



Course Guide

Phil 10022: *Feminism and Philosophy*

2013/14

Course Organiser: Elinor Mason (Elinor.Mason@ed.ac.uk)

Office Location: DSB 6.06

Office Hour: Thursday 10am-11am and by appointment.

Course Secretary: Sue Richards (sue.richards@ed.ac.uk)

Contents

1. (Course) Aims and Objectives
2. Intended Learning Outcomes
3. Seminar Times and Locations
4. Seminar Content
5. PPLS Undergraduate Student Handbook
6. Readings
7. Assessment Information
8. Learn
9. Useful Information
10. Common Marking Scheme

1. Course Aims and Objectives

This course focuses on philosophical issues relevant to feminism. Topics will range across the standard curriculum divisions in philosophy, and will touch on philosophical debates from ethics, meta-ethics, metaphysics, political philosophy, philosophy of language, and free will and moral responsibility.

The course begins with the classic political issues for feminism: women now have the right to vote in most places, and in many countries have equal rights. However, it is undeniable that women earn less than men in the workplace, and do more than half the work in the domestic sphere. Is this an injustice, or a matter of the free choices of individual women? We will examine arguments for both positions, and explore the political philosophy of family choices in a western context.

In the middle section of the course we will talk about the complex issues arising from sex and sexuality, including pornography, prostitution, and the objectification of bodies.

Finally we will discuss the construction of gender, and how our identities may be formed by our ideas, and perhaps by false consciousness. We will examine the vexed notion of false consciousness to see if it can be usefully applied to contemporary gender roles.

2. Intended Learning Outcomes

On completing the course, students should have:

- A solid understanding of the topics listed above, and an ability to critically assess the arguments given for and against the various positions we will be studying.
- An appreciation of the value of characteristically philosophical ways of thinking.
- A firm basis for the development of further philosophical knowledge and understanding.
- Analytic skills: how to analyse and evaluate arguments; the sorts of evidence that philosophical arguments use; the differences between philosophical and empirical ways of thinking; the analysis of concepts.
- The ability to express philosophical ideas and arguments both orally and in writing, with particular regard to the following qualities: clarity, precision, and concision; structure in essay organization; structure in argument (written and oral); the ability to argue effectively in a debate, including showing respect for other participants.
- Generic analytical and critical thinking skills, including: the ability to identify the argument in a piece of prose; the ability to approach ideas with an open mind.
- Other transferable skills: working to deadlines; using computers for word-processing, competently using library resources (including electronic resources).

3. Seminar Times and Locations

Thursdays 2.10pm - 4pm, David Hume Tower Room 12.18. From 24 October we will be at the same time in Room G.4 in St Leonard's Land, on Holyrood Rd.

4. Seminar Content

The readings listed below are provisional – please check for updates. Starred readings are essential. Stars will be added and updated as we get nearer the time.

Week 1

Introduction

No required reading. We will discuss feminism and the course themes.

Week 2 and 3

Work and Family

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

*Okin, Susan (1989), *Justice, Gender and the Family*, (New York: Basic Books).

Debra Satz and Rob Reich (2009), *Toward a Humanist Justice: The Political Philosophy of Susan Moller Okin* (OUP). Available online through Oxford Scholarship online.

*Nussbaum, 'The Future of Feminist Liberalism', *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (Nov., 2000), pp. 47-79. On JSTOR

Janet Radcliffe Richards, (1980), "Society and the Mother' in *The Sceptical Feminist* (Penguin)

Calhoun, Cheshire (2000) *Feminism, the Family, and the Politics of the Closet: Lesbian and Gay Displacement* (OUP).

Week 4 and 5

Pornography

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

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pornography-censorship/>

Saul, J. 2010, 'Feminism in Philosophy of Language': article online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-language/>

*MacKinnon, Catherine (1989), "Sexuality, Pornography, and Method: 'Pleasure Under Patriarchy'" *Ethics* 314 (1989): 99 on JSTOR.

*Langton, Rae (1993), "Speech Acts and Unspeakable Acts", *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 22 (Fall 93) on JSTOR (and in her 2009 book, *Sexual Solipsism* (OUP)).

Saul, Jennifer (2006) 'Pornography, Speech Acts and Context', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 106:2, 61-80 (available online).

Mikkola, Mari (2011). Illocution, silencing and the act of refusal. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 92 (3):415-437.

*Dworkin, Ronald, 'Is There a Right to Pornography?', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Summer, 1981), pp. 177-212

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/764457>

*Brison, Susan, 1998, 'The Autonomy Defense of Free speech', *Ethics* 108 (2) 312–339.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/freedom-speech/>

Week 6

Prostitution

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminist-sex-markets/>

Jeffrey Gauthier (2011), "Prostitution, Sexual Autonomy, and Sex Discrimination" *Hypatia* 25 (3).

Debra Satz (1995). Markets in Women's Sexual Labor. *Ethics* 106 (1):63-85. Available online.

Week 7

The Construction of Gender

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

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

N.B. The SEP articles are particularly useful on this topic.

Calhoun, Cheshire (2001), 'Thinking About the Plurality of Genders'. *Hypatia* 16 (2):67-74. Available online.

Haslanger, Sally (2000), "Feminism and Metaphysics: Unmasking Hidden Ontologies" in APA Newsletter on Feminism and Philosophy (Spring 2000) available online at <http://www.mit.edu/~shaslang/papers/fmnewsUHO.html>

Haslanger, Sally (2000), "Gender and Race: (What) Are They? (What) Do We Want Them to Be?" *Noûs* 34 (1):31–55.

Mari Mikkola. "Gender Concepts and Intuitions." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 39.4 (2009): 559-583.

Saul, J. 2006. 'Gender and Race.' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* Supplementary Volume **80** (2006) 119–43.

Week 8

Implicit Bias

*Tamar Szabó Gendler (2011). On the epistemic costs of implicit bias. *Philosophical Studies* 156 (1):33-63.

*Andy Egan (2011). Comments on Gendler's, "the epistemic costs of implicit bias". *Philosophical Studies* 156 (1):65-79.

Journal of Social Philosophy vol. 43 has a special edition on implicit bias. See all, but especially:

Holroyd, Jules (2012). Responsibility for Implicit Bias. *Journal of Social Philosophy* 43 (3):274-306.

See also articles in Michael Brownstein & Jennifer Saul (eds.), *Implicit Bias and Philosophy*. OUP (forthcoming).

Class 9

Epistemic injustice

*Fricker, Miranda (2007). *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press. **Chapters 1&2.**

Anderson, E. (2012). [Epistemic Justice as a Virtue of Social Institutions](#), *Social Epistemology*, Vol. 26, No. 2: 163-173

Class 10

False Consciousness

Rosen, Michael (1996) *Voluntary Servitude: False Consciousness and the Theory of Ideology* **Ch. 2.**

*Sally Haslanger (2007). "But Mom, Crop-Tops Are Cute!" Social Knowledge, Social Structure and Ideology Critique. *Philosophical Issues* 17 (1):70–91.

Cudd, Ann. (2006). *Analysing Oppression*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Khader, Serene J. (2011). *Adaptive Preferences and Women's Empowerment*. OUP USA.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels, *The German ideology*

George Sher, 'Our Preferences, Ourselves', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Winter, 1983), pp. 34-50. On JSTOR.

5. PPLS Undergraduate Student Handbook

The PPLS Undergraduate Student Handbook has more information on Student Support and academic guidance; late coursework and plagiarism; illness and disability adjustments, and useful sources of advice.

The Handbook can be found here:

http://www.ppls.ed.ac.uk/students/undergraduate/documents/PPLS_Student_Handbook_FINAL.pdf

6. Readings

See "Seminar Content above" for required reading. You should do the reading in advance of class and expect to discuss texts in detail in class. Additional Readings will be suggested as we go along. There are also some general resources you may find useful. The *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (online) has many excellent articles on feminist philosophy. There is a blog chiefly about empirical issues pertaining to feminist philosophy:

<http://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/>

Hypatia is a journal of feminist philosophy and women's studies – the last ten years or so are available online. Be aware that not all the articles are philosophy.

Introductory books/Collections:

Saul, Jennifer, 2003, *Feminism: Issues and Arguments* (OUP).

Tong, Rosemary, 2004, *Feminist Thought* (Routledge).

Fricke, M. and Hornsby, J., 2000, *The Cambridge Companion to Feminism in Philosophy* (CUP).

Bryson, Valerie, (1992) *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction* (Palgrave Macmillan).

Welton, Donn, (1998), (ed.) *Body and Flesh: A Philosophical Reader* (Blackwell).

7. Assessment Information

For Edinburgh Honours students and visiting students the course will be assessed by a mid-semester essay of (30%. max. 1500 words), due on Thursday 24th October 2013, by 4pm and a final essay (70%, max. 2000 words), due on Thursday 12th December 2013, by 4pm

Senior Honours students may opt to write a long essay (approximately 5000 words) to fulfil the dissertation requirement, due on Thursday 16th January, by 4pm.

Feedback will be provided within 3 weeks of the submission date, unless otherwise notified by email.

Word Count Penalties

Essays must not exceed the word limit, which includes footnotes but excludes bibliography. The precise word count must be written on the coversheet. Overlong essays will be penalised according to the following rule: 5% will be deducted for every 100 words, or part thereof, over the word limit. So, 1-100 words over lose 5%; 101-200 words over lose 10%; 201-300 words over lose 15%; and so on.

Penalties for Late Submission of Essays

Unless an extension has been granted, essays must be submitted by the dates shown in the table of Submission Dates below. Essays submitted late without an extension may not be marked, but, if marked, will incur a penalty (in accordance with section 3.8 of the University Undergraduate Assessment Regulations at:

http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Regulations/UG_AssessmentRegulations.PDF

For each working day that the work is late there will be a reduction of the mark by 5% of the maximum obtainable mark (e.g. a mark of 65% on the common marking scale would be reduced to 60% up to 24 hours later). This penalty applies for up to five working days, after which a mark of zero will be given.

Please note - Regulation 14 Assessment deadlines: Student responsibilities

It is a student's responsibility to ascertain and meet his or her assessment deadlines, including examination times and locations.

8. Learn

This year the majority of courses will use electronic submissions for Honours coursework. For essay submission instructions please see the instructions on LEARN. Please note you should not include your name or matriculation number on coursework, only your exam number.

9. Useful Information

WEEK 6 INNOVATIVE LEARNING WEEK (17 - 21 February 2014). Normal teaching slots will be suspended and in their place will be a range of other activities such as master classes, a research day, a science fair, and guest lectures. More information will follow nearer the time so please check the School website where details will be available on the PPLS Events page: <http://www.ppls.ed.ac.uk/events/view/innovative-learning-week-18-22-february-2013>

10. Common Marking Scheme

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/registry/exams/regulations/common-marking-scheme>

A1	90-100	Excellent <i>Outstanding in every respect, the work is well beyond the level expected of a competent student at their level of study.</i>
----	--------	--

A2	80-89	Excellent <i>Outstanding in some respects, the work is often beyond what is expected of a competent student at their level of study.</i>
A3	70-79	Excellent <i>Very good or excellent in most respects, the work is what might be expected of a very competent student.</i>
B	60-69	Very Good <i>Good or very good in most respects, the work displays thorough mastery of the relevant learning outcomes.</i>
C	50-59	Good <i>The work clearly meets requirements for demonstrating the relevant learning outcomes.</i>
D	40-49	Pass <i>The work meets minimum requirements for demonstrating the relevant learning outcomes.</i>
E	30-39	Marginal fail <i>The work fails to meet minimum requirements for demonstrating the relevant learning outcomes.</i>
F	20-29	Clear fail <i>The work is very weak or shows a decided lack of effort.</i>
G	10-19	Bad fail <i>The work is extremely weak.</i>
H	0-9	Bad fail <i>The work is of very little consequence, if any, to the area in question.</i>

Grade-related Marking Guidelines

Explaining the function of these guidelines:

- (1) These are only guidelines; marking still requires discretion and judgment.
- (2) The guidelines are “bottom up” — each band presupposes that the student has at least satisfied the criteria laid down under the lower bands. So to get a first, it is assumed that you at least satisfy all the criteria for a 2-1, etc.
- (3) Each set of guidelines should be understood not as providing necessary and sufficient conditions for a mark in the band specified. Rather, the guidelines under each band provide a kind of “cluster” which defines a paradigm of a piece of work falling within the band in question. A piece of work might deviate from the paradigm in certain respects but still fall within the band. It might help to explain the idea of a paradigm being invoked here. By way of comparison, an ornamental chair (as one might find in a museum, and that is not fit for sitting on)

is a less paradigmatic instance of a piece of furniture than an ordinary sofa, but plausibly an ornamental chair still counts as a piece of furniture all the same. This is because it satisfies enough of the criteria in the cluster of concepts associated with being a piece of furniture, though it satisfies fewer of those criteria than an ordinary sofa. Similarly, a piece of work might be a less than fully paradigmatic instance of a 2-1 but still count as a 2-1 all the same.

- (4) Although they are written in a way that might naturally suggest a binary reading, the guidelines are generally scalar – satisfying each of them comes in degrees, and is not all or nothing. This is important, and relevant to the “paradigm” point above, in that doing better with respect to one criteria under a given band could offset doing slightly less well with regards to another. Also, precisely where within the band a piece of work is assessed will typically reflect how well the work does in terms of each of these criteria.
- (5) The guidelines apply most clearly for essays. In the case of exam questions, part of the exercise will be for the student to work out the extent to which the question calls for something going beyond pure exegesis.
- (6) For history of philosophy classes, where the instructor explicitly indicates this is the case, the contrast between exegesis and original argument may be less clear. In these cases, the original argumentation may be an original argument for an interpretation or reading of a text, for example. Individual instructors have some discretion in explaining how the specific details of their course mean these guidelines should be interpreted. As mere guidelines, they provide only a sort of “default setting” rather than a one size fits all set of prescriptions, amenable to only one canonical interpretation.

General Guidelines

- **Clarity:**
 - Is the writing clear?
 - Is the grammar and spelling correct?
 - Is the language used appropriate?
- **Structure:**
 - Is a clear thesis or position stated?
 - Is an argument, or arguments, offered in support of the thesis?
 - Does each part of the essay/exam have a clearly indicated purpose?
- **Understanding:**
 - Is a sound understanding of relevant issues demonstrated?
 - Is the exposition of others’ views accurate?
 - Are technical terms adequately defined?
- **Originality:**
 - Is there evidence of independent thought?
 - Is there critical engagement with the material?
- **Argument:**
 - Is the argument convincing?
 - Are the inferences valid?
 - Are obvious objections anticipated?

Grade Bands

Fail (less than 40)

Third Class (40–49):

- Writing is generally unclear. Frequent spelling or grammar mistakes, incorrect language, and/or excessively convoluted sentence structure.
- Neglects clearly to state a thesis or position and/or fails to support this with arguments. Contains irrelevant material, or material whose relevance is not adequately explained.
- Demonstrates a barely adequate understanding of central issues. Contains several errors in exposition or in explanation of concepts.
- No evidence of independent thought or critical engagement. Merely rehashes arguments from readings or lectures.
- Where arguments are given, these are weak, depend on invalid inferences or implausible premises. Fails to anticipate obvious objections.

Lower Second Class (50–59):

- Writing is generally clear, but there are occasional spelling/grammar infelicities and/or poorly constructed sentences.
- A thesis/position is indicated but not clearly defined. Some arguments given, but their structure often unclear.
- Demonstrates a basic grasp of key concepts, but occasional inaccuracies in exposition/explanation.
- Little evidence of independent thought. Some suggestion of original ideas, but these are under-developed and/or expressed unclearly.
- Arguments generally weak or unconvincing.

Upper Second Class (60–69):

- Writing is generally clear, marred only by the rare spelling/grammar infelicity or poorly constructed sentence.
- A thesis/position is indicated and clearly defined. Arguments are given with relatively clear structure. It is generally clear what is going on in each section, why one section follows on from the previous one, and how the essay as a whole hangs together.
- Demonstrates a solid understanding of the key concepts, and the exposition is generally accurate and thorough.
- Substantial evidence of original thought – either an original argument of some kind for a familiar position or an original argument for a novel position. In either case, the argument should be reasonably well developed.
- The author's original arguments are interesting and promising, but fairly central or glaring problems with the argument are not discussed or addressed in any way, or are given only a highly cursory treatment.

Low First Class (70–79):

- Writing is very clear and engaging throughout. Where examples are used they are both relevant and memorable. The writing will also be concise.
- The essay's structure is not only clear and well defined; it also provides a satisfying narrative arc.
- Demonstrates a deep understanding of the key concepts. Explains other philosopher's ideas in the author's own terms, clearly presenting those ideas in a way that indicates that the author has "made them his/her own." Where technical terms are used they are always carefully defined.
- Highly original thought, with well developed arguments. The exegesis will generally be sufficiently concise as to allow the author to develop his or her own arguments in considerable detail.
- The author very carefully considers the most central and obvious problems with his/her original argument(s) and has interesting things to say about them.

Mid-First Class (80–89):

- Writing is crystal clear and highly engaging throughout. Memorable examples are used to underscore key points. The writing is concise without coming across as terse or stilted.
- The essay's structure is clear and well defined, with a highly satisfying narrative arc.
- Demonstrates a deep understanding of key concepts. Not only explains the ideas of other philosophers in a way that shows he/she has "made them his/her own," but that actually casts new light on how we might charitably understand the ideas of those philosophers.
- Very original thought, above and beyond what we would normally expect from an undergraduate. These original ideas will be developed in great detail.
- The author very carefully considers the most central and obvious problems with his/her original argument(s) and has prima facie convincing rejoinders. Author may also consider more subtle objections to his/her argument(s)/view(s).

High First Class (90–100):

- Writing is extremely clear, concise, and engaging — of a publishable quality.
- The essay's structure is extremely clear and well-defined, with a highly satisfying narrative arc.
- Demonstrates a deep understanding of key concepts. Not only explains the ideas of other philosophers in a way that shows he/she has "made them his/her own," but that actually casts new light on how we might charitably understand the ideas of those philosophers.
- A highly original and well developed line of argument and/or novel view, such that the essay is publishable, at least in an undergraduate or postgraduate journal, perhaps bordering on being publishable in a mainstream professional journal.
- The author considers the most important objections to his/her arguments/views. The replies are generally convincing and subtle. If space allows, less obvious

objections may also be discussed in interesting ways.