Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Seminar Outline 2023–24

Fall Term 2023　　　　　　　**Instructor: N/A**
Seminar (001)

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.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

In the seventeenth century, Descartes's doctrine of mind-body dualism played an outsized role in setting the terms and conditions for theorizing about the mind. This outsized role continues to this day, affecting both how scholars approach the historical study of philosophy of mind and how contemporary practitioners approach theorizing about the mind. This is kind of surprising, given that Descartes himself never actually developed a theory of mind (he never completed parts 5 and 6 of the *Principles*) and that there were alternative conceptions of mind floating around during the seventeenth century.

This graduate-level course will survey a number of sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and early eighteenth-century theories of mind to explore rich variety of perspectives on mind that philosophers contemplated and reflected on. Although a final determination of figures and theories is pending, the course may contain material from Francisco

COURSE GOAL

The aim of this survey course is to discover how various philosophers conceived of the mind in the early modern period. Emphasis will be placed on non-Cartesian alternatives explored during the period. One of the goals of the course is to break the Cartesian hegemony on our conception of what mind-body dualism consisted of. Another goal is to recognize that it was not inevitable that the Cartesian conception of mind-body dualism would come to dominate our conception of dualism.

Western
Arts&Humanities

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Seminar Outline 2023–24

Suarez, Pierre Gassendi, Kenelm Digby, Thomas Hobbes, Margaret Cavendish, Benedict Spinoza, Louis de la Forge, Robert Desgabet, Henry More, Ralph Cudworth, John Locke, Nicholas Malebranche, Anne Conway, John Norris, Mary Shepherd, or George Berkeley. And of course, René Descartes.

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.

ONLINE E-LEARNING PLATFORMS
OWL
OWL is Western's official learning management system. It will be our primary online learning platform.

COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES
See Appendix 1 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. **Explain** the differences among the various theories of mind developed and defended during the early modern period, esp the differences between Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.
2. **Critically Evaluate** the arguments in support of Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.
3. **Formulate** a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing philosophical discussion revolving around a specific issue or problem among these accounts of the mind.
4. **Defend** philosophically that thesis and **Evaluate** the more cogent response(s) philosophers might make against the student's thesis or its defense.

9068A METHODS OF EVALUATION
All assignments are due at 23:59:59 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 Dr. 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 with

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Seminar Outline 2023−24

distinction = 100; Pass = 80; Fail (with submission) = 40; No Submission = 0. Pass/Fail assessments generally do not include qualitative assessments (comments or rubric scores).

Weekly Philosophical Questions/Comments (20%) [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2]
Due: 12:00 (noon) Eastern Mondays 18 Sept – 04 Dec (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 substantial Philosophical Questions or Comments directly engaging with the texts and ideas assigned for that week. Details regarding the required format and contents of each Question/Comment can be found in Appendix 2. It is expected that each will consist of a minimum of 100 words.

Oral Presentation (20%) [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2]
Due: 23:59:59 Eastern the Sunday before the reading is to be discussed
Eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period
Submission via OWL Assignments
Assessment: Numeric with Qualitative Feedback
Students are required to submit a 20-minute annotated PowerPoint presentation on a designated reading and defend that presentation during seminar discussion. The presentation should include a brief overview of the texts as well as critical commentary on it. The class will review the PowerPoint presentations offline before the seminar meeting and the first part of the meeting will be devoted to discussing the student's presentation and hearing their defense of it. Details regarding the format and expectations for this assessment can be found in Appendix 3.

Scholarly Research Term Paper Project (60%) [Learning Outcomes: 1, 3, 4]
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 assignment. The Project consists of THREE (3) concrete deliverables oriented around three critical stages in the development of a term paper:

- **Paper Proposal Due 17 Nov 2023** (eligible for 48-hour automatic grace period) (worth 10%; 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 8 Dec 2023** (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 05 Jan 2024 (FIRM)** (not eligible for 48-hour grace period) (worth 35%; 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 4 and on the course OWL sites.

REQUIRED TEXTS

STUDENT HOURS

I am generally on campus and available to meet anytime my office door is open. Contact me through OWL Messenger to arrange time to meet via Zoom or in-person. I will include multiple students in the Zoom or meeting if the request is to discuss course material; if the request is to discuss something confidential (grades, accommodations, etc.), please let me know and an alternative Zoom session will be arranged.

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

Western
Arts&Humanities

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind
Seminar Outline 2023–24

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

ACCOMMODATIONS
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.

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
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.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 1 (Alignment of Learning Outcomes)

Course Learning Outcomes	Aligned Philosophy Program Learning Outcomes	Aligned Western Degree Learning Outcomes
Explain the differences among the various theories of mind developed and defended during the early modern period, esp the differences between Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.	HSp 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 MajP 1, 2, 3, 4	1, 2, 3
Critically Evaluate the arguments in support of Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.	HSp 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 MajP 2, 4	1, 2, 6
Formulate a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing philosophical discussion revolving around a specific issue or problem among these accounts of the mind.	HSp 2, 4 MajP 2, 4	2, 3, 6
Defend philosophically that thesis and **Evaluate** the more cogent response(s) philosophers might make against the student's thesis or its defense.	HSp 2, 3, 4, MajP 2, 4	1, 3, 6, 7

Western
Arts&Humanities

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind
Appendix 2 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

The Project

Every week students are required to submit two substantial Philosophical Questions or Comments directly engaging with the text or ideas assigned for that week. These Philosophical Questions/Comments are supposed to be the type of things that inform deeper philosophical engagements with the ideas. 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 12:00 (NOON) EASTERN, MONDAYS 18 Sept – 04 Dec (FIRM)**

Not eligible for 48-hour grace period (because I require 48-hours to review the questions and prepare them for discussion during the seminar meeting)

Extra Credit Bonus

+5 point awarded to Questions/Comments selected for discussion during the seminar meeting

- Minimum 100-word text consisting of two original questions or comments + 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/comment 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 or Comment: The specific ask or observation/criticism.
    - Reflective Overview of Your Question or Comment:
        - 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.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 2 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

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 17th century philosophical discussions? Was there something philosophically distinctive about principles rather than ideas in 17th 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.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 2 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

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. **Explain** the differences among the various theories of mind developed and defended during the early modern period, esp the differences between Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.
2. **Critically Evaluate** the arguments in support of Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 2 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

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 it 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 α, β, and γ." 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

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 2 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

> 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 is 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

Appendix 2 (Philosophical Questions Guidelines)

> 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.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 3 (Graduate Oral Presentations Guidelines)

The Project

Students are required to submit a 20-minute annotated PowerPoint presentation on a designated reading and defend that presentation during seminar discussion. The presentation should include a brief overview of the texts as well as critical commentary on it. The class will review the PowerPoint presentations offline before the seminar meeting and the first part of the meeting will be devoted to discussing the student's presentation and hearing their defense of it.

Concrete Deliverable **DUE: 23:59 EASTERN, THE SUNDAY BEFORE THE READING IS TO BE DISCUSSED**

Eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period

- 20-min (+/- 10%).ppt slide show consisting of
    - Brief overview of the assigned reading material (<15%)
    - Focused discussion of the issue to be critically discussed (~10%)
    - Presentation of the Critical Commentary (50%<60%)
    - Discussion of options of addressing the criticism and their prospects (25%<30%)

Submission via OWL Assignments, Attachment only [.ppt files]

Project Parameters

- Twenty minutes is a long time for viewers to watch your presentation and is not nearly enough time for presenters to present their ideas—Be economical and judicious in your selections for inclusion!
- It can be somewhat painful to listen/view yourself presenting via recording (I hate seeing and listening to myself), but it is becoming increasingly common and important to be able to present material asynchronously.

Assessment

Numeric with Qualitative Feedback

Learning Outcomes

1. **Explain** the differences among the various theories of mind developed and defended during the early modern period, esp the differences between Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.
2. **Critically Evaluate** the arguments in support of Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 4 (Scholarly Research Term Paper)

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: 17 NOV 2023
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 that the paper should be 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. **Explain** the differences among the various theories of mind developed and defended during the early modern period, esp the differences between Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.
2. **Formulate** a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing philosophical discussion revolving around a specific issue or problem among these accounts of the mind.
3. **Defend** philosophically that thesis and **Evaluate** the more cogent response(s) philosophers might make against the student's thesis or its defense.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 4 (Scholarly Research Term Paper)

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 08 DEC 2023
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

1. **Explain** the differences among the various theories of mind developed and defended during the early modern period, esp the differences between Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.
2. **Formulate** a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing philosophical discussion revolving around a specific issue or problem among these accounts of the mind.
3. **Defend** philosophically that thesis and **Evaluate** the more cogent response(s) philosophers might make against the student's thesis or its defense.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 4 (Scholarly Research Term Paper)

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
DUE: 05 JAN 2024
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. **Explain** the differences among the various theories of mind developed and defended during the early modern period, esp the differences between Cartesian and non-Cartesian theories of mind.
2. **Formulate** a coherent and philosophically significant thesis that critically engages with an ongoing philosophical discussion revolving around a specific issue or problem among these accounts of the mind.
3. **Defend** philosophically that thesis and **Evaluate** the more cogent response(s) philosophers might make against the student's thesis or its defense.

Philosop 9068A:
Cartesian and Non-Cartesian Theories of Mind

Appendix 4 (Scholarly Research Term Paper)

Graduate Term Paper Grading Rubric								
Categories	Exemplary (4 +/-)		Superior (3 +/-)		Adequate (2 +/-)		Substandard (1 +/-)	Unacceptable (0 +/-)
Overall Assessment The paper is publishable or worth pursuing for professional publication or presentation	**97-100** Paper is **publishable** with **minor** revisions.	**97-93** Paper is **publishable** with **moderate** revisions.	**93-90** Paper is **publishable** with **major** revisions.	**90-87** Paper displays **potential** for becoming publishable.	**87-83** Paper displays **some features worth** graduate level study.	**83-80** Paper displays **some features potentially worth** graduate level study.	**80-70** Paper displays **few features of limited** graduate level interest.	**70>** Paper displays **no redeeming features worth** graduate level study.
Philosophical and Historical Significance	Paper is of **considerable** philosophical and/or historical interest. Provides a **noteworthy contribution** to the scholary conversation.		Paper is of **some** philosophical and/or historical interest. Provides a **minor contribution** to the scholarly conversation.		Paper is of **limited** philosophical or historical interest. Make **no contribution** to the scholarly discussion even though engaged with it.		Paper is of **no** philosophical or historical interest. **Fails to adequately present** or comprehend the scholarly discussion.	Paper is of **no interest**. **Fails to engage** with the issues or the scholarly discussion.
Depth of Analysis	Paper displays **deep and/or original** analysis of the philosophical issues or historical context and **effectively** uses that depth in **furthering** the scholarly conversation.		Paper displays **reasonably deep and interesting** analysis of the philosophical issues or historical context. **Makes use** of that depth in **contributing** to the scholarly conversation.		Paper displays **limited** analysis of the philosophical issues or the historical context. Makes only **occasional use** of that analysis in **engaging** with the scholarly conversation.		Paper displays **superficial** analysis of the philosophical issues or historical context.	Paper displays **no analysis**. At best it is a **paraphrase** of the text(s) used.
Argument Coherence	Paper makes a **compelling and forceful** argument in support of its thesis. **Full and reasonable explanations** of the premises and ideas that the argument rests on are provided.		Paper makes a **reasonable** argument in support of its thesis. **Some explanations** of the premises and ideas that the argument rests on are provided.		Paper **argues** in support of its thesis. **Occasional explanations** of key ideas and concepts are provided.		Paper does **not clearly argue** in support of its **purported thesis**.	Paper provides **no discernible argument** or **no discernible thesis**.
Use of Primary and/or Secondary Literature	Paper **makes judicious and effective** use of **both** the **primary** and **recent secondary** literature **appropriate** to its topic and thesis.		Paper makes **good** use of the **relevant primary** literature. Paper makes **some** use of **the appropriate recent secondary** literature.		Paper **makes use** of the **relevant primary** literature. Paper makes **some** use of **some relevant secondary** literature.		Paper **uses** the **primary** literature **in some way.** Paper **ineffectually** uses **some secondary** literature.	Paper **mentions** the **primary** literature. **Mentions** of the **secondary** literature, **if present**, are **confused** or **misguided**.
Use of Course Materials and Classroom Discussions	Paper **effectively incorporates** or **builds** upon the ideas engaged in the **course** and discussed during **class meetings**.		Paper **uses to a large extent** the ideas engaged in the **course** or discussed during **class meetings**.		Paper makes **limited use** of the ideas engaged in the **course** or discussed during **class meetings**.		Paper displays **some** engagement with the **topics covered** in the course or discussed in class.	Paper **fails to engage** with the ideas or main topics of the course. Paper **fails to reflect** the influence of class discussion.

Western
Arts&Humanities