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**Disgrifiad y Cwrs/Course Description:**

What is so deadly about the ‘deadly sins’? Does the inclusion of gluttony, lust and sloth merely reflect a Puritanical suspicion that virtue can’t be any fun? Does the person without pride lack anything but appropriate self-respect? Aren’t such alleged vices less deadly than some so-called virtues? What are faith and hope but an abdication of responsibility for one’s beliefs and a foolish penchant for comforting delusions? Have we inappropriately medicalised vices such as addiction? Does research on ‘implicit bias’ show that the most virtuous of efforts will anyway be undermined by vices of which we are not even aware?

This course will explore the nature of vice in the light of both philosophical theory and psychological research. We will examine what guidance philosophy may offer us in shaping our characters, evaluating those of our fellow citizens and formulating public policy.

No previous knowledge of philosophy will be assumed.

The specific content of the course will vary, but the following list of sample topics indicate the kind of subject matter which may be discussed:

- What can psychology tell us about the empirical respectability, or otherwise, of our concept of ‘vice’?
- What makes a character trait a virtue or a vice?
- What is the nature of particular vices?
- Are some vices especially ‘deadly’ and, if so, why?
- Can somebody have one or more vices while still possessing some virtues?
- Does the nature of particular vices make them especially corrupting of good character?
- What is the relation between vice, blameworthiness and moral responsibility for character and action?
- Is addiction a vice or an illness?
- To what extent are we responsible for our implicit biases and their influence on our behaviour? Do implicit biases necessarily undermine virtue? What, if anything, can we do about them?
- How can we eradicate vices in ourselves, prevent their development in our children, and assist our fellow citizens to resist them?
- Can public policy shape citizens’ character? Should it?

The course may draw on case studies and examples from fiction and non-fiction to illustrate the theoretical positions discussed and students are encouraged to draw further examples from their own experience.
Amcanion/Goals:

By the end of this course, you should be able to:

• demonstrate an understanding of core elements of the course material;
• critically read and analyse a philosophical text;
• use philosophical vocabulary appropriate to the subject matter of the specific course;
• formulate and defend a philosophical thesis;
• constructively discuss philosophical ideas with others;
• recognise, analyse and critically evaluate arguments;
• compare and contrast different positions on an issue;
• explain and defend a view clearly and concisely whether orally or in writing;
• respond constructively to disagreement;
• evaluate claims concerning ethical character in the context of historical and contemporary discussions;
• bring the insights of both philosophy and psychology to bear on questions concerning the nature of vice; the architecture of character, virtues and vices; and the implications for public policy;
• formulate useful questions in the context of ethical theory, empirical research and public policy.

Amgylchedd/Environment:

If something occurs which you feel negatively affected your ability to learn, please do not hesitate to discuss the matter with me. If you have any disability which may affect your ability to succeed in the class, please discuss any accommodations you may require with me as soon as possible.

Cymraeg/Welsh:

Croeso i chi anfon ebost ataf yn Gymraeg neu Saesneg.

Ymhellach, mae gennych hawl i gael eich asesu trwy gyfrwng y Gymraeg neu’r Saesneg. Os hoffech gael eich asesu yn Gymraeg, rhowch wybod imi cyn gynted à phosib.

You are welcome to send email to me in Welsh or English.

Furthermore, you have a right to be assessed through the medium of Welsh or English. If you would like to be assessed in Welsh, please let me know as soon as possible.

Cyfrifon Llyfrgell a Chyfrifiadur/Library and Computer Accounts:

You will be provided with details of your computer account during the first class provided that you registered in advance and do not already have one. Your computer account will enable you to submit work for feedback and assessment, to make use of institutional subscriptions to electronic resources and to use the university’s computing facilities.

All students are entitled to use the university libraries. Lifelong Learning students can obtain a card from the library in the Centre for Lifelong Learning on Senghennydd Road.

As the course proceeds, we will draw on a number of resources, including the paper and electronic resources available through the university, publicly accessible internet sources and photocopies.
**Llyfrau/Books:**

*You will need your library/computer account in order to access certain readings.*

Readings listed in the class schedule are key. In general, you will find it difficult to follow the class if you have not read the assigned readings for that week. Where possible, these key readings will be included in the course packet.

**Asesiad/Assessment:**

Assessment for this module consists of (i) a contribution to a class glossary, and (ii) a final paper.

**Glossary entry** 300–400 words (20%)

- Each student will be responsible for writing one entry. There will be opportunities to draft, discuss and revise these entries in class, although students are welcome to work on them further outside class time if they wish to.
- Finalised entries should be typed and submitted electronically as explained above.
- I will collate the entries into a glossary of key terms as a resource for all members of the class. Obviously, I will only include entries whose authors do not object to my doing so. If you would prefer that I not include your entry in the collection, just let me know.
- We will discuss the format and content of entries in class but the basic idea is that your entry should explain the relevant term to the ‘bright 14 year old’ with no knowledge of philosophy described in my handout on writing philosophy.

**Paper** 1,200–1,500 words (80%)

- A draft should be submitted in advance and will be returned with comments to help you prepare the final version.
- A list of topics and other details will be provided.
- Both drafts and final papers should be typed and submitted electronically as explained below.
- Deadlines are marked on the class schedule.

**General** The following points apply to all work submitted for assessment.

- All work should include appropriate references, be double-spaced in a reasonable font and submitted electronically through Learning Central, which includes plagiarism detection.
- Do not include your name on your work itself. Use your student identification number instead. This enables me to grade ‘blind’ (or at least attempt to).
- Deadlines are marked on the included class schedule.
- ‘Asesiad/Assessment’ and ‘Adnoddau/Resources’, included in this course packet, provide detailed instructions and guidance, and I am happy to answer any questions in class.

*Please keep copies of all work submitted.*
Cyfeirnodi/Referencing:
The Centre’s Student Handbook explains the basics of formatting citations and references and is available online at http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/learn/choices/student-information/.
The handbook also explains what plagiarism is and strategies for avoiding it. You should read this if you are in any doubt whatsoever about these matters. I would be happy to answer any further questions you might have.

Achrediad a Chyllid/Accreditation and Funding:
This is an accredited course. The guidelines anticipate that students will study for 80–100 hours for a 10 credit module such as this one, including class contact time and activities outside the classroom.

Students taking the course as a free-standing module should ensure that I am aware of this and that I have your full details as you are not included on the pre-printed register and the paperwork necessary for reporting assessment will not be automatically generated. Please also ensure that you provide me with your home school, your university email address, a current telephone number and preferred postal address so that you can be contacted if necessary. I do not have these and the Centre may not have them if your home school registered you directly.

I strongly encourage all students to attempt one of the assessment options. Even if you are not personally concerned with gaining the credits available, there are at least two reasons to participate. The first and most important reason is that assessment is designed as an integral part of the course and will form the basis for class discussion and collaboration. Participation should enhance your understanding of the reading and enable you to get the most out of the class. I hope that completing the assignments will prove an enjoyable and stimulating part of the course.

Unfortunately, the second reason is less pedagogically inspiring. The viability of the Centre in general, and the humanities programme in particular, depends on students attempting assessment. This is a consequence of national educational funding policy. The Centre relies on two primary sources of income to fund its programmes: student fees and HEFCW funding. We receive no HEFCW funds for students who do not attempt assessment.

Amserlen y Cwrs/Course Schedule
This schedule is tentative and may require modification depending on the pace at which we cover the material. Full references for all readings are included in the list which follows this schedule.

Further readings are included in the topic introductions later in the course packet. This reflects their secondary importance.

The key to success when beginning philosophy is to read the core material carefully, and to actively seek to understand and evaluate it. Some readings may seem short, but you will often need to read them two or three times in order to prepare well for class.
§1 Fatal Attractions

Week 1: 28 Sept  Once upon a time...

§2 Illusory Goods

Week 2: 5 Oct  Temptation & Illusion
Murray, ‘Vice and Illusion: The Psychology of Vice’ (1936)

§3 Deontological Approaches

Week 3: 12 Oct  Failing Oneself

Week 4: 19 Oct  Snobbery
Hill, ‘Social Snobbery and Human Dignity’ (2012)

§4 The Deadly Seven

Week 5: 26 Oct  Destructive Desires
Taylor, *Deadly Vices* (2006, ch. 2)

— Wythnos Darllen/Reading week —

6 Nov  Draft glossary entries due by noon.

§5 Beyond the Seven

Week 6: 9 Nov  Ignorance Is No Excuse

Week 7: 16 Nov  Efficiency & Ethical Deficiency

20 Nov  Glossary entries due by noon.

§6 Vicious Attitudes

Week 8: 23 Nov  Bad Attitudes
Hurka, ‘Vices as Higher-Level Evils’ (2001)

27 Nov  Draft papers due by noon.

Week 9: 30 Nov  The Problem of Implicit Vice
§ 7 Sick Minds

Week 10: 7 Dec Poor Health or Bad Character?

— Diweddi y dosbarthiadau/Classes end —

14 Dec Papers due by noon.

CYFEIRIADAU/References
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Compilation and supplementary material copyright ©2015 Clea F. Rees.

Cover image: Colin Thompson. The Bookshelf. URL: http://www.colinthompson.com/. As noted, ‘Rule One’ is from Jay Rosenberg’s The Practice of Philosophy (Prentice Hall, 1996). ‘Writing with Philosophical Attitude’ is a modified version of a handout developed by William G. Lycan. The structured paper schema is based on a system developed by John Roberts and other graduate students at University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Typeset using pdfLaTeX, BibLaTeX and Biber in Latin Modern and URW ChanceryL.
First things first: You need, first of all, to make sure you understand the assignment. One thing you will need to decide is whether the assignment requires you to give your own view or simply to present some view which you may or may not share.

The pondering stage: Once you understand the assignment, you will need to think the issues through carefully. Mull them over, discuss them with each other or with me. Even after this, you may not be sure what you think — that’s wise, as the issues are tricky. If you need to present your own view, you may feel stuck. Simply pick the side you are inclined most towards and then defend it to the death. This is useful for developing your budding philosophical wings, even if you’re not sure you’ve picked the correct side!

A word about scholarship: When you are presenting or using the ideas of another, you must do so fairly and accurately. You must, of course, acknowledge the source of the idea, giving a citation and full reference. Except in a very few cases, quotations are unacceptable but, of course, if you do use the words of somebody else, you must use quotation marks and give a page reference as part of your citation.

You are not encouraged to do extra reading to complete assignments. They are not, or not mainly, research papers. I want to see you working out your own thoughts, as clearly and as rigorously as you can. If you do use a source from outside class, be sure to credit the author, giving a full citation in a footnote, including page references.

Failure to give full citations, acknowledge the source of others’ ideas or to use quotation marks when using the words of another counts as plagiarism, a particularly awful violation of academic integrity. You must acknowledge the source of ideas and words you use whatever the source — e.g. book, web site, journal, relative, friend, classmate etc. etc.

Philosophy is hard: If you don’t find it hard, then either you were born with philosophy in your very bone marrow or you do not understand the assignment. Although the degree of difficulty is high, my expectations are modest. I expect only that you say something reasonable — not that you discover a step deductively valid argument from indisputable premises! (Though that would be great, should you stumble across one!)

Writing style: A simple, clear and concise style is recommended. Oratory and rhetorical flourishes will not particularly help, nor will bare assertion in any style; it is the content of your arguments and the substantive force of your reasoning that I will be assessing. Imagine your audience as a bright 14 year-old, who is intelligent but has no special philosophical knowledge. She needs to be able to understand your paper. Note that it is fine to use ‘I’ in philosophy papers.

Is there a right answer? When you are asked for your own opinion, there is no preferred answer. You make take any position, provided you can give reasons for it. Remember: any claim is admissible in philosophy, provided one can give reasons for it. I don’t care what position you end up taking, but only how clearly and cogently you defend it.

---

1Further discussion can be found in the Centre’s Student Handbook, available from Reception or at http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/learn/student_information/index.php.

2I hope that everyone fully understands the great significance of this figure for the universe.
Relevance: Be sure that your paper answers the question. If you are asked to defend a particular view, that’s what your paper should do. If you are asked to write about a particular topic, that is the topic you need to write about. You will lose credit for including irrelevant material.

Language: Clarity and conciseness are very important. It should be crystal clear to your reader exactly what you are saying and what your reasons are for saying it. Philosophy requires very precise use of language, because many of the issues involve somewhat subtle distinctions. Remember, I will evaluate the written work you hand in and not the thoughts you had while writing. So, you need to say what you mean and mean what you say, as precisely as possible. You may remember Lewis Carroll on this topic:

‘Come, we shall have some fun now!’ thought Alice. ‘I’m glad they’ve begun asking riddles — I believe I can guess that,’ she added aloud.
‘Do you mean that you think you can find out the answer to it?’ said the March Hare.
‘Exactly so,’ said Alice.
‘Then you should say what you mean,’ the March Hare went on.
‘I do,’ Alice hastily replied; ‘at least — at least I mean what I say — that’s the same thing, you know.’
‘Not the same thing a bit!’ said the Hatter. ‘Why, you might just as well say that “I see what I eat” is the same thing as “I eat what I see”!’
‘You might just as well say,’ added the March Hare, ‘that “I like what I get” is the same thing as “I get what I like”!’
‘You might just as well say,’ added the Dormouse, which seemed to be talking in its sleep, ‘that “I breathe when I sleep” is the same thing as “I sleep when I breathe”’!

Structure: If you are asked to use a particular structure, be sure to follow it exactly.

Editing: It is usually best to write quite a lot and then later pare down your draft, eliminating redundancies, repetition and irrelevancies. You can then organise the remainder as systematically as possible. Be sure to proofread and edit, edit, edit! Here are some suggestions which you may find useful:

• When you’ve written your first draft, put it aside for a time. Then look at it again. Imagine you are your own worst enemy and have been paid by the CIA to humiliate and destroy the paper. Write down the criticisms and objections which occur to you.
• Now, stop imagining you’re somebody else and try to answer the criticisms. Some of this adversarial thought process might go into your paper; philosophers often try to anticipate objections.
• Get a friend or classmate to read your (new) draft. Read it aloud to yourself.
• Make sure you have answered the question / done the assignment and not something else.
• If the assignment has several parts, make sure you have done all of them.
• Remember that spell-checkers are fallible. In particular, be careful that you have the correct word spelt correctly and not merely a correctly spelt word. Triple-check authors’ names!
• If the assignment allows you to turn in a draft for feedback, make full use of the opportunity by turning in a draft which is as complete and as good as you can possibly make it.
• Keep repeating the process until you feel your paper is as good as possible.

Good Luck. I’m looking forward to seeing what you have to say.

---

3Lewis Carroll, Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland in The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll, The Modern Library: Random House. Pp. 75–76. (Note: no copyright year is included as none is given.)
This is how Jay F. Rosenberg explains the point:

Any opinion for which one can give reasons is admissible in philosophy, but once a claim has been supported by an argument, subsequent criticism must then engage the argument.

Rule One

In fact, the point is so important that there is no Rule Two. (Original emphasis. Rosenberg 1996, 19)

References

Each paper requires you to do some or all of the following schema. Throughout your paper, you must use your own words. This is emphasised, especially, for part 1, where it is easiest to forget the importance of using your own language. It applies, however, to all parts of the paper.

Except in a very few, unusual cases, quotations are not acceptable and you should not use them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 0: Introduction</th>
<th>Thesis = main conclusion. 1 sentence. 2–3 supplementary sentences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitional sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: Initial argument</td>
<td>Present and explain the argument fully, fairly and accurately in your own words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Objection</td>
<td>An argument (1 reason) that raises an objection to the argument in part 1. ** Remember ‘Rule 1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3: Response</td>
<td>An argument (1 reason) that attacks the argument in part 2. ** Remember ‘Rule 1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout your paper: use your own words; follow the advice in ‘Writing with Philosophical Attitude’ and any mechanics guidelines; and edit! Proofread! Edit!

**PART 0: Introduction [3–4 sentences total]**

*Write this part **last**.*

Include a 1 sentence thesis statement. Make it as clear and concise as possible.

Note: your thesis is the same as the conclusion of your argument. In some papers, your thesis may be stated for you — in this case, use the exact wording given in the assignment.

Write 1 other sentence to introduce the thesis.

Write 1 or 2 other sentences explaining what you will do in your paper.

Avoid ‘yawners’ i.e. unnecessary sentences which immediately bore. Examples include ‘Religious belief is a very controversial topic’, ‘Since the dawn of time...’, ‘Collins English Dictionary says that...’ etc.

This part of your paper is of least importance.

**PART 1: Argument to be defended [1 paragraph]**

*Present and explain the argument fully, fairly and accurately.*

- in some papers, you will need to reconstruct the author’s argument. In this case, you are simply explaining her argument — whether you agree or not is irrelevant.
- in others, you may be presenting an argument of your own.

Be sure to *focus on one specific argument*. You are to present only one of the many arguments the author gave in her paper. If you are presenting your own argument, you may have several, present only one — the strongest one.

It’s a good idea to work out the conclusion and then work backwards to get the premises.

Remember to use your own words — especially if you are reconstructing the argument of somebody else.

Your premises should be basic. They shouldn’t obviously beg a central question.

Every time you write down a premise, ask ‘why?’ This will help push you back to the most basic claims the argument rests on. (Obviously, at some point, you’ll have to stop! But only stop when you have to.)
Sometimes, an author does not state all the claims she relies on explicitly. Rather, some of the premises may be implicit. If you are reconstructing an argument, you need to make all such implicit premises explicit — that is, you need to state them, explaining that the author doesn’t state them explicitly but that her argument relies on them. You need to explain how the argument relies on them, too.

If it’s your argument, all your premises should be explicit!

The argument should be valid.

**Part 2: Objection [1 paragraph]**

*Present one single objection to the argument in part 1* — i.e. *one* reason to reject it.

Pick the strongest objection.

You need to offer an *argument* challenging the truth of one of the premises in part 1.

Do *not* be tempted to weaken this section in order to write a super-duper part 3!

**Part 3: Response [1 paragraph]**

*Present one single response* — i.e. *one* reason to reject the argument in part 2.

Pick the strongest response.

If you find this part hard, you may be on the right track — you probably did a good job in part 2; if you find this part easy, you are almost certainly on the wrong track — you probably did a poor job in part 2.

You are *defending* the argument in part 1 and your thesis by doing this. Make sure that you do not say things inconsistent with what you said in parts 0 and 1!
This handout is designed to offer some guidance on developing effective objections. The most important point is covered by ‘Rule One’ (included in ‘Resources’ in part 1 of the course packet). Recall Rosenberg’s ‘Rule One’:

Any opinion for which one can give reasons is admissible in philosophy, but once a claim has been supported by an argument, subsequent criticism must then engage the argument. (Original emphasis. Rosenberg 1996, 19)

Indeed, Rosenberg continues:

In fact, the point is so important that there is no Rule Two. (Original emphasis. Rosenberg 1996, 19)

What does it mean to say that ‘subsequent criticism must...engage the argument’? It means that an objection should not typically consist of an independent argument for a thesis contrary to the thesis defended in the original argument. That is, to object in philosophy is not typically to give reasons against a particular thesis or conclusion. Rather, it is to explain why the particular reasons given in the original argument fail to establish that thesis. Crucially, this is entirely consistent with the truth of the thesis. Of course, objections will often cast doubt on the original thesis but this should be a side-effect rather than the focus of the objection.

Of course, there are exceptions to this. Occasionally, you might have excellent reasons for thinking a thesis false even though you cannot pinpoint exactly where an argument for that thesis goes wrong. However, this move should be the option of last resort since it leaves your reader in something of a quandary.

To see this, suppose that on Monday you read a really convincing argument for Socrates’ claim that ‘the unexamined life is not worth living’. The author of the argument has provided what seems to be a series of valid inferences from premises to conclusion. The terms of the argument are clearly explained and you have a strong grasp of what it means to live an ‘(un)examined life’ and of what it means for a life to be ‘(not) worth living’. Moreover, the argument provides compelling reasons to think the premises are true. That is, you have good reason to think that the argument is sound and the conclusion true. On Tuesday, therefore, you set about leading a more examined life.

But there’s a problem. On Wednesday, you try to persuade a classmate of the thesis by explaining the argument. Your classmate agrees that the argument appears to be sound but insists that it cannot be so because there are good reasons to think the thesis is, in fact, false. In support of this, the classmate produces an argument for the claim that ‘the unexamined life is the only one worth living’. This argument also appears to be valid, explains its terms clearly, and includes compelling reasons to think its premises are true. Moreover, it is clear that both arguments are using their terms in the same ways. So the inconsistency cannot be explained away by arguing that the two theses are using ‘(un)examined’ or ‘(not) worth living’ in different senses.

Now you (and your classmate) are stuck. You have two apparently sound arguments for incompatible conclusions. At least one of them is unsound but you’ve no idea which.

Now suppose that rather than producing an argument for an incompatible claim, your classmate had pointed out a subtle flaw in the original argument. Perhaps the classmate has specialist expertise which casts doubt on one of the premises. Or perhaps the appearance of validity is merely that — an appearance — and your classmate points out an invalid inference. Since this objection points
out the specific mistake in the reasoning, you now know the original argument is unsound and this casts doubt on the thesis. This does not show the thesis is false, of course. However, it does tell you something important about the issues involved. It puts you in a good position to decide whether to suspend judgement concerning the truth of the thesis, to attempt to develop a new argument for that thesis, or to try to repair the existing argument for that thesis.

So an objection which points out the mistake in a particular argument for a thesis is a much more constructive and helpful contribution to debate than one which merely provides an independent argument for an incompatible thesis.

What does this mean? It means that the conclusion of part 2 should not typically be that the paper’s thesis is false. Part 2 should typically develop an objection to the particular argument given for that thesis in part 1. The same considerations apply to part 3. Part 3 should typically respond to the specific objection developed in part 2. It should not simply reiterate the argument of part 1 or provide a different argument for the paper’s thesis. It should instead explain why the criticism of the original argument is mistaken or how that argument can be defended against that criticism.

Consider the following (daft) example:

**Part 1:**

1. All apples are red.
2. All post boxes are bright yellow.
3. Red and bright yellow are not the same colour.
4. No apple is the same colour as any post box. (1–3)

**Part 2:**

1. Post boxes in the UK are red.
2. Red and bright yellow are not the same colour.
3. Some post boxes are not bright yellow. (1–2)

This does not commit the objector to the falsity of (4) because the objection is not a defence of the claim that some apple is the same colour as some post box. Instead, the objection points out a specific mistake in the particular argument advanced in part 1 for the paper’s thesis.

**References**


This handout is designed to offer some concrete guidance on expressing your philosophical thoughts in writing.

The first column of table 2 lists phrases which people tend to use when beginning to write philosophy and which detract from the quality of their work. The second column gives suggested substitutes.

- Note that the suggested substitutions are not synonyms — the point is not that the phrases on the left are insufficiently formal or academic-sounding. The point is that you (usually) should not mean them. The phrases on the right reflect what you should mean. The point concerns what to say rather than merely how to say it.

- The point is not that the phrases on the left are never appropriate: sometimes they may be just what you need. The point is rather that you should think before using them.

- Phrases which are struck through (like this) should NEVER be used. Please ask if you are unsure why a phrase is struck through.

Table 2: Things People Write vs. Things People Should Write

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you are tempted to use...</th>
<th>you probably need...</th>
<th>Express a view</th>
<th>Express agreement</th>
<th>Express disagreement</th>
<th>Criticise an argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that $P$.</td>
<td>I (will) argue that $P$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that $P$.</td>
<td>Since $R$, $P$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my (personal) opinion $P$.</td>
<td>$P$ because $R$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that $P$.</td>
<td>$P$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman says that $P$.</td>
<td>I (will) defend Friedman’s claim that $P$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descartes thinks that $P$.</td>
<td>Descartes’ claim that $P$ is plausible because $R$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato claims that $P$.</td>
<td>Plato is correct to claim that $P$ because $R$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I disagree with $Q$.</td>
<td>I (will) object that $P$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People no longer believe that $Q$.</td>
<td>I (will) reject the claim that $Q$ because $R$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe that $Q$.</td>
<td>The claim that $Q$ is implausible because $R$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is $Q$ really right?</td>
<td>However, $Q$ is a mistake because $R$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The argument is a good one but the conclusion is not true.</td>
<td>The argument is valid but unsound because $R$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This argument is invalid because $R$.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mere fact that you believe $P$ does not establish that $P$. It is not itself a reason for $P$. The mere fact that everyone at all times, in all places believes $P$ does not establish that $P$. It does not itself count in favour of $P$. The question is whether $P$ is true. The question is whether $P$.

Table 3 includes a selection of useful phrases. The list is intended as a starting point for the development of your own philosophical voice. These phrases apply primarily to assignments which require you to complete all parts of the ‘Paper Schema’, especially those which ask you to defend a
view of your own. Note that only assignments which include Part 0 require an introduction. Papers which start with Part 1 should not include any such thing.

Table 3: Useful Phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Motivating a Position</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
<th>Sign-Posting: Transitions</th>
<th>Sign-Posting: Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (will) argue that...</td>
<td>One disadvantage of B’s view is that...</td>
<td>In this paper, I use the term ‘T’ to refer to...</td>
<td>I (will) consider two objections.</td>
<td>Therefore...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (will) defend B’s argument that...</td>
<td>One problem with B’s argument is that...</td>
<td>This claim should be understood as...</td>
<td>I (will) return to this point later.</td>
<td>...because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In response, I (will) argue that...</td>
<td>B’s argument is open to the objection that...</td>
<td>I do not mean that...</td>
<td>I claimed above that...</td>
<td>Since..., ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An alternative is needed because...</td>
<td>By ‘T’, I mean...</td>
<td>However, somebody might object that...</td>
<td>Hence...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One advantage of my account is that...</td>
<td>My argument will assume that...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My argument avoids this difficulty by...</td>
<td></td>
<td>First...</td>
<td>For example,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This objection does not apply to my argument because...</td>
<td>By ‘T’, I do not mean...</td>
<td>Second...</td>
<td>Consider the following analogy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I overcome this problem by...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This analogy shows that...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a map</td>
<td>Explain your view’s appeal</td>
<td>Clarify your position</td>
<td>Explain what you are doing</td>
<td>Ex- penses &amp; Anal- ogesies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain why your view is needed</td>
<td>Explain reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criticise reasoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
argument
A set (or group) of sentences. One of the sentences is the conclusion of the argument and the other sentences are premises. The premises are supposed to support the conclusion.

conclusion
The claim which an argument is trying to convince you of.

invalid
An argument is deductively invalid iff it is not deductively valid. See valid.

premise
Any sentence in an argument which is not its conclusion.

sound
An argument is deductively sound iff it is deductively valid and all its premises are true. See valid.

unsound
An argument is unsound iff it’s not sound: either it is deductively invalid or one (or more) of the premises is false. See sound.

valid
An argument is deductively valid iff if the premises are all true, then the conclusion must be true as well — i.e. the conclusion follows from the premises; it is not possible for the premises to all be true and the conclusion false.
What must I do? How do I write a philosophy paper?
Before beginning work, you MUST read the sections of the Centre’s Student Handbook dealing with plagiarism and how to avoid it. Copies of the handbook are available online at http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/learn/choices/student-information/. I would be happy to answer any further questions you might have.

The Handbook also explains the basics of formatting citations and references and includes a pointer to the university’s guides at http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/insrv/educationandtraining/guides/citingreferences/index.html.

You do not need to seek outside sources when completing this assignment and I recommend not doing so unless you wish to draw on them for an original example. Any sources you do use should be properly cited.

Whether you use additional sources or not, your list of references should include full references for all sources, including assigned materials distributed in class. The introductory section of the course packet includes bibliographical details for all readings. Citations in the text should include specific page numbers where appropriate.

Draft due: due by date marked on schedule
Paper due: due by date marked on schedule
Length: 1,200–1,500 words
Submission: via Learning Central (which includes plagiarism detection)
Layout: double-space; reasonable font; page numbers; word count
Referencing: in-text citations; bibliography
Anonymous: do NOT include your name in your uploaded document

do include your student ID number on every page

Note that this assignment is extremely structured. This structure is designed to help you succeed, but it means that you must read the instructions extremely carefully, pay attention to details, and clarify, clarify, clarify.

Students who have successfully written philosophy papers in the past may opt out of utilising this structure by prior agreement with me. Please discuss this option with me if you fall into this category.
1  **Topic selection**

Choose one topic:

1. What’s so deadly about the ‘deadly vices’?
2. Is inattention blameworthy?
3. Is efficiency a vice?
4. What is a vice?
5. Have we inappropriately medicalised bad character?
6. Can a deontological approach provide an adequate account of the vices?
7. Does a vicious character harm its possessor as much as anybody?
8. Are some vices worse than others?
9. Do we have vices for which we are not to blame?
10. Does vice always depend on ignorance and/or illusion?

Bear in mind that your paper needs to demonstrate knowledge of relevant module content. In choosing a question, therefore, you should think about how the topic relates to ideas which you have read about and discussed in this course.

2  **Thesis formulation**

Formulate one thesis in response to your chosen question.

Your paper will defend the thesis you choose. If you are not entirely sure what to think even after reflecting carefully, that is probably wise. Choose a thesis which you think can be defended most cogently.

3  **Think philosophically**

Writing a philosophy paper is rather different from writing in other disciplines. Carefully read the following handouts from the section Adnoddau/Resources of the course packet before beginning work, and refer to them as needed as you write your paper.

- Writing With Philosophical Attitude
- Rule One
- Paper Schema
- Guidelines for Paper Schema
- Philosophical Target Practise (Guidance on raising objections)
- The Practice of Writing with Philosophical Attitude: Useful Phrases

*Your paper must follow the structure specified in the ‘Paper Schema’.*
4 Fill in the schema

Your first task is to carefully and clearly explain the strongest argument* you can for the thesis you are defending. This will be part 1 of your paper. Note that the conclusion* of this argument should be precisely your chosen thesis — you should not restate or alter it. You should clearly state the premises* and show how they support the final conclusion. If the argument involves sub-arguments, your explanation should reflect this structure and identify the various sub-conclusions. If necessary, you should then briefly explain and/or briefly defend the premises. (You don’t need to do this for all the premises — just those that your reader might otherwise find unclear and/or implausible.) Be sensible. If necessary, it is fine to clarify the premises which need it, indicate which premises need further defence, and then explain that you are going to focus on a defence of premise X. In that case, premise X should be the premise your reader is most likely to question.

You may wish to appeal to one of the ethical approaches discussed in the course. If so, your explanation should include an explanation of why the ethical approach you appeal to is a good one. For example, ‘As Singer says... This seems plausible because...’ is much better than ‘As Singer says...’. Giving reasons for a claim always requires more than merely appealing to authority. This is true no matter how illustrious the authority.

Continue to fill in the paper schema until you have completed parts 1–3 and, optionally, 4–5. Edit, review and revise until you are happy with what you’ve written. Finally, write part 0 and add the transition sentences to provide your reader with ‘sign-posting’.

As a whole, your paper should reflect your understanding of relevant aspects of the assigned reading and of the further reading for your chosen topic, but you do not need to seek out additional sources and I recommend not doing so. Of course, this does not mean that you cannot present an original position, argument or objection: thinking for yourself is encouraged!

Recall the advice from ‘Writing With Philosophical Attitude’:

Could the bright 14 year old understand your paper?

References

§1 Fatal Attractions

Heyden, Superbia, c1550
Once upon a time there was little girl, pretty and dainty. But in summer time she was obliged to go barefooted because she was poor, and in winter she had to wear large wooden shoes, so that her little instep grew quite red.

In the middle of the village lived an old shoemaker’s wife; she sat down and made, as well as she could, a pair of little shoes out of some old pieces of red cloth. They were clumsy, but she meant well, for they were intended for the little girl, whose name was Karen.

Karen received the shoes and wore them for the first time on the day of her mother’s funeral. They were certainly not suitable for mourning; but she had no others, and so she put her bare feet into them and walked behind the humble coffin.

Just then a large old carriage came by, and in it sat an old lady; she looked at the little girl, and taking pity on her, said to the clergyman, ‘Look here, if you will give me the little girl, I will take care of her.’

Karen believed that this was all on account of the red shoes, but the old lady thought them hideous, and so they were burnt. Karen herself was dressed very neatly and cleanly; she was taught to read and to sew, and people said that she was pretty. But the mirror told her, ‘You are more than pretty–you are beautiful.’

One day the Queen was travelling through that part of the country, and had her little daughter, who was a princess, with her. All the people, amongst them Karen too, streamed towards the castle, where the little princess, in fine white clothes, stood before the window and allowed herself to be stared at. She wore neither a train nor a golden crown, but beautiful red morocco shoes; they were indeed much finer than those which the shoemaker’s wife had sewn for little Karen. There is really nothing in the world that can be compared to red shoes!

---

Karen was now old enough to be confirmed; she received some new clothes, and she was also to have some new shoes. The rich shoemaker in the town took the measure of her little foot in his own room, in which there stood great glass cases full of pretty shoes and white slippers. It all looked very lovely, but the old lady could not see very well, and therefore did not get much pleasure out of it. Amongst the shoes stood a pair of red ones, like those which the princess had worn. How beautiful they were! and the shoemaker said that they had been made for a count’s daughter, but that they had not fitted her.

‘I suppose they are of shiny leather?’ asked the old lady. ‘They shine so.’

‘Yes, they do shine,’ said Karen. They fitted her, and were bought. But the old lady knew nothing of their being red, for she would never have allowed Karen to be confirmed in red shoes, as she was now to be.

Everybody looked at her feet, and the whole of the way from the church door to the choir it seemed to her as if even the ancient figures on the monuments, in their stiff collars and long black robes, had their eyes fixed on her red shoes. It was only of these that she thought when the clergyman laid his hand upon her head and spoke of the holy baptism, of the covenant with God, and told her that she was now to be a grown-up Christian. The organ pealed forth solemnly, and the sweet children’s voices mingled with that of their old leader; but Karen thought only of her red shoes. In the afternoon the old lady heard from everybody that Karen had worn red shoes. She said that it was a shocking thing to do, that it was very improper, and that Karen was always to go to church in future in black shoes, even if they were old.

On the following Sunday there was Communion. Karen looked first at the black shoes, then at the red ones—looked at the red ones again, and put them on.

The sun was shining gloriously, so Karen and the old lady went along the footpath through the corn, where it was rather dusty.

At the church door stood an old crippled soldier leaning on a crutch; he had a wonderfully long beard, more red than white, and he bowed down to the ground and asked the old lady whether he might wipe her shoes. Then Karen put out her little foot too. ‘Dear me, what pretty dancing-shoes!’ said the soldier. ‘Sit fast, when you dance,’ said he, addressing the shoes, and slapping the soles with his hand.

The old lady gave the soldier some money and then went with Karen into the church.

And all the people inside looked at Karen’s red shoes, and all the figures gazed at them; when Karen knelt before the altar and put the golden goblet to her mouth, she thought only of the red shoes. It seemed to her as though they were swimming about in the goblet, and she forgot to sing the psalm, forgot to say the ‘Lord’s Prayer.’

Now every one came out of church, and the old lady stepped into her carriage. But just as Karen was lifting up her foot to get in too, the old soldier said: ‘Dear me, what pretty dancing shoes!’ and Karen could not help it, she was obliged to dance a few steps; and when she had once begun, her legs continued to dance. It seemed as if the shoes had got power over them. She danced round the church corner, for she could not stop; the coachman had to run after her and seize her. He lifted her into the carriage, but her feet continued to dance, so that she kicked the good old lady violently. At last they took off her shoes, and her legs were at rest.

At home the shoes were put into the cupboard, but Karen could not help looking at them. Now the old lady fell ill, and it was said that she would not rise from her bed again. She had to be nursed and waited upon, and this was no one’s duty more than Karen’s. But there was a grand ball in the town, and Karen was invited. She looked at the red shoes, saying to herself that there was no sin in doing that; she put the red shoes on, thinking there was no harm in that either; and then she went to the ball; and commenced to dance.

But when she wanted to go to the right, the shoes danced to the left, and when she wanted to dance up the room, the shoes danced down the room, down the stairs through the street, and out
through the gates of the town. She danced, and was obliged to dance, far out into the dark wood. Suddenly something shone up among the trees, and she believed it was the moon, for it was a face. But it was the old soldier with the red beard; he sat there nodding his head and said: ‘Dear me, what pretty dancing shoes!’

She was frightened, and wanted to throw the red shoes away; but they stuck fast. She tore off her stockings, but the shoes had grown fast to her feet. She danced and was obliged to go on dancing over field and meadow, in rain and sunshine, by night and by day—but by night it was most horrible.

She danced out into the open churchyard; but the dead there did not dance. They had something better to do than that. She wanted to sit down on the pauper’s grave where the bitter fern grows; but for her there was neither peace nor rest. And as she danced past the open church door she saw an angel there in long white robes, with wings reaching from his shoulders down to the earth; his face was stern and grave, and in his hand he held a broad shining sword.

‘Dance you shall,’ said he, ‘dance in your red shoes till you are pale and cold, till your skin shrivels up and you are a skeleton! Dance you shall, from door to door, and where proud and wicked children live you shall knock, so that they may hear you and fear you! Dance you shall, dance–!’

‘Mercy!’ cried Karen. But she did not hear what the angel answered, for the shoes carried her through the gate into the fields, along highways and byways, and unceasingly she had to dance.

One morning she danced past a door that she knew well; they were singing a psalm inside, and a coffin was being carried out covered with flowers. Then she knew that she was forsaken by every one and damned by the angel of God.

She danced, and was obliged to go on dancing through the dark night. The shoes bore her
away over thorns and stumps till she was all torn and bleeding; she danced away over the heath to a lonely little house. Here, she knew, lived the executioner; and she tapped with her finger at the window and said:

‘Come out, come out! I cannot come in, for I must dance.’

And the executioner said: ‘I don’t suppose you know who I am. I strike off the heads of the wicked, and I notice that my axe is tingling to do so.’

‘Don’t cut off my head!’ said Karen, ‘for then I could not repent of my sin. But cut off my feet with the red shoes.’

And then she confessed all her sin, and the executioner struck off her feet with the red shoes; but the shoes danced away with the little feet across the field into the deep forest.

And he carved her a pair of wooden feet and some crutches, and taught her a psalm which is always sung by sinners; she kissed the hand that guided the axe, and went away over the heath.

‘Now, I have suffered enough for the red shoes,’ she said; ‘I will go to church, so that people can see me.’ And she went quickly up to the church-door; but when she came there, the red shoes were dancing before her, and she was frightened, and turned back.

During the whole week she was sad and wept many bitter tears, but when Sunday came again she said: ‘Now I have suffered and striven enough. I believe I am quite as good as many of those who sit in church and give themselves airs.’ And so she went boldly on; but she had not got farther than the churchyard gate when she saw the red shoes dancing along before her. Then she became terrified, and turned back and repented right heartily of her sin.

She went to the parsonage, and begged that she might be taken into service there. She would be industrious, she said, and do everything that she could; she did not mind about the wages as long as she had a roof over her, and was with good people. The pastor’s wife had pity on her, and took her into service. And she was industrious and thoughtful. She sat quiet and listened when the pastor read aloud from the Bible in the evening. All the children liked her very much, but when they spoke about dress and grandeur and beauty she would shake her head.

On the following Sunday they all went to church, and she was asked whether she wished to go too; but, with tears in her eyes, she looked sadly at her crutches. And then the others went to hear God’s Word, but she went alone into her little room; this was only large enough to hold the bed and a chair. Here she sat down with her hymn-book, and as she was reading it with a pious mind, the wind carried the notes of the organ over to her from the church, and in tears she lifted up her face and said: ‘O God! help me!’

Then the sun shone so brightly, and right before her stood an angel of God in white robes; it was the same one whom she had seen that night at the church-door. He no longer carried the sharp sword, but a beautiful green branch, full of roses; with this he touched the ceiling, which rose up very high, and where he had touched it there shone a golden star. He touched the walls, which opened wide apart, and she saw the organ which was pealing forth; she saw the pictures of the old pastors and their wives, and the congregation sitting in the polished chairs and singing from their hymn-books. The church itself had come to the poor girl in her narrow room, or the room had gone to the church. She sat in the pew with the rest of the pastor’s household, and when they had finished the hymn and looked up, they nodded and said, ‘It was right of you to come, Karen.’

‘It was mercy,’ said she.

The organ played and the children’s voices in the choir sounded soft and lovely. The bright warm sunshine streamed through the window into the pew where Karen sat, and her heart became so filled with it, so filled with peace and joy, that it broke. Her soul flew on the sunbeams to Heaven, and no one was there who asked after the Red Shoes.
§2 Illusory Goods

Heyden, *Gula*, c. 1550
Philosophers are concerned with the *arguments* which authors give for their theses. In order to evaluate a piece of philosophical writing, we need to clarify both the claims the author is making and the reasons she gives in support of those claims.

The key reading for this week is an excerpt from Murray’s ‘Vice and Illusion: The Psychology of Vice’ (1936) and is included in this course packet. The reading uses some words and phrases from other languages without translation — their approximate meaning is given in table 5.

**Thesis**

1. What is Murray’s main thesis or *conclusion* in ‘Vice and Illusion: The Psychology of Vice’?

**Terminology**

Understanding a philosophical text often involves identifying specialist terminology and ensuring that you understand how the author is using that terminology.

2. Identify and explain in your own words the terms which are important for understanding ‘Vice and Illusion: The Psychology of Vice’. Your explanations should reflect Murray’s use of the terms.

**Argumentation**

3. What *reasons* does Murray give in support of the thesis you identified in question 1?

4. How are Murray’s examples supposed to support his argument?

**Evaluation**

5. Do the examples you identified in question 4 support Murray’s argument effectively? Why or why not?

6. Is Murray’s argument a good one? Why or why not?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German/Latin</th>
<th>Approximate English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meisterjäger</td>
<td>master hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et qui nolunt occidere quenquam Posse volunt</td>
<td>having the power, but not the desire, to do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id genus omne</td>
<td>all of that kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possunt quia posse videntur</td>
<td>they can because they they think they can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magna est illusio et prevalebit*</td>
<td>illusion is mighty and shall prevail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Presumably an allusion to ‘magna est illusio et prevalebit’, meaning ‘truth is mighty and shall prevail’.

Table 5: Approximate meanings in English of German and Latin words and phrases.
Figure 1: The ‘Meisterjäger of Germany’, Hermann Göring (1936, 263).
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