

Phil. 270 – Exercise 6, due Friday, Nov. 5

This week's assignment gives those who have one more of these assignments to complete a choice between doing last week's more open assignment (this is only for those who didn't do exercise 5), or a regular assignment on reading 11 from the syllabus, Susanna Siegel. So, do either option A (which itself has a couple different ways to go) or option B, below.

Option A: This should be an exercise of normal length (700 – 1,050 words, about 2 – 3 pages), and it is intended to be the same kind of low-stress, no-letter-grade (and not hurting your course grade, even if you're going for a straight A, so long as you get it done reasonably (with a check)), exercise as the earlier assignments, but it will be a bit different in nature, as it is intended to play a different role: helping to explore possible paper topics, rather than getting you into a course reading for the purpose of preparing for lecture. You are to do one of the following:

- Describe an issue that arises in one of our readings that we have already covered that you find interesting, and may have ideas of your own about, and critically discuss it. This can (but need not) involve a paper you wrote about in an earlier exercise, and can even be (but need not be) an issue you brought up in an earlier assignment. If so, this is a chance to spend a little more space on the issue. **Or...**
- Looking ahead on our syllabus's list of readings to papers we have not yet covered, but that look interesting to you, describe and critically assess a position taken or a move made by one of our upcoming authors.

Option B: 700–1,050 (about 2 – 3 pages) of total writing:

- 525 – 700 words (about 1½ - 2 pages) of summary/exposition of reading 11 from the syllabus: Susanna Siegel, "Cognitive Penetrability and Perceptual Justification"
- 175 – 350 words (about ½ - 1 page) of critical commentary about, or a question or questions you have about, the material you've summarized above