

# New Assignment 11/17/24

---

On pages 324 of your text book, Nick Bostrom defends transhumanism while on page 325 Rosamarie Garland-Thomson objects to the use of CRISPR (clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats), a gene editing tool to promises the eradication of inherited disease.

Next Tuesday, you will need to turn in a 4 sentence outline articulating which philosopher you agree with and why. This assignment is one of 4.

November 26 - 4 sentence outline due

December 3 - Explication of Author's argument is due

December 10 - Your point of contention (why you disagree with the philosopher)

December 17 - Possible responses available to the philosopher and your responses to these.

Remember that the 4 point outlie goes like this

1. Philosopher X argues \_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_ and philosopher Y argues \_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_
2. I think that philosopher Y is right because \_\_\_\_\_
3. Philosopher X might say \_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_
4. However this objection does not work because \_\_\_\_\_

Further below is the rubric I will be using. Read it carefully.

Some points to consider:

Whatever goes in the blanks, needs to be highly accurate and precise. This means that all terminology used needs to be accurately defined and precisely summarized.

The issue itself needs to be described accurately and possible alternatives or solutions considered.

**Analysis** Premises are important. You need to be able to take the issue and create a systematic argument, premise 1, 2, 3, and conclusion. These need to be precisely summarized, as concise as is possible.

The arguments need to be presented with validity and soundness considered closely. If you believe that a given argument is invalid, then you need to state as much, or if it is unsound, the same thing.

## Understanding

**Text** The paper contains highly accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text. The paper uses appropriate textual support for these. The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly accurate and precise, and has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices. The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly accurate, but not precise, and the textual support is inappropriate. The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is inaccurate and/or has no textual support. 4

**Ideas** The paper contains a highly accurate and precise description of the issue or problem, along with a careful consideration of possible alternatives or solutions. The paper contains relevant examples, and indicates the salient issues the examples highlight. The description of the problem or issue is fairly accurate and precise, and possible alternatives or solutions are considered. Examples are given, but similar examples may have been better. The description of the problem or issue is fairly accurate but not precise, and possible alternatives or solutions are either not considered, or ill-described. Examples are given, but it is not made clear how they are relevant. The description of the problem or issue is inaccurate, and possible alternatives or solutions are not considered, and examples are not provided. 4

**Analysis** The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts (Premises). The connections between the parts are clear and highly accurate. The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are fairly accurate. The paper breaks the argument, issue, or problem into parts, but some parts may be missing or unclear. The connections between the parts are somewhat accurate. The parts identified are not the correct and/or relevant ones. The connections between the parts are completely inaccurate. 4

**Synthesis** The paper successfully integrates all relevant parts from various places into a coherent whole. The connections between the parts are clear and insightful. The paper integrates most relevant parts from various places into a mostly coherent whole. The connections between the parts are generally clear. The paper integrates some parts from various places into a somewhat coherent whole. The connections between the parts are somewhat unclear. The parts to be integrated are not clear and/or relevant. The connections between the parts are unclear. 4

## **Evaluation**

**Argument** The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking for adherence to various standards (validity, soundness, etc.), and checking for informal fallacies. The paper suggests how the argument could be made better according to the appropriate standard. The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking for adherence to various standards (validity, soundness, etc.), and checking for informal fallacies. The paper evaluates the argument in question by checking only the truth of the premises and/or the conclusion, and does not check for informal fallacies. The paper evaluates the argument in question by whether the author agrees or disagrees with the conclusion or a premise. 4

**Position** The paper evaluates the position in question by checking for support in an argument and internal consistency, and by exploring unmentioned plausible alternatives. The paper evaluates the position in question by checking for support in an argument and internal consistency. The paper evaluates the position in question by considering its plausibility. The paper evaluates the position in question by whether the author agrees or disagrees with it. 4

## **Creation**

**Thesis** Thesis is original, interesting, and relevant. The thesis is interesting and relevant. The thesis is slightly off-topic, obviously true (or false), or not really worth writing about. The thesis is totally irrelevant. **4**

**Examples** Examples are original, relevant, insightful, and well-used. Examples are original, relevant, and well-used. Examples are unoriginal, only somewhat relevant, and/or not well-used. Examples are missing, irrelevant an/or misused. **4**

**Alternative Positions** Previously unmentioned alternative positions are explored. Alternative positions are explored. Alternative positions are mentioned but not explored. Alternative positions are ignored. **4**

## **STYLE**

**Clarity** All sentences are complete and grammatical. All words are chosen for their precise meanings. All new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained. Good, clear examples are used to illuminate concepts and issues. Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. All sentences are complete and grammatical. Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts and theories are explained. Examples are clear. Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. New or unusual terms are not well-defined. Key concepts and theories are not explained. Examples are not clear. Information (names, facts, etc.) is mostly accurate. Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. The author does not acknowledge that key words have precise meanings. Information (names, facts, etc.) is inaccurate. Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. **4**