

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Course Outline 2020-21**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

**Winter Term 2021  
Lecture (001)  
Emergency Remote Learning  
WF / 9:30–11:00**

**Instructor: Dr. Benjamin Hill (he/him/his)  
STVH 3140  
519.661.2111 (x80143)  
Virtual Office Hour: upon request  
Email: Please use OWL Messages  
Emergencies Only: [bhill28@uwo.ca](mailto:bhill28@uwo.ca)**

**LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

We acknowledge that Western University is located on the traditional lands of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, Lūnaapéewak, and Attawandaron peoples, on lands connected with the London Township and Sombra Treaties of 1796 and the Dish with One Spoon Covenant Wampum. With this, we respect the longstanding relationships that Indigenous Nations have to this land, as they are the original caretakers. We acknowledge historical and ongoing injustices that Indigenous Peoples (e.g. First Nations, Métis, and Inuit) endure in Canada, and we accept responsibility as a public institution to contribute toward revealing and correcting miseducation as well as renewing respectful relationships with Indigenous communities through our teaching, research, and community service.

**EMERGENCY REMOTE LEARNING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

We acknowledge that the current emergency situation is extraordinary and that the extra demands of remote learning are difficult to manage even in the best of times, to say nothing of during the current pandemic. In retooling this course for the current emergency remote learning environment, our aim has been to avail ourselves of the best research and recognized good principles and practices for remote learning. **We pledge that this course will not consist of you watching us speaking into a camera 3 hours a week.** Because we also recognize the special challenges facing all of us because of the COVID-19 pandemic, we've aimed to incorporate recommended structures and progressive strategies for supporting student wellness and well-being, as well as academic achievement, during the pandemic. **We pledge that we will be sensitive to and supportive of everyone's personal challenges and to recognize academic accommodations that a student's specific situation may require.**

**COURSE GOAL**

The goal of this course in the history of 18<sup>th</sup> century philosophy is to complete a *deep reading* of a single, philosophically significant text—Leibniz's *New Essays*—and to engage in deep philosophical reflection regarding its significance in itself and for understanding Leibniz's larger philosophical vision. The course will offer an opportunity for an immersive experience with the text as well as the development of students' capacities for deep, philosophical reading and reflection.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Course Outline 2020-21**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

**Leibniz as a Critic of Locke: *The New Essays on Human Understanding***

Leibniz was a philosopher blessed with an especially large vision of a complex, multi-layered and interconnected, metaphysical universe and cursed with the lack of discipline to produce a detailed, and systematic presentation of his grandiose philosophical vision. This challenges students wishing to approach Leibniz's thought. The goal of this course is to approach Leibniz's thought through its contrasts with Locke's empiricism as developed by Leibniz in his *New Essays*. We don't see him trying to explain or justify the universe of monads like in the *Monadology*, but we are given the opportunity to see what philosophical ends or goals Leibniz's universe of monads are supposed to achieve, which provide us an opportunity to peer more deeply behind Leibniz's motivations for developing his baroque metaphysics.

The aim of this course is to provide students with a curated opportunity for deep reading and deep reflection on the reasons Leibniz found so attractive about the metaphysics of the monadology. The goal is for students to successfully read and philosophically reflect on this one text in its entirety and to situate it somewhat within its intellectual context. The philosophical capacities targeted for development will be those most relevant for independent, deep reading of a philosophical text and reflecting philosophically on its meaning and significance.

Because this course is being offered online as an emergency remote learning course occasioned by the COVID pandemic, it is possible to successfully complete this course asynchronously. But regularly attending the synchronous meeting sessions is strongly recommended.

Prerequisites: Philoso 2202F/G

Antirequisites: None

Unless you have either the requisites for this course or written special permission from your Dean to enroll in it, you may be removed from this course and it will be deleted from your record. This decision may not be appealed. You will receive no adjustment to your fees in the event that you are dropped from a course for failing to have the necessary prerequisites.

**PREFERRED NAMES AND PRONOUNS**

If you prefer to be called something other than the name on file with the Registrar, please let us know. Please also feel free to specify the pronoun(s) you wish to be referred to by. If anyone mispronounces your name or forget your preferred name/pronoun, please correct them. I always greatly appreciate being corrected when I mispronounce or forget someone's preferred name/pronoun.

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Course Outline 2020-21

Dr. Benjamin Hill

#### ONLINE E-LEARNING PLATFORMS

##### **MS Teams (primary platform)**

Teams is a communication platform and information hub. It is the place to look for any information about the course and for the course contents. It has much better functionality than OWL and is more user-friendly, which is why I prefer using it.

- Group Chat
- Announcements
- Trello Board
- Streams Channels
- Zoom Info

##### **Zoom (video conferencing platform)**

Zoom is a more robust and user-friendly video conferencing platform than Teams or OWL's Collaborate. Western provides all of us with a corporate account, which has more features and greater functionality than a personal account. To access your Western corporate account, you must sign-in to Zoom using the SSO login, which is different than logging in using a Western email account. See Appendix 1 for suggestions regarding professionalism and good practices while video conferencing.

##### **OWL (secondary platform)**

OWL is Western's official learning management system. Our use of it will be limited but required.

- Assignments
- Gradebook
- Messenger

#### COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES

See Appendix 2 for the alignment of the course learning outcomes with the program and Western degree learning outcomes.

By the end of this course, successful students will be able to:

1. **Restate** and **Explain** the themes, theses, arguments, and philosophical doctrines of Leibniz's *New Theories on Human Understanding*.
2. **Question** and **Criticize** the theses, arguments, presuppositions, and philosophical motivations of Leibniz's *New Theories on Human Understanding*.
3. **Contrast** Leibnizianism as a philosophical doctrine with Lockean empiricism, and the specific points and theses comprising those two doctrines.
4. **Restate** and **Explain** the themes, theses, and arguments of selected secondary literature offering interpretations of Leibniz, Locke, or the Leibnizian criticisms of Locke.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Course Outline 2020-21**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

5. **Formulate** a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing scholarly discussion revolving around the theme(s) and topic(s) of chosen by the student.
6. **Defend** philosophically that thesis and **Evaluate** the more cogent response(s) scholars might make against the student's thesis or its defense.

**4036G METHODS OF EVALUATION (UNDERGRADUATE)**

All assignments are due at 23:59 Eastern time on their specified due dates and must be submitted via OWL unless specified otherwise. Assignments that have an automatic 48-hour grace period may be submitted via OWL as "late" but without any late penalty. To submit an assignment after the 48-hour grace period, when the OWL submission portal has closed, contact Prof. Hill and, if necessary, your Academic Dean, regarding an academic accommodation and alternative submission deadline. Assignments that are designated "Pass/Fail" will be scored as follows: Pass = 100; Fail (with submission) = 40; No Submission = 0. Pass/Fail assessments generally do not include qualitative assessments (comments or rubric scores).

**Weekly Philosophical Questions (15%)** [Learning Outcomes: 2, 3]

**Due: 12:00 (noon) Eastern Thursdays Jan 21–Apr 1 (FIRM)**

Not eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period

Submission via OWL Assignments

*Assessment: Pass/Fail/No Submission*

Every week students are required to submit two distinct Philosophical Questions directly engaging with the texts assigned for that week. Details regarding the required format and contents of each Question can be found in Appendix 3. It is expected that each Question will consist of a minimum of 100 words. Other things being equal, one of your Philosophical Questions should serve as the prompt for your Journal Reflection on the readings (see below).

**Philosophical Reflections Journal (35%)** [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3, 4]

**Due: 23:59 Eastern Jan 29, Feb 26, Mar 19, and Apr 2**

Eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period

Submission via OWL Assignments

*Assessment: Pass/Fail/No Submission*

Students are required to engage in dedicated philosophical reflection exercises on the weekly reading assignments and keep a journal documenting those exercises and their philosophical results. Details regarding the requirements and expectations for those reflective exercises and results can be found in Appendix 4. Each reflection should consist of a substantive engagement with the philosophical content and ideas of the readings. Philosophical engagements are generally focused around philosophically interesting or significant issues such as a significant vulnerability, a philosophical breakthrough or

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Course Outline 2020-21

Dr. Benjamin Hill

advancement, or a contested point of interpretation. Other things being equal, it is expected that the primary prompt for the reflective exercise will be the one of the student's Philosophical Questions (see above).

#### **Scholarly Term Paper Project (50%)** [Learning Outcomes: 2, 5, 6]

Students are required to complete a Scholarly Term Paper Project during the term. I have adopted a process-based approach toward this Term Paper Project. The Project consists of THREE (3) concrete deliverables oriented around three critical stages in the development of a term paper:

- **Paper Proposal Due March 26** (eligible for 48-hour automatic grace period) (worth 5%; graded Pass/Fail/No Submission with qualitative feedback) Your proposal (minimum 500-words) should specify the paper's theme and philosophical research question, the central passages and texts from the primary and secondary literature to be engaged, the basic way that you understand those passages and texts, and the working hypothesis being explored in the Project;
- **Argument Outline Due April 4** (eligible for 48-hour grace period) (worth 15%; graded numerically with qualitative feedback) Your argument outline should specify the structure and character of the philosophical defense being developed for your Final Draft submission;
- **Final Draft** (minimum 2500 words) **Due April 12 (FIRM)** (not eligible for 48-hour grace period per Senate regulation) (worth 30%; graded numerically) Your final draft should explain and defend your thesis against the scholarly tradition.

A critical paper defends a way of evaluating the philosophical content of a selection of key texts. It presupposes an interpretation of those key texts. Its thesis is that the philosophical idea(s) or argument(s) are or are not worthy of philosophical acceptance for a set of clearly characterized and united reasons. An argument outline is an outline of the student's argument presented in the critical paper as a defense of their assessment and the reasons on which it rests. A paper proposal is a brief description of the topic to be engaged in the paper, a statement of the central philosophical question to be solved in the project, and a preliminary, provisional statement of what the student anticipates the solution will prove to be. Details of each component as well as a grading rubric and guidelines and advice for planning and completing each component can be found in Appendix 5 and on the course MS Teams and OWL sites.

#### **Extra Credit Opportunities** [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

Opportunities for extra credits may be made available throughout the term. Some may be for extra credit on the score of a particular assignment; some may be for extra credit on a student's overall course grade. All opportunities will be announced in MS Teams and on OWL with the expectations and potential credits specified.

- ExCr Opportunity #1: "Make Me an Offer" **Due April 12 (FIRM)** [Learning Outcomes: TBD] Max +10 points on your final grade.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Course Outline 2020-21**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

It is expected that an extra credit project to involve an additional 15–20 hours of work for the average student. **Only projects that have received prior special permission from Dr. Hill will be graded.** I strongly recommend front-loading any extra credit project in the first nine weeks of the term so that it may be submitted before your course term paper project ramps up. Possible extra credit projects include:

- a) Review a recent book within the secondary literature.
- b) Locate and review a collection of relevant research resources.
- c) Build a scholarly resource webpage.
- d) Write a special 1500–1800-word research paper.
- e) Write a series of scholarly blog posts about the course readings.
- f) Write a dialogue involving Leibniz, Locke, and/or another historical or imagined interlocutor on a key philosophical point of debate.
- g) Write a symphonic tone poem representing the Leibniz-Locke disagreements.
- h) Write a dramatization of a philosophical discussion between Leibniz and Locke on a key philosophical issue.

Contact Dr. Hill if you are interest in submitting a proposal for an extra credit project.

**9061b METHODS OF EVALUATION (GRADUATE)**

All assignments are due at 23:59 Eastern time on their specified due dates and must be submitted via OWL unless specified otherwise. Assignments that have an automatic 48-hour grace period may be submitted via OWL as “late” but without any late penalty. To submit an assignment after the 48-hour grace period, when the OWL s submission portal has closed, contact Prof. Hill and, if necessary, the Graduate Chair or Academic Dean, regarding an academic accommodation and alternative submission deadline. Assignments that are designated “Pass/Fail” will be scored as follows: Pass = 100; Fail (with submission) = 40; No Submission = 0. Pass/Fail assessments generally do not include qualitative assessments (comments or rubric scores).

**Weekly Philosophical Questions (10%)** [Learning Outcomes: 2, 3]

**Due: 12:00 (noon) Eastern Thursdays Jan 21–Apr 1 (FIRM)**

Not eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period

Submission via OWL Assignments

*Assessment: Pass/Fail/No Submission*

Every week students are required to submit two distinct Philosophical Questions directly engaging with the texts assigned for that week. Details regarding the required format and contents of each Question can be found in Appendix 3. It is expected that each Question will consist of a minimum of 100 words. Other things being equal, one of your

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Course Outline 2020-21**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

Philosophical Questions should serve as the prompt for your Journal Reflection on the readings (see below).

**Philosophical Reflections Journal (20%)** [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3, 4]

**Due: 23:59 Eastern Jan 29, Feb 26, Mar 19, and Apr 2**

Eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period

Submission via OWL Assignments

*Assessment: Pass/Fail/No Submission*

Students are required to engage in dedicated philosophical reflection exercises on the weekly reading assignments and keep a journal documenting those exercises and their philosophical results. Details regarding the requirements and expectations for those reflective exercises and results can be found in Appendix 4. Each reflection should consist of a substantive engagement with the philosophical content and ideas of the readings. Philosophical engagements are generally focused around philosophically interesting or significant issues such as a significant vulnerability, a philosophical breakthrough or advancement, or a contested point of interpretation. Other things being equal, it is expected that the primary prompt for the reflective exercise will be the one of the student's Philosophical Questions (see above).

**Oral Presentation (20%)** [Learning Outcome 4]

**Due: 23:59 Eastern Mar 26**

Eligible for automatic 48-hour grade period

Submission via OWL Assignments

*Assessment: Numeric with qualitative feedback*

Graduate students are required to submit an oral presentation of an important contribution to the secondary literature regarding this course's content. Other things being equal, the item should be a central component engaged in the student's Research Term Paper. Details regarding the requirements and expectations can be found in Appendix 6.

**Scholarly Research Term Paper Project (50%)** [Learning Outcomes: 2, 5, 6]

Students are required to complete a Scholarly Research Term Paper Project during the term. I have adopted a process-based approach toward this Term Paper Project. The Project consists of THREE (3) concrete deliverables oriented around three critical stages in the development of a term paper:

- **Paper Proposal Due March 26** (eligible for 48-hour automatic grace period) (worth 5%; graded Pass/Fail/No Submission with qualitative feedback) Your proposal (minimum 500-words) should specify the paper's theme and philosophical research question, the central passages and texts from the primary and secondary literature to be engaged, the basic way that you understand those passages and texts, and the working hypothesis being explored in the Project;

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Course Outline 2020-21

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

- **Argument Outline Due April 4** (eligible for 48-hour grace period) (worth 15%; graded numerically with qualitative feedback) Your argument outline should specify the structure and character of the philosophical defense being developed for your Final Draft submission;
- **Final Draft** (minimum 6000 words) **Due April 30 (FIRM)** (not eligible for 48-hour grace period) (worth 30%; graded numerically) Your final draft should explain and defend your thesis against the scholarly tradition.

A critical paper defends a way of evaluating the philosophical content of a selection of key texts. It presupposes an interpretation of those key texts. Its thesis is that the philosophical idea(s) or argument(s) are or are not worthy of philosophical acceptance for a set of clearly characterized and united reasons. An argument outline is an outline of the student's argument presented in the critical paper as a defense of their assessment and the reasons on which it rests. A paper proposal is a brief description of the topic to be engaged in the paper, a statement of the central philosophical question to be solved in the project, and a preliminary, provisional statement of what the student anticipates the solution will prove to be. Details of each component as well as a grading rubric and guidelines and advice for planning and completing each component can be found in Appendix 5 and on the course MS Teams and OWL sites.

### Essay Course Word Count

As a course that satisfies the senior level essay course requirement, student enrolled in this course should expect to submit a minimum of 3500 words of written work.

### Department Target Average Policy

The Philosophy Department has a policy requiring a 78 average for each 4<sup>th</sup> year course. The grades I assign will be in the OWL "Gradebook". Should there be any discrepancy between the grade I recorded for you in OWL and your "official" grade reported by the Registrar, you should contact the Philosophy Department Undergraduate Chair for clarification and explanation. Western's current policies and procedures for undergraduate student academic appeals can be found [here](#).

### REQUIRED TEXTS

Gottfried Leibniz, *New Essays on Human Understanding*, translated and edited by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), ISBN 0521576601.

### NOTICE OF RECORDING

**All Discussion Sessions and Q&A Sessions for this course will be recorded.** The data captured during these recordings may include your image, voice recordings, chat logs and personal identifiers (name displayed on the screen). The recordings will be used for educational purposes related to this course, including evaluations. The recordings may

## **Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

### **Course Outline 2020-21**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

be disclosed to other individuals participating in the course for their private or group study purposes. Please contact the instructor via OWL Messenger if you have any concerns related to session recordings.

Participants in this course are not permitted to record the sessions, except where recording is an approved accommodation, or the participant has the prior written permission of the instructor.

Alternatives to being recorded are available.

- Virtual backgrounds are available for students concerned about revealing their ordinary backgrounds;
- Students in a significantly different time zone may request an alternative activity;
- Students who do not have the appropriate technical capabilities may request accommodations or an alternative activity;
- Students who may be disadvantaged by the recording may request an alternative activity.

### **VIRTUAL OFFICE HOURS**

I will be available for up to 60 minutes after each class meeting for discussion and questions on Zoom, which will be included in the video posted to MS Stream. Upon request and only in response to questions posted in MS Teams before 23:59 Eastern on Sundays, I will hold a special session of virtual office hours Mondays at 21:00 Eastern. All questions received will be answered during the virtual office hour. Should you wish to discuss something private and confidentially with me, please contact me through OWL Messenger to arrange an alternative, private meeting time.

### **COURSE SOCIAL MEDIA**

In addition to our official MS Teams and OWL site, we have a course website and blog as well as social media presence.

Website and blog: TBA

Facebook public page: TBA

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DrBenjaminHill1>

~~To receive credit for any public event or social media challenge, your posting must include the official course tags. Students without any social media presence or who wish not to post anything that might compromise their personal privacy to social media should contact Prof. Hill regarding alternative ways of documenting their participation or meeting the social media challenge(s).~~

~~@drbenjaminhill1~~

~~@TBA~~

~~#~~

~~#westernleibniz2021~~

~~#westernu~~

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Course Outline 2020-21

Dr. Benjamin Hill

#### **PROFESSIONALISM**

Education is a professional activity and campus is a professional environment. Everyone is expected to comport themselves in a manner appropriate for and conducive of such an environment. All academic activities, interactions, and conversations should be conducted in a respectful, inclusive, and professional manner. **Judgmental, belittling, shaming, rude, ridiculing, bullying, and all other such behavior, comments, and attitudes are inappropriate and will not be tolerated.** We require that all discussion be respectful and kind even when that discussion is critical, defensive, emotional, and contradictory.

#### **COPYRIGHT**

All original material presented in this course is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License:

© Benjamin Hill, 2021



#### **AUDIT**

Students wishing to audit the course should consult with the instructor prior to or during the first week of classes.

#### **DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY POLICIES**

The **Department of Philosophy Policies** which govern the conduct, standards, and expectations for student participation in Philosophy courses is available in the Undergraduate section of the Department of Philosophy website [here](#). It is your responsibility to understand the policies set out by the Senate and the Department of Philosophy, and thus ignorance of these policies cannot be used as grounds of appeal.

#### **ACCOMMODATION**

Students seeking academic accommodation on medical grounds for any missed tests, exams, participation components and/or assignments worth 10% or more of their final grade must apply to the Academic Counselling office of their home Faculty and provide documentation. Academic accommodation cannot be granted by the instructor or department. Documentation shall be submitted, as soon as possible, to the Office of the Dean of the student's Faculty of registration, together with a request for relief specifying the nature of the accommodation being requested. The Western Policy on Accommodation for Medical Illness and further information regarding this policy can be found [here](#).

#### **SELF- REPORTED ABSENCE FORM**

Students who experience an unexpected illness or injury or an extenuating circumstance (48 hours or less) that is sufficiently severe to temporarily render them unable to meet academic requirements (e.g., attending lectures or labs, writing tests or midterm exams,

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Course Outline 2020-21**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

completing and submitting assignments, participating in presentations) should self-declare using the online Self-Reported Absence portal. This option should be used in situations where the student expects to resume academic responsibilities within 48 hours or less. The conditions in place for self-reporting of medical or extenuating circumstances are [here](#).

**EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE**

At least three days prior to the deadline for withdrawal from a course without academic penalty, students will receive assessment of work accounting for at least 15% of their final grade. For 3000- or 4000-level courses in which such a graded assessment is impracticable, the instructor(s) must obtain an exemption from this policy from the Dean and this exemption must be noted on the corresponding course syllabus. In rare instances and at the Dean's discretion, other courses could receive a similar exemption, which also must be noted in the course syllabus.

For Phil 4036G the following grades will be available prior March 12, a total of 17.00% of your final grade:

- Weekly Philosophical Questions, Jan 21–Mar 4;
- Philosophical Reflections Journal, Jan 29 and Feb 26.

**COURSE ASSIGNMENT**

The last day of scheduled classes in any course will be the last day on which course assignments will be accepted for credit in a course. Instructors will be required to return assignments to students as promptly as possible with reasonable explanations of the instructor's assessment of the assignment.

**ACADEMIC OFFENCES**

Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, [here](#).

**PLAGIARISM CHECKING**

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and [Turnitin.com](#).

**SUPPORT SERVICES**

[Registrarial Services](#)

[Student Support Services](#)

[Services provided by the USC](#)

January 4, 2021

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Course Outline 2020-21**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

[Student Development Centre](#)

Students who are in emotional/mental distress should refer to [Mental Health@Western](#) for a complete list of options about how to obtain help. Immediate help in the event of a crisis can be had by phoning 519.661.3030 (during class hours) or 519.433.2023 after class hours and on weekends.

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 1 (Video Conferencing Professionalism)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

When thinking about how to best comport oneself during a video conference call and good practices regarding participation and organization of one, it is important to perceive how the technology impacts discussions. The video conferencing platforms and their functionalities artificially constrain (and enhance) interactions. The two biggest challenges are that they obscure most of the social and behavioral cues that structure conversations and that open-ended pauses or “dead air” are significantly more painful than they are in face-to-face interactions.

A solution is to impose tight structure onto the video conferencing session. A structure I’m finding particularly productive in video conferencing sessions is a “3R” structure of “Respond, React, Reply” (slightly modified).<sup>1</sup> Applied to a video conference format, a 3R structure looks as follows: the host provides a discussion prompt (either ahead of time or during the call’s introduction); each participant is then called on in turn to Respond to the prompt; other participants can React to the Response using the video conference emojis; and they can also Reply using the platform’s Chat function. Replies can continue in the Chat box or, should they seem especially important or fruitful, the moderator can elevate a reply to a prompt or ask for verbal elaboration and counter-replies.

The 3R structure avoids the two aforementioned problems with video conference calls. By having the host or moderator take the place of the social and behavior cues in much the same way that a radio or TV interviews does the other participants are relieved of the responsibility for guiding the conversation and are less likely to interrupt or talk over others, and no single voice dominates assuming that the moderator adequately controls the conversation and allows everyone to speak. And by having the host or moderator call on people, the “dead air” problem of no one knowing who should be speaking, and the natural urge that people have to fill such dead air, is eliminated. Unless otherwise specified, we will be using the 3R structure described above for any synchronous video conferencing we do.

Zoom offers their own sets of [Zoom etiquette tips](#) for participants and [Online Event Best Practices](#) for hosts. Check them out!

---

<sup>1</sup> Susan J Wegmann and Joyce K. McCauley, “Investigating Asynchronous Online Communication: A Connected Stance Revealed,” *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks* 18 no. 1 (2014): 1–17.  
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/545d/210804f12ca09ee9e3272688660368fe2999.pdf>

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 1 (Video Conferencing Professionalism)

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

This advice is specific to Zoom because it is so ubiquitous. But the ideas behind the recommendations apply to all video conferencing platforms. A rationale justifying the recommendations are included at the end.

#### Professionalism for Participants

- Log in approximately 5 min before the scheduled start of the video conference.
- Always include your proper professional name and affiliation or title (which may be context dependent) and your preferred pronouns too. Here is Dr. Hill's example: Benjamin Hill (he/him) Philosophy/Western. And dress professionally, appropriate to the context. (During COVID-19, a suit would be inappropriate and a COVID haircut ok; during normal times, professional office attire is called for even if you are Zooming from home.)
- Background: When you are not able to have/keep a professional background, use a professional virtual background. (See the "Zoom Backgrounds" folder in OWL for images you are free to use.)
- Always keep open the Participants and Chat screens.
- Always mute your microphone unless you are speaking.
- Keep your video turned off unless you are speaking.<sup>2</sup>
- When you finish speaking, provide a clear social cue that you are finished (I say, "thank you," hold my hand up in a gentle wave, and turn off my video).
- When the session involves open discussion or brainstorming, use the hand raise function in Participants to get a turn to speak. [Waving at the camera or, worse, interrupting/speaking over someone is only to be done when the host has failed to adequately control the meeting.]
- Use Chat and the Reactions/emojis to reply or react to a speaker's point; don't vocalize what can be shared effectively in these complimentary ways.
- If you need to step away, indicate so using the icons in Participants. (Pro tip: In Zoom, your status will automatically change to "away" when the Zoom window is not the active window for more than 2 minutes; you can, and should, adjust that in Settings, Chat to 60 minutes.)
- Always, and I mean always, turn off your camera when eating!

---

<sup>2</sup> This is somewhat controversial. Some believe that seeing people on video contributes to cohort and community building. Some also believe that observing spontaneous facial reactions is beneficial to participants. I rather strongly disagree with the latter point and am unclear about the evidence (if any) for the former. And even if there is some benefit for either point, I do not believe it outweighed by the distractions poor video etiquette inevitably causes. Ultimately, you need to make a considered, reflective judgment for yourself. Personally, when I'm host or when it is a small meeting, I leave my video on; for a large meeting, especially when the format controls the speaking order, I leave it off when I am not speaking.

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 1 (Video Conferencing Professionalism)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

#### Professionalism for Hosts

- Have a clear agenda that fits the allotted time. (Pro tip: Schedule and plan 50 min meetings so that people with back-to-back meetings have transition time.)
- Open the Zoom room at least 10 minutes before the schedule start of the Zoom.
- Screen share the agenda and any important info for participants to observe upon arrival before the scheduled start of the Zoom. (Pro tip #1: You can create a basic Title Slide in PowerPoint and have that open on your screen for sharing.) (Pro tip #2: Be sure to close all other programs and tabs on your screen before screen sharing.) (Pro tip #3: You can share music by selecting to “share computer sounds” from the Share Screen menu.)
- Have a dedicated moderator who can manage Security, Participants, and Chat. Where that is not possible or necessary, the host must be prepared to monitor those while conducting the meeting.
- Take firm control of the meeting: keep the agenda moving and keep a speakers list. Normalize using the hand raise function.
- Never allow people to interrupt or speak over another who has the floor.
- Know the command codes to the phone functions (esp. mute/unmute [\*6] and raise/lower hand [\*9]) and be prepared to give them out (some people calling in won't know them).
- End the meeting on time with a brief recap of the progress or accomplishments and log all participants out of the session.

#### Rationales for Recommended Practices

These recommendations begin from the premise that these events are professional events which call for standard and norms analogous to the standards and norms of analogous in-person events. If the in-person professional event (meeting, conference, collaboration, etc.) calls for certain standards and norms, those should be transferred to the video conferencing event. They also all revolve around the notion of professional respect for other participants and collaborators who are spending their time, energy, and focus on the event.

Time is the professional's biggest expense: don't ever waste their time. Setting up early and being prepared to start (and finish) on time are priorities number one. Keeping the material focused and maximizing the transfer of ideas relative to time spent is priority number two. With just a little reflection, almost all the recommendations can be seen to fit those two priorities. The remainder can be seen as facilitating others (the moderator/host or other participants) to avoid wasting time or to maximize the transference of ideas.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Appendix 2 (Alignment of Learning Outcomes)**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

<b>Course Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Aligned Philosophy Program Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Aligned <u>Western Degree Learning Outcomes</u></b>
<b>Restate</b> and <b>Explain</b> the themes, theses, arguments, and philosophical doctrines of Leibniz's <i>New Theories on Human Understanding</i> .	HSp 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 MajP 1, 2, 3, 4	1, 2, 3
<b>Question</b> and <b>Criticize</b> the theses, arguments, presuppositions, and philosophical motivations of Leibniz's <i>New Theories on Human Understanding</i> .	HSp 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 MajP 1, 2, 3, 4	1, 2, 3, 6
<b>Contrast</b> Leibnizianism as a philosophical doctrine with Lockean empiricism, and the specific points and theses comprising those two doctrines.	HSp 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 MajP 2, 4	1, 2, 6
<b>Restate</b> and <b>Explain</b> the themes, theses, and arguments of selected secondary literature offering interpretations of Leibniz, Locke, or the Leibnizian criticisms of Locke.	HSp 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 MajP 1, 2, 3, 4	1, 2, 3
<b>Formulate</b> a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing scholarly discussion revolving around the theme(s) and topic(s) of chosen by the student.	HSp 2, 4 MajP 2, 4	2, 3, 6
<b>Defend</b> philosophically that thesis and <b>Evaluate</b> the more cogent response(s) scholars might make against the student's thesis or its defense.	HSp 2, 3, 4, MajP 2, 4	1, 3, 6, 7

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 3 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

#### The Project

Every week students are required to submit two distinct Philosophical Questions directly engaging with the text assigned for that week. These Philosophical Questions are supposed to be the type of things that inform deeper philosophical engagements with the text. They are suitable for serving as: prompts for class discussion and philosophical conversation about the texts; prompts for philosophical reflections engaging with the texts; guiding questions for deeper or additional readings of the texts; or research questions for professional philosophical presentations or papers.

#### Concrete Deliverable **DUE THURSDAYS, 12:00 (NOON) EASTERN**

#### Not eligible for 48-hour grace period

- Minimum 100-word text consisting of two original questions + context and reflective overview (formatted as described below)

Submission via OWL Assignments, Inline only [RTF textbox: write or paste your text]

#### Project Parameters

- Each question should consist of three components:
  - Preamble: An explanatory introduction to the question which focus it onto the specific text(s) addressed and provides context for understanding what the question is seeking and what concerns are motivating it.
  - Question: The specific ask.
  - Reflective Overview of Your Question:
    - Classification of the question you are asking (see below) and why you classify it so
    - How you think it will move forward our philosophical engagement with the text.
- Question Types for Classification
  - Clarificatory: The question seeks to clarifying what the text is saying.
  - Contextual: The question seeks to position the text within its intellectual context or among its predecessors or tradition.
  - Interpretative: The question seeks to establish what the proper interpretation of the text is or the boundaries of that interpretation.
  - Assessing: The question seeks to probe the philosophical truth or adequacy of the text.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Appendix 3 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

**Examples (A–D)**

(A) Throughout *Essay I.ii–iv*, Locke spoke in terms of “innate **principles**,” as in “No innate Principles in the Mind,” when I expected to see him talking in terms of innate ideas. The way I’ve always heard his position described was in terms of “no innate ideas”.  
[Preamble]

What did Locke mean by “principle” when he presented his anti-nativism?  
[Question]

**Clarificatory Question:** I don’t understand what an “innate principle” means here and how it differs from an innate idea. Because this is a question whose answer will primarily benefit me in understanding what the text is saying, it is merely a Clarificatory Question.  
[Reflective Overview] [100 words]

(B) Throughout *Essay I.ii–iv*, Locke spoke in terms of “innate **principles**,” as in “No innate Principles in the Mind,” when I expected to see him talking in terms of innate ideas. The way I’ve always heard his position described was in terms of “no innate ideas”.  
[Preamble]

How was the term “principle” typically used in 17<sup>th</sup> century philosophical discussions? Was there something philosophically distinctive about principles rather than ideas in 17<sup>th</sup> century epistemology or philosophical discussions regarding innatism? [Question]

**Contextual Question:** We all would have a better understanding of why Locke was using the term “principle” and how he expected his audience to understand it if we knew how it was understood and used by others at the time (and in the context) that Locke was using it. Because this is a question whose answer will enlighten all modern readers, it is best seen as a Contextual Question. [Reflective Overview] [147 words]

(C) Throughout *Essay I.ii–iv*, Locke spoke in terms of “innate **principles**,” as in “No innate Principles in the Mind,” when I expected to see him talking in terms of innate ideas. The way I’ve always heard his position described was in terms of “no innate ideas”.  
[Preamble]

How does Locke conceive of principles allegedly operating/functioning if they were innate? What is an allegedly innate principle according to Locke or how does it operate epistemically? [Question]

**Interpretative Question:** This is asking for how the entity in question (a principle) operates philosophically or fits into Locke’s philosophical system rather than asking for the meaning of a word. Because it is about what the entities are, how they operate, or how they fit into a philosophical doctrine, the question is properly considered an Interpretative Question. [Reflective Overview] [130 words]

(D) Throughout *Essay I.ii–iv*, Locke spoke in terms of “innate **principles**,” as in “No innate Principles in the Mind,” when I expected to see him talking in terms of innate ideas.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Appendix 3 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

The way I've always heard his position described was in terms of "no innate ideas".  
[Preamble]

How does the epistemic function Locke attached to allegedly innate principle fit with the Cartesian conception of an innate idea of God? [Question]

Why should innatists like Leibniz or Descartes grant Locke that innate thoughts are principles with the epistemic characteristics he located in them? [Question]

**Assessing Question(s):** These are pushing into Locke's position and looking behind the texts for philosophical reasons to support (or discount) the interpreted philosophical claims being made in the texts. Because the question(s) push beyond the interpretation of the text, they are properly classified as Assessing Question(s). [Reflective Overview]  
[136 words]

**Assessment**

Pass/Fail/No Submission, no Qualitative Feedback

**Learning Outcomes**

1. **Question and Criticize** the theses, arguments, presuppositions, and philosophical motivations of Leibniz's *New Theories on Human Understanding*.
2. **Contrast** Leibnizianism as a philosophical doctrine with Lockean empiricism, and the specific points and theses comprising those two doctrines.

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 3 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

#### ADVICE FOR APPROACHING THIS ASSIGNMENT

Reading philosophically is not a natural act. But it is one that can be studied, reflected on, learned, and developed. I encourage you to reflect on it for yourself as your development progresses. I am happy to share a few observations with you here.

#### Philosophical Texts

I start my reflections with the text itself. Texts are multi-layered entities. Each of these layers affects what the text is saying, i.e. what is the philosophical message of the text.

- **Words:** The first layer, the top or surface of the text, consists of the words themselves. At its most basic, this is what the text says, as in “The author says, ‘blah, blah, blah...’”. This is the level of **Textual Exegesis**.
- **Meanings:** The next deeper levels are meanings. Individual words have meanings and there are propositional meanings. Texts employ—and exploit—both. Words have established meanings, although most are polysemous; propositional meaning is in some way a function of word meanings, but that function is not often merely compositional or the simple product of the meanings of the words. At their most basic, this is what the text means, as in “By saying ‘blah, blah, blah...,’ the author means  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$ .” Depending on how tightly connected these meanings are with the words, this is the level at which textual exegesis transitions to **Textual Meaning**. (N.B., thus far, if the philosophical message is thought to equal the textual meaning, that message is disengaged from context and authorial intent; our analysis remains at a simple, abstracted level of comprehension.)
- **Linguistic Acts:** It is important to recognize that not every linguistic act is the same, and that not every linguistic act is a straightforward assertion. There are all sorts of linguistic acts that substantially alter the propositional meaning of a sentence depending on how and when they are deployed. This applies to texts just as much as it applies to verbal exchanges. Philosophers often wish to analyze every statement in a text as if it were an assertion, other things being equal. Whether or not that is wise when directed at contemporary philosophical texts, I’m sure that it is not wise to uncritically presume it when dealing with historical texts that were composed in accordance with different philosophical practices governed by norms different from our own. (Indeed, uncritically and stubbornly reading every statement in a historical, philosophical text as a simple assertion is a professional pet peeve of mine.) This is the level at which the **Message** of the text begins to come into focus. Context and authorial intent begin to factor in here because the character of the linguistic act engaged in by an author is typically a decision made within, and in response to, a particular intellectual context. But there is one more noteworthy layer to a text also determining its message.
- **Authorial Intent:** Authorial intent picks up on the aim or goal the author means to achieve through their linguistic act. In philosophical contexts, what is often the focus of an issue are the concepts underlying the meanings and uses of words. In

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 3 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

explore and debating those concepts, authors may intentionally choose to stretch or alter those meanings or uses, and those intentions may or may not be clearly marked and explained in the text. Insofar as those authorial intentions drive a linguistic act, the philosophical message or **Deep Hidden Meaning (DHM)** of a philosophical text may be nuanced and philosophically different from the textual meaning. This, then, is the level at which **Philosophical Interpretation**, properly speaking, obtains. It is here, finally, that we can identify what a text says as in “The author defends/holds the position that *A*, *B*, and *Γ*.”

I hope that this provides you with a sense of the complexities and subtleties that are internal to a text. Depending on how radical an author’s intents are and how much the author wishes to stretch or play with language, the text’s message may be more or less removed from its surface language, but this structure, more or less, is what we as readers and interpreters have to dig through when we are reading. We shouldn’t rest contented here, however; there’s more to consider when reflecting on reading philosophically.

#### Philosophical Readers

A reader’s experience of a text is colored by what they bring to that experience. As a commonplace observation, this is probably general to the nature of experience. But whenever we ourselves are engaging in the activity of philosophical reading, it behooves us to pay attention to what we are bringing with us on that day. I take it as obvious that we often see what we expect to see in a text—indeed, shaping those expectation is a central aspect of lecture and education that students and professors both want, rely upon, and exploit when studying texts. We all should acknowledge that and be self-aware when of its influence when we are reading. But there’s something else we should also note that shapes how we as readers philosophically engage with a text. There are different kinds of engagements we are seeking when we study and return to a text, and they typically mutually connect with and inform one another.

- **Clarification:** This occurs when readers simply hope to clarify what a text says. It can occur at the superficial textual levels or at the deeper levels of a text’s meaning. Upon first reading a text, we are typically seeking just that—gaining familiarity with what a text says.
- **Contextualization:** This is a somewhat deeper level of engagement that occurs when we seek to gain familiarity with a text’s message. It occurs when we apply our understanding of the author’s intellectual context (whatever that may be) to our understanding of the text. Of course, this can happen during an initial read-through of a text, but it may also occur during subsequent readings. And of course, it is dependent on the knowledge of the context a reader brings with them.
- **Interpretation:** This is where most professional engagement in the history of philosophy occurs. As indicated above, it is where assessments of the linguistic, contextual, and philosophical character of the text, as well as the authorial intent, combine to inform one’s reading of the text. As students, this is what you should

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 3 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

be working toward developing and improving, i.e. your capacity for engaging in philosophical interpretation as you are reading through a philosophical text.

- **Philosophical Assessment:** This occurs when we are reading and reviewing a text with an eye toward its plausibility or truthfulness. Typically, what's our concern is whether the interpretation we are working with is philosophically adequate. In the history of philosophy, this type of assessment occurs simultaneously according to a few different metrics: on the one hand, the metric can be that which is in accord with the author's own historical era; on another hand, the metric can be that which is in accord with the author's preferred philosophical tradition or school; and on yet another hand, the metric can be that which is accord with our own [individual or sociological] contemporary philosophical assumptions and sensibilities (which is often confused with philosophical truth simpliciter by assessors—yet another professional pet peeve of mine).

Students need most to make the transition from reading for clarification to reading for interpretation, if they are to continue their philosophical development and improve their philosophical assessments and capacities for making rich and interesting philosophical assessments. Often, they do not feel as if they know how to transition and they are not comfortable and confident in transitioning. I hope that the observations shared in the next section below, and in how the course assessments are structured and scaffolded, can help students overcome these knowledge, comfort, and confidence gaps.

### Philosophical Questions

When thinking about how we are guided deeper into a text and how we shape and reshape our own knowledge and expectations as readers, I keep returning to the role that the right philosophical question plays in our reading. The ability to ask the right questions of a text and to bring those questions to bear in looking for information and insights in a text are key capacities for doing the history of philosophy as well as philosophy simpliciter. So, when you are engaged in a deep philosophical reading of a text, it is, I think, crucial that you are aware of and in control of the question(s) guiding your reading of that text at that moment. The first step in this is, of course, to be self-aware and not to unwittingly let your reading be informed by just any old question—or to be uninformed at all! So, you should be asking yourself what you are looking for and expecting to find in the text, and really what is philosophically at issue in the text. I'm not sure that I have much at this time to offer regarding how to be self-aware—it seems pretty basic and obvious to me! The second step involves asserting our own control over the questions shaping our own readings. The Weekly Philosophical Questions assessment is intended to support your development of this skill and to build confidence in your capabilities through regular practice.

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 4 (Philosophical Reflection Guidelines)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

#### The Project

Keep a journal documenting your weekly, dedicated philosophical reflection exercises by means of which you engage with the assigned materials. Each reflection should consist of a substantive engagement with the philosophical content and ideas contained in the assigned materials. It is expected that, other things being equal, the primary prompt for your reflective exercises will be one of your weekly Philosophical Questions. A philosophical engagement is generally focused on the philosophical interesting or salient point(s) of the materials, such as a significant philosophical vulnerability, a philosophical breakthrough or advancement, or an important, contested interpretative issue.

**Concrete Deliverable DUE 23:59 EASTERN ON THE FOLLOWING DATES:  
JAN 29, FEB 19, MAR 19, APR 2**

#### Eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period

In single document, broken into weekly sections, that are added to throughout the term, each weekly section should meet the following specifications:

- Minimum 350-word per weekly section consisting of
  - the prompt(s) you've selected to occasion or guide your reflections
  - your philosophical reflections addressing the prompt(s)
  - the conclusions or resolutions (if any) that you achieve as a result of your reflective engagement.

Submission via OWL Assignments, Attachment only [Word, PDF, or RTX files]

#### Project Parameters

- The reflective engagements should be considered part of your weekly study activities and should build directly out of your regular weekly studies.
- Dedicate time each week to engage in the recommended reflective activities and to keep your journal current and up to date between submissions.
- Feel free to be creative with how you reflectively engage with the material and how you record and document your reflection; embed in the document any non-text material you wish to record and submit.

#### Assessment

Pass/Fail/No Submission, no Qualitative Feedback

#### Learning Outcomes

1. **Restate** and **Explain** the themes, theses, arguments, and philosophical doctrines of Leibniz's *New Theories on Human Understanding*.
2. **Question** and **Criticize** the theses, arguments, presuppositions, and philosophical motivations of Leibniz's *New Theories on Human Understanding*.
3. **Contrast** Leibnizianism as a philosophical doctrine with Lockean empiricism, and the specific points and theses comprising those two doctrines.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Appendix 4 (Philosophical Reflection Guidelines)**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

4. **Restate** and **Explain** the themes, theses, and arguments of selected secondary literature offering interpretations of Leibniz, Locke, or the Leibnizian criticisms of Locke.

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 4 (Philosophical Reflection Guidelines)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

#### ADVICE FOR APPROACHING THIS ASSIGNMENT

Reflection is work, hard work. While it comes naturally to some students, others find it difficult and intimidating. For this course, almost all of the reflective exercises are philosophical and/or cognitive, which means that they are designed to foster philosophical analysis and engagement or knowledge retention and recollection. They are not, in other words, exercises in self-reflection, which are designed to uncover aspects about your own character, belief system, or experiences. That being said, there are considerable overlaps in the techniques and practices conducive to both forms of reflective exercises. Here are some bits of practical advice and hints that may help you get started and be successful at philosophical and cognitive reflective exercises. Because the reflective exercises for this course are ungraded, no rubric for assessing them will be used. But because a rubric may be helpful in guiding self-evaluation, I offer you one to review.

- Find a quiet place with no distractions; a place that you can turn inward toward your thoughts and ideas. Music can help to set the mood for introspective meditation and reflection.
- TURN OFF THE DAMN PHONE AND ITS DINGING NOTIFICATIONS!!! (At least while you are reflecting.)
- Take 5 minutes to settle and relax before beginning the reflective exercise.
- Plan on spending 20 minutes (or so) on the reflective exercise — spend at least 15 minutes engaged in reflection, thinking through the prompts and responding to the questions *before* writing notes your thoughts and ideas.
- Focus on contrasts—compare what you believe or want to say with alternative perspectives. If it helps to think about how another philosopher (Hume, Locke, Socrates, Leibniz, Russell, etc.) would respond or react, do it.
- Before transitioning to jotting down note or writing up your reflections, recap the significant findings and recollections and how the ideas connect and intersect with each other.
- The most important thing any reflective exercise is the act of reflection and how deeply or intently you were engaged in it. If you are the type of person who thinks best while writing, then write away while you reflect! If you are the type of person who thinks best while talking, don't be afraid to use a voice-to-text tool or some similar way of getting your reflections down. But if you are not either of those kinds of people and you find it easier or better to think first and then write down your ideas, do that. What is important is making it work for you, no matter how you do it.
- When engaging in *postcognitia* reflections, spend some time bringing everything together: the *praecognitia* prompts and reflections, your questions and analyses and assessments of the reading, and the *postcognitia* prompts and reflections.

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 4 (Philosophical Reflection Guidelines)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

Philosophical Reflections Assignments Rubric				
Categories	Exemplary (4 +/-)	Superior (3 +/-)	Adequate (2 +/-)	Inadequate (1 +/-)
<b>Depth of Reflections</b>	Seeks to understand the text or ideas by examining <b>rigorous and in-depth</b> their meaning and philosophical significance as well as their connections to one another and other sections of the text. Demonstrates a <b>sophisticated ability</b> to analyze texts, ideas, and logical structures. <b>Consistently asks probing questions</b> about ideas and <b>seeks to answer these in detail</b> .	Seeks to understand the text or ideas by examining <b>somewhat cautiously</b> their meaning and philosophical significance as well as their connections to one another and other sections of the text. Demonstrates <b>some aptitude</b> for analyzing texts, ideas, and logical structures. <b>Occasionally asks probing questions</b> about ideas and <b>often seeks an answer</b> to these.	Seeks to understand the text or ideas by examining <b>cautiously</b> their meaning and philosophical significance as well as their connections to one another and other sections of the text. Demonstrates a <b>merely adequate ability</b> for analysis texts, ideas, and logical structures. <b>Rarely asks probing questions</b> about ideas and make <b>little headway toward answering</b> them.	Exhibits <b>little to no examination</b> of the underlying philosophical meaning and significance of the text. <b>Little to no evidence of analytic ability</b> or the potential thereof is displayed. <b>Almost never asks philosophically interesting questions</b> about the ideas and <b>makes little to no progress</b> toward answering any philosophically interesting questions.
<b>Makes Effective Use of Previously Acquired Philosophical Insights</b>	Integrates <b>rich and effective comparisons (or contrasts)</b> between the text or ideas being reflected on and previously encountered material. Makes <b>clear connections</b> through <b>judicious references</b> and allusions to said material.	<b>Somewhat interesting comparisons or contrasts</b> between the texts or ideas being reflected on and previous material are presented. A <b>connection is indicated</b> through references to the previous material.	A <b>vague or unclear</b> attempt to incorporate some previous material is <b>perhaps evident</b> . What connection(s), if any, with the previously assigned material are <b>unclear or murky</b> .	<b>No attempt</b> to incorporate or connect with any previously encountered material <b>is evident</b> or <b>plausibly presented</b> by or through the reflection.
<b>Makes Effective Use of Previous Course Material (as appropriate)</b>	Integrates <b>rich and effective comparisons (or contrasts)</b> between the text or ideas being reflected on and previously course material. Makes <b>clear connections</b> through <b>judicious references</b> and allusions to said materials	<b>Somewhat interesting comparisons or contrasts</b> between the texts or ideas being reflected on and previous course materials are presented. A <b>connection is indicated</b> through references to said materials	A <b>vague or unclear</b> attempt to incorporate some previous course material is <b>perhaps evident</b> . What connection(s), if any, with the previously presented course materials are <b>unclear or murky</b> .	<b>No attempt</b> to incorporate or connect with any previous course materials <b>is evident</b> or <b>plausibly presented</b> by or through the reflection.
<b>Thoroughness</b>	Reflection provides <b>complete explanations</b> of <b>all</b> of the philosophically salient points and <b>completely covers</b> the issue flagged by the prompt.	Reflection provides <b>detailed explanations</b> of <b>almost all</b> of the philosophically salient points and <b>satisfactorily covers</b> most of the issue flagged by the prompt.	Reflection provides <b>merely adequate explanations</b> of the <b>main</b> philosophical point and <b>covers somewhat</b> the issue flagged by the prompt.	Reflection <b>fails to provide adequate explanations</b> of key philosophical points and <b>barely covers</b> the issue flagged by the prompt, if at all.
<b>Overall Assessment</b>	<b>100–80</b> <b>Could not reasonably demand better</b> work from a student at this level. <b>4 or greater in most areas</b> of the rubric.	<b>79–70</b> <b>Above average</b> work for students at this level. <b>May include lower in one area, if outweighed by exemplary and strongly superior</b> marks in the remaining areas.	<b>69–60</b> <b>Average</b> work for students at this level. <b>May include exemplary marks (3- or greater) in one or two areas that are overwhelmed by adequate</b> marks in the other areas.	<b>59–50</b> <b>Below average</b> work for students at this level. May include a 2- in one area that is overwhelmed by inadequate marks or in the other areas.
				<b>50&gt;</b> <b>Failing</b> work. No submission, submission formally unacceptable, or so poorly completed as to warrant no credit.

## Philoso 4036G/9061B: Leibniz as a Critic of Locke

### Appendix 5 (Term Paper Guidelines)

Dr. Benjamin Hill

#### PAPER PROPOSAL

##### The Project

Submit a written proposal for your term paper project. A proposal is a preliminary description and justification of the philosophical project that results in your philosophical term paper. It is not something done prior to your beginning study or research for the term paper, but it is done prior to completing the study or research for your paper. It should be approached as an opportunity for feedback regarding your paper project, the challenges you should expect to encounter, and ways of shaping or altering the project to improve its philosophical character as well as its likelihood of success.

**Concrete Deliverable DUE MARCH 26 (FRI) 23:59 EASTERN**

**Eligible for 48-hour grace period**

- Minimum 500-word document describing the key points of your Term Paper Project

Submission via OWL, Attachment only (Word, PDF, or RTF)

##### Project Parameters

The proposal should clearly address the following points:

- Present the Project's Theme and Topic, broadly construed;
- Present the specific research question being solved/answered through this term paper project;
- Identify the central sections and passages from the primary text to be engaged in the project;
- Describe how those passages and sections are being interpreted;
- Present the preliminary bibliography for the project (if the assignment specifies a Research Term Paper);
- Present the working hypothesis or preliminary thesis, as precisely as it can be formulated at this point.

##### Assessment

Pass/Fail/No Submission with Qualitative Feedback

##### Learning Outcomes

1. **Question** and **Criticize** the theses, arguments, presuppositions, and philosophical motivations of Leibniz's *New Theories on Human Understanding*.
2. **Restate** and **Explain** the themes, theses, and arguments of selected secondary literature offering interpretations of Leibniz, Locke, or the Leibnizian criticisms of Locke. [For Research Term Paper Projects only]
3. **Formulate** a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing scholarly discussion revolving around the theme(s) and topic(s) of chosen by the student.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Appendix 5 (Term Paper Guidelines)**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

**ARGUMENT OUTLINE**

**The Project**

Students are required to provide a description of the **logical structure** of the argument that they are developing in their Term Papers that provides justification for the truth of their thesis. This is different from a typical paper outline in that the structural features of central interest are not the topics and sections of the paper but the premises, inferences, and conclusion(s) being presented through the paper.

**Concrete Deliverable DUE APRIL 4 (SUN) 23:59 EASTERN**

**Eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period**

- Materials (as deemed appropriate and clearest by the student) describing, presenting, or showing the logical structure of the argument or train of reasons that the students are using in their paper to show the truth of their thesis.

Submission via OWL Assignments, attachment only (Word, PDF, RTF) [unless alternative submission arrangements are pre-arranged]

**Project Parameters**

- There is no minimum specified word count because some students may wish to present their arguments using formal logical representations or symbolism, such as argument schema, argument trees, or argument formalized in a particular logical system.
- Students are encouraged to present and describe the structure as they deem appropriate and using the representational tools and resources they find most expressive.

**Assessment**

Numeric with Qualitative Feedback

**Learning Outcomes**

3. **Formulate** a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing scholarly discussion revolving around the theme(s) and topic(s) of chosen by the student.
4. **Defend** philosophically that thesis and **Evaluate** the more cogent response(s) scholars might make against the student's thesis or its defense.

**Philoso 4036G/9061B:  
Leibniz as a Critic of Locke**

**Appendix 5 (Term Paper Guidelines)**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

**FINAL DRAFT**

**The Project**

Students are required to submit a final draft of their paper. The final draft should consist of their complete and considered explanation and defense of their paper's thesis against the scholarly tradition. Students should write the paper for their classroom peers, which means that the audience would be their classmates and that the standard for "common knowledge" would be the materials presented through the course, including class discussions and supplemental readings and materials made available to students. The final draft should be prepared as if it were ready for submission for publication.

**Concrete Deliverable for Undergraduate Students (4036G)**

**DUE APRIL 14 (WED) 23:59 EASTERN**

**Not eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period**

- Minimum 2500-word document

Submission via OWL Assignments, attachment only (Word, PDF, RTF)

**Concrete Deliverable for Graduate Students (9061B)**

**DUE APRIL 14 (WED) 23:59 EASTERN**

**Not eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period**

- Minimum 6000-word document

Submission via OWL Assignments, attachment only (Word, PDF, RTF)

**Project Parameters**

- Clearly express your paper's philosophically significant and interesting thesis.
- Provide a rich and detailed explanation of what your thesis consists in.
- Provide a compelling and forceful justification that shows the truth of your thesis.
- Defuse or respond to the obvious or primary objection(s) to your thesis.
- Document should be prepared as if for submission for publication.

**Assessment**

Numeric, Qualitative Feedback upon request only

**Learning Outcomes**

1. **Formulate** a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing scholarly discussion revolving around the theme(s) and topic(s) of chosen by the student.
2. **Defend** philosophically that thesis and **Evaluate** the more cogent response(s) scholars might make against the student's thesis or its defense.

**Philoso 2202F:  
[Western] Early Modern Philosophy**

**Appendix 6 (Graduate Oral Presentation)**

**Dr. Benjamin Hill**

**The Project**

Graduate students are required to submit an oral presentation of ONE (1) important contribution to the secondary literature regarding this course's content. The contribution should be at minimum comparable to a typical journal article in the field (approx. 10,000-words). In addition to journal articles, books and book chapters or sections would be considered acceptable contributions to present. Other things being equal, the item should be a central component of the student's Research Term Paper.

**Concrete Deliverable **DUE MARCH 26 (FRI) 23:59 EASTERN**  
Eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period**

- A 30-minute (minimum), PowerPoint slideshow, annotated and with video commentary.
- A PDF of the secondary literature item being presented.

Submission via OWL Drop Box, file uploads (PPT and PDF)

**Project Parameters**

The presentation should clearly address the following points:

- Clearly orient the item within the primary text(s) and the course discussions of those texts;
- Provide a clear explanation of the philosophical or interpretative question(s) being resolved within or through the item;
- Provide clear exegesis of the item, including situating it within its own appropriate intellectual context, and a clear identification of the item's primary thesis;
- Provide a clear breakdown and analysis of the item's primary argument(s) and their logical structures;
- Provide a clear assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the item's argument(s) as well as an overall assessment item's contribution to the scholarly discussion.

**Assessment**

Numeric with Qualitative Feedback

**Learning Outcomes**

1. **Restate** and **Explain** the themes, theses, and arguments of selected secondary literature offering interpretations of Leibniz, Locke, or the Leibnizian criticisms of Locke.