Philosophical Perspectives on the Humanities III
Spring 2003
Weibolt 230
TUE / TH 3:00-4:20

Instructor: Brian Johnson
Office: Cobb 520
Office Hours: TBA
E-mail: invalidemail@midway.uchicago.edu
Home Phone: 324-6540 (although e-mail is a much better way to reach me)

Writing Intern: Aishwarya Lakshmi
E-mail: invalidemail@midway.uchicago.edu

Texts:
David Hume, <u>An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals</u>
Herman Melville, <u>Billy Budd</u>
Immanuel Kant, <u>Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals</u> (translated by Mary Gregor)
Joseph Conrad, <u>Heart of Darkness</u>
We will also watch the film *Apocalypse Now* at a time to be arranged.

Course Requirements:
(1) Reading Assignments (which will be assigned in class).
(2) Course papers. There will be three papers; each paper will be 4-5 pages (which works out to
    approximately 1500 words).
Although I will not take attendance, both attendance and participation will affect your grade
positively, especially in borderline cases.

Course Plan (Rough):
Week 1
Tuesday, April 1: Introduction
Thursday, April 3: Hume, *Enquiry*

Week 2
Tuesday, April 8: Hume, *Enquiry*
Thursday, April 10: Hume, *Enquiry*

Week 3
Tuesday, April 15: Hume's epistemology and his ethics; on paper writing
Thursday, April 17: *Billy Budd*
FIRST PAPER (due Friday April 18th at noon)

Week 4
Tuesday, April 22: *Billy Budd*
Thursday, April 24: Background on Kant and *Groundwork*

Week 5
Tuesday, April 29: Kant, *Groundwork*
Thursday, May 1: Kant, *Groundwork*

Week 6
Tuesday, May 6: Kant, *Groundwork*
Thursday, May 8: Kant, *Groundwork*

Week 7
Tuesday, May 13: Kant and Aristotle
Thursday, May 15: *Heart of Darkness*
SECOND PAPER (due Friday May 16th at noon)

Week 8
Tuesday, April 20: *Heart of Darkness*
Thursday, April 22: "Apocalypse Now"

Week 9
Tuesday, April 27: "Apocalypse Now"
Thursday, April 29: "Apocalypse Now"

Week 10
Tuesday, June 3: Review; Kant and Hume in 20th century ethics.
Thursday, June 5: Reading Period, no class.
THIRD PAPER (due date to be decided — either the end of week 10 or the middle of finals
week.)

University of Chicago
Plagiarism Guidelines

I. University policy on academic honesty

From the Student Manual of University Policies and Regulations:

As students and faculty of the University of Chicago, we belong to an academic community with high scholarly standards of which we are justly proud. Our community also holds certain fundamental ethical principles to which we are deeply committed. We believe it is contrary to justice, to academic integrity, and to the spirit of intellectual inquiry to submit the statements or ideas of work of others as one's own. To do so is plagiarism or cheating, offenses punishable under the University's disciplinary system. Because these offenses undercut the distinctive moral and intellectual character of the University, we take them very seriously and punishments for them may range up to permanent expulsion from the University.

Proper acknowledgment of another's ideas is expected, whether that use is by direct quotation or by paraphrase, however loose. In particular, if any written source is consulted and material is used from that source, directly or indirectly, the source should be identified by author, title, and page number. Any doubts about what constitutes "use" should be addressed to the instructor.

II. Some advice on plagiarism and paraphrase

From Joe Williams and Larry McEnerney, "Writing in College," in *Engaging the Humanities at the University of Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 206-207.

When you want to use the exact words you find in a source, stop and think. Then, type a quotation mark before and after, or create a block quotation; record the words exactly as they are in the source (if you change anything use square brackets and ellipses to indicate changes); cite the source.

Those are the first three principles of using the words of others: unambiguously indicate where the words of your source begin and end, get the words right (or indicate changes), and cite the source. Omit the first or last step, and intentionally or not, you plagiarize. You also plagiarize when you use someone else's ideas and you do not credit that person.

It is trickier to define plagiarism when you summarize and paraphrase. They are not the same, but they blend so seamlessly that you may not even be aware when you are drifting from summary into paraphrase, then across the line into plagiarism. No matter your intention, close paraphrase may count as plagiarism, even when you cite the source.

For example, this next paragraph plagiarizes the last one, because it paraphrases it so closely:

It is harder to describe plagiarism when summary and paraphrase are involved, because while they differ, their boundaries blur, and a writer may not know that she has crossed the boundary from summary to paraphrase and from paraphrase to plagiarism. Regardless of intention, a close paraphrase is plagiarism, even when the source is cited.

This is borderline plagiarism:

> Because it is difficult to distinguish the border between summary and paraphrase, a writer can drift dangerously close to plagiarism without knowing it, even when the writer cites a source and never meant to plagiarize.

The words in both these versions track the original so closely that any reader would recognize that the writer could have written them only while simultaneously reading the original. Here is a summary of that paragraph, just this side of the border:

According to Williams and McEnerney, writers sometimes plagiarize unconsciously because they think they are summarizing, when in fact they are closely paraphrasing, an act that counts as plagiarism, even when done unintentionally and sources are cited (Williams and McEnerney, "Writing in College," p. 206).

Here is a simple test for inadvertent plagiarism: be conscious of where your eyes are as you put words on paper or on a screen. If your eyes are on your source at the same moment your fingers are flying across the keyboard, you risk doing something that weeks, months, even years later could result in your public humiliation. Whenever you use a source extensively, compare your page with the original. If you think someone could run her finger along your sentences and find synonyms or synonymous phrases for words in the original in roughly the same order, try again. You are least likely to plagiarize inadvertently if as you write, you keep your eyes not on your source, but on the screen or on your own page, and you report what your source has to say after those words have filtered through your own understanding of them.

A Selection from Hume

David Hume's *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book III "Of Morals," Part I "Of Virtue and Vice in General," Section 1 "Moral Distinctions Not Derived from Reason."

I cannot forbear adding to these reasonings an observation, which may, perhaps, be found of some importance. In every system of morality, which I have hitherto met with, I have always remarked, that the author proceeds for some time in the ordinary way of reasoning, and establishes the being of a God, or makes observations concerning human affairs; when of a sudden I am surprised to find, that instead of the usual copulations of propositions, *is*, and *is not*, I meet with no proposition that is not connected with an *ought*, or an *ought not*. This change is imperceptible; but is, however, of the last consequence. For as this *ought*, or *ought not*, expresses some new relation or affirmation, it is necessary that it should be observed and explained; and at the same time that a reason should be given, for what seems altogether inconceivable, how this new relation can be a deduction from others, which are entirely different from it. But as authors do not commonly use this precaution, I shall presume to recommend it to the readers; and am persuaded, that this small attention would subvert all the vulgar systems of morality, and let us see, that the distinction of vice and virtue is not founded merely on the relations of objects, nor is perceived by reason.