

Paperling 2

Instructions: submitting this assignment requires two things. First, you should email it to me (my email address is immerman@ksu.edu) with the subject "Paperling 2". You should do this by **9 AM** on **September 8**. You should also print out a copy and **bring it to class** on **September 8**. In class, we will talk over the assignment and then you will fill out a short self-assessment before turning it in. This Paperling should be one paragraph long. I like to grade as anonymously as possible, so please **do not put your name on the top of the paper, but instead put it on the opposite side of the page or on a second page**. If you have any questions about how to complete the assignment, please let me know.

Today for class we are reading an article by Louis Pojman called "Who's to Judge?" In the first part of his third section, "Conventional Ethical Relativism (Conventionalism)", (244-7) Pojman discusses conventional ethical relativism. What are the main conclusions he draws about it in these pages?

Daniel Immerman
Introduction to Moral Philosophy

Paperling 2 Rubric

Clarity and precision	(4) You are quite clear and precise.	(2) For the most part, you are clear and precise, but at times you could be clearer or more precise.	(0) There are lots of times when you are not clear or precise.
Identifying Authors' View	(4) You never interpret the author as endorsing some view when the author is mentioning the view but not endorsing it.	(2) You sometimes interpret the author as endorsing some view when the author is mentioning the view but not endorsing it.	(0) You regularly interpret the author as endorsing some view when the author is mentioning the view but not endorsing it.
Interpreting Charitably	(4) You are charitable in your interpretation. In particular, when there are multiple ways of interpreting an author, you interpret them in a way that makes what they are saying plausible and keeps them from contradicting themselves.	(2) You are usually charitable in your interpretation. In particular, when there are multiple ways of interpreting an author, you usually interpret them in a way that makes what they are saying plausible and keeps them from contradicting themselves.	(0) You are uncharitable in your interpretation. In particular, when there are multiple ways of interpreting an author, you often interpret them in a way that makes what they are saying implausible or makes them contradict themselves
Self-assessment (Note: you'll be performing this in class on the day the paper is due.)	(3) You accurately self assess.	(1.5) You are somewhat accurate in how you self-assess.	(0) You are totally inaccurate in how you self-assess.