2: page 4):

1.) Science and Logic:

Please read the following sections:

-Introduction & Sections 1 & 2 (pp. 1-9)

-Section 3.1-3.2 (pp. 9-13)

-Optional: Sections 3.4-3.5 & 4 (pp.13-24)³

...from the following article:

James Hawthorne (2004) "Inductive Logic," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (on -line)

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-inductive/>

Then, in no less than 5 double-spaced pages and no more than 10 double-spaced pages (12 pt. font, Times New Roman and/or Palatino and/or Times) write an essay in which you:

- Explain, in simple and clear terms, what the problem of induction is and how the points raised in the review article by Hawthorne attempt to solve it. (Spend no more than 2 pages on this section.)
- Discuss, in the light of your readings of Popper, why Popper's falsificationism rejects such maneuvers. In this section, mention what the hypothetico-deductive strategy is, and then describe and explain a simple toy example (similar, but not identical to the one mentioned in the lecture notes of September 6th) in which a hypothesis or law generated by a theory is falsified according to this scheme. Explain why falsificationism is methodologically asymmetrical but logically symmetrical according to Popper (Spend no more that 3-4 pages on this section)
- Then, give an argument why you think Popper's falsificationism does or doesn't answer to the issues dealt with in inductive logic as described by Hawthorne. If you're arguing pro-Popper, make sure you indicate why you think Popper's falsification gives a more accurate or truer account to the process of theory-formation in science than inductivist approaches. (It helps to provide a simple example/counterexample here to argue your case.) Conversely, if you're arguing against Popper, explain why inductivist strategies do a better job of capturing the essential aspects of theory-testing and development. You're welcome to use some of the relevant counter-arguments of Kuhn, Lakatos, and Thagard here. (Spend no more than 3-4 pages on this section.)

³ Do not attempt to read these sections unless you've already had some exposure to issues in Probability & Statistics like Bayes' Theorem and/or Hypothesis testing.

2.) Science and Values:

Please read the following sections:

-Introduction & Sections 1-7 (pp. 1-43)

-Optional: The remaining sections

...from the following article:

Elizabeth Anderson (2007) "Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science,"

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (on-line)

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-epistemology/>

Then, in no less than 5 double-spaced pages and no more than 10 double-spaced pages (12 pt font, Times New Roman and/or Palatino and/or Times) write an essay in which you:

- Explain, in simple and clear terms, what the basic issues are concerning feminist epistemology and philosophy of science as discussed by Anderson. Make sure explain why (according to Anderson) standpoint dependence in feminist theory does *not* imply relativism, and how and why feminist thought addresses issues and concerns in scientific practice, philosophy of science, and epistemology. (Spend no more than 3-4 pages on this section)
- Discuss, in the light of your readings of Kuhn, McMullin, or Longino (or any combination thereof) how these authors may or may not address the issues and concerns Anderson writes about. (Spend no more than 2-3 pages in this section)
- Then, give an argument why you think Anderson (2007) may or may not be conveying essentially important issues concerning what scientific norms and practices define as 'objective'. If you're arguing pro-Anderson, explain why feminist philosophy of science gives sufficient analyses and offers essential norms that would refine standards of objective inquiry (vis-à-vis of the relevant claims and criticisms discussed in Kuhn, or McMullin, or Longino.) Conversely, if arguing against Anderson, explain why her position addresses superfluous factors (i.e., are independent of the norms typically governing propositional knowledge as codified in scientific practice, suitable idealized) In other words, explain and argue how and why issues presented by Kuhn, McMullin and even Longino may sufficiently characterize the shortcomings of scientific practice and theorizing and its value-ladenness without necessitating aspects of the feminist programme as articulated by Anderson. (Spend no more than 3-4 pages in this section.)

GOOD LUCK ☺