

PHI 210: Philosophical Foundations and Moral Reasoning
Anderson University (SC)
Syllabus

I. Course Information

PHI 210: Philosophical Foundations and Moral Reasoning

Credit hours: 3

Prerequisites: CHR105 and ENG102

Target student audience: All sophomores and higher

Class meeting times and place: online

Course begins on: _____ and ends on: _____

Students should expect to spend 12-13 hours a week on course related material

II. Instructor Information

Instructor name: _____

Email: _____

III. Textbook(s), Supplementary Readings, Required Materials

Required texts: **See Canvas**

Supplementary materials

- Electronic reading material provided on CANVAS
- Zoom Classroom record lectures provided on CANVAS

IV. Course Purpose, Student Learning Outcomes, and Course Learning Goals

Course purpose: An exploration of enduring philosophical questions; and a survey of moral reasoning in order to apply Christian belief.

Student learning outcomes: (1) moral and ethical reasoning and action; (2) critical thinking skills: inquiry, analysis, and creative problem-solving; (3) written communication skills

Course learning goals:

- Students will be able to apply philosophical and moral reasoning to everyday life.
- Students will be able to evaluate strong and weak arguments.
- Students will be able to analyze and evaluate different philosophical viewpoints.
- Students will be able to articulate and explain a basic understanding of the questions and importance of philosophy and moral reasoning.
- Students will be able to critique and defend different conceptions of metaphysics, epistemology, the existence of God, and the good/just life.

IDEA Course Evaluation Objectives:

- Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making
- Gaining a basic understanding of the subject
- Developing skill in expressing myself orally or writing

V. Method(s) of Instruction and Evaluation

Instructional and Evaluation Methods:

1. The course is lecture based and relies heavily on assigned readings.
 1. Lectures are uploaded and linked with each module. Students are responsible for all lecture and reading material.
2. Evaluation happens through graded assignments consisting of written papers (both ‘reflective notes’ on scheduled readings as well as argumentative critical response papers), and two discussion boards.

Testing Procedures:

1. There are no tests in this course

Grading Scale:

| | |
|---|--------|
| A | 90-100 |
| B | 80-89 |
| C | 70-79 |
| D | 60-69 |
| F | 0-59 |

Assignments/Projects:

Critical Response Papers (3 @ 100 points each) = 300

Reflective Notes [RNs] (8 @ 20 points each) = 160

Reflective Note Discussion Boards (2 @ 20 points each) = 40

Total = 500 points

VI. Additional Course Details

VI.1 What We'll Be Doing

In this class we will focus on areas and questions in philosophy that will help us deepen our views about human nature and the meaning of life. To do this, we will focus on four main issues: Reality (what is truth? What sorts of things are there? What sorts of things are humans?); Knowledge (can we ever really *know* anything?); God (does God exist? Is anyone ever *intellectually* justified in believing God exists?); free will, moral responsibility, and moral reasoning (what are good and just actions? What is *the Good*? Do we ever deserve *moral* praise or criticism for our actions?)

A note about doing philosophy and asking philosophical questions:

- Philosophical questions differ from other kinds of questions (e.g., scientific questions) in that they combine these three features:
- Philosophical questions concern certain abstract yet deeply interesting and important concepts: Knowledge, Intellectual Justification, God, Personhood, Causation, Action, Freedom, Moral Accountability, Justice, and so on.
- The main intellectual tool we use to explore philosophical questions is our power of *reason* or *rational insight*, a kind of “sixth sense” that’s distinct from the five “empirical” senses (vision, touch, taste, smell, hearing).
- Philosophical questions resist (but do not deny that there are) final, definitive solutions: as we’ll see both in assigned readings *and* in class discussion, it’s often very difficult to achieve widespread agreement on the best answer to a given philosophical question.

7-Week Course Disclaimer!

Because of the nature of this 7-week online course, and the content of the class, viz., philosophy and moral reasoning, this 7 weeks will be *very* intense. Students will be required to think deeply and meaningfully about a whole host of complex issues almost immediately upon entering the course, rather than a more gentle ‘wading in’ provided for students in a semester-long course. We’ve got to cover a full semester’s worth of material in under half the time!

VI.2 Assignment Specifications

Critical Response Papers: (3 @ 20% each = 60%)

o Students will write three (3) critical response papers. A critical response paper is one that summarizes and evaluates. So, roughly the first half of the paper will be a summary of the author’s argument, and the second half will be an evaluation of the content discussed in the first half. The paper should demonstrate a thorough understanding of the author’s argument and include carefully reasoned arguments in defense of the student’s point of view. The paper should also make as many connections as possible to course materials, including quotes from the book(s), as well as from other essays and articles when relevant. **Students may use a previously written RN (more on these, below) as a ‘jumping off’ point for a critical response.**

o For the first critical response paper, the student will respond, critically (where ‘critically’ means ‘with substantive engagement’, and not necessarily ‘with disagreement’), to any *one* of

the readings from UNIT 1. Students should *not* do any outside research. Rather, limit your research to the readings found in UNIT 1.

o For the second critical response paper, students will respond, critically, to any *one* of the readings from UNIT 3. For the third critical response paper, students will respond, critically, to any *one* of the readings from UNIT 4. Again, students should *not* do any outside research; rather, research must be limited to the readings found in the relevant UNIT.

- 600 – 800 words
- Double-spaced
- 12 point font
- 1 inch margins
- No cover page
- Saved as a Word .doc
- Proper citations (Chicago/Turabian)
- Must be turned in through CANVAS *before midnight* on the due date.
- Students' first critical response paper is due on or before _____. The second is due on or before _____. The third is due on or before the day of the final of class, _____.
- There will be a deduction of one full letter grade (that is: 11%) for every day the assignment is late.

The paper must be argumentative within a critical response framework. Do not plagiarize or copy other sources without giving credit to the original author. Intentional and unintentional cases of plagiarism are treated the same: **a zero on the paper and a possible F in the class.**

Papers will be graded as follows:

Quality of writing = 30%

- Grammar and style are polished = 27 – 30
- Grammar and style are good = 24 – 26.5
- Grammar and style are acceptable, but some problems may make reading difficult = 21 – 23.5
- Grammar and style obstruct reading = 1 – 20.5

Meets minimum requirements = 20%

- Paper is not an argumentative response essay = 0
- Paper is not on a relevant topic = 0
- Paper is either under or over the required word count = 0

Quality and clarity of argument = 50%

- Excellent *summary* of author's arguments; excellent *evaluation* of author's arguments; multiple and relevant connections with other course materials; logical argumentation is employed in defense of student's point of view = 45 – 50

- Good *summary* of author's arguments; good *evaluation* of author's arguments; some connections with other course readings; logical argumentation is employed in defense of student's point of view = 40 – 44.5
- Acceptable *summary* of author's arguments; acceptable *evaluation* of author's arguments; few connections with other course readings; logical argumentation is employed in defense of student's point of view = 35 – 39.5
- Summary may be seriously deficient; evaluation may be seriously deficient; connections to other course materials may be lacking; logical argumentation and coherence may be lacking = 1 – 34.5

Reflective Notes (RNs) (8 @ 4% each = 32%):

o Each Reflective Note (RN) you submit will earn a grade of 'Acceptable' or 'Unacceptable'. An *Acceptable* RN will be a healthy paragraph (i.e., five or more sentences) in which you raise *either* (i) a question about *or* (ii) an objection to something that happens in a particular assigned reading. To ensure that I understand exactly how your question or objection engages the material you're writing about, you'll need to provide some context by briefly summarizing the part of the reading your question or objection concerns. Sincere effort will usually suffice for an Acceptable RN. However, an RN that's too short or inaccurate or unclear will earn a grade of 'Unacceptable', and won't count toward this portion of the final grade. (See the end of the syllabus for two sample Acceptable RNs.)

- Here are some important rules about RNs:

- Each RN must be about one of the starred (*) readings in the reading schedule below (there are many more options than 10, so you'll have a lot of leeway here).
- Each of your RNs must be about a different reading assignment—no more than one RN on a given reading assignment.
- Each RN must be titled with the corresponding number RN (e.g., RN 4) and the title of the text about which it's reflecting. Example: RN 4: Gettier, "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?"

- See Appendix 1 on this syllabus

Reflective Note Discussion Boards (2 @ 4% each = 8%):

o One of my main goals this semester is to help us fruitfully discuss the ideas we'll be exploring. By participating in discussion, you can do at least three important things:

(1) Gain a deeper understanding of the material this course covers;

(2) Help classmates better to understand the material and resolve questions or objections they may have of the sample reading;

and

(3) Strengthen your ability to participate in rational discussion about topics of all kinds.

To help foster virtual discussion, two of our semester's Reflective Notes (RNs 3 and 10) will play important roles in sparking class discussion. They'll be done in the form of a discussion

board. For Reflective Note 3, you'll upload your third reflective note as a "post" in the RN 3 DB (link located in the Unit 1 Module). For RN 10, you'll upload your tenth reflective note as a post in the RN 10 DB (link located in the Unit 4 Module). Your initial posting will be evaluated as above (i.e., as acceptable or unacceptable with the same criteria). But there's an additional duty with these DBs. Once you've posted your initial post (the RN), you'll need to find another student's RN that you find interesting and respond to it. This response should be in complete sentences and in the range of 250 – 300 words. Your job is to attempt to answer the classmate's question (or clarify other answers that have been given) if the classmate has posted a "question" RN (more about which below). Alternatively, if s/he has offered an "objection" RN, your job is either to respond to the objection or else help further strengthen the problem your classmate highlights. As with normal RNs, these are worth 20 points. Each part of this two part assignment is worth 10 points on an "acceptable"/"unacceptable" evaluation.

- Here are some important rules about RN Discussion Boards:
- **There are *two* due dates associated with *each* RN-DB. The first date is the date for the initial posting; the second date is the date for your response to a classmate. *Late posts and replies are unacceptable (i.e., zero credit).***
- Each RN must be about one of the starred (*) readings in the reading schedule below (there are many more options than 10, so you'll have a lot of leeway here).
- Each of your RN must be about a different reading assignment—no more than one RN on a given reading assignment.
- Each RN-DB initial post must be titled with the corresponding number RN (e.g., RN 3) and the title of the text about which it's reflecting. Example: RN 3: Frank Jackson, "The Qualia Problem."

There should be absolutely no replies-to-a-classmate of this sort: "That was a really great post! I liked everything you said about [insert topic]. I too think the same way."

- Such responses will yield a '0' score on that part of the assignment because they are 'unacceptable'. Engagement should be substantive doing as outlined above.

VII. Class Policies:

Intentional disrespect (for your classmates or for your instructor) will not be tolerated. Think of this class as an exercise in impartial, dispassionate, free and rational thinking about some contentious philosophical and theological issues. For the purposes of this course (though I think this is good practice just in general), I'll ask you to set aside your own likes and dislikes, your feelings, your upbringings and instead concentrate on giving *reasons* for the positions you defend and against the ones you criticize. And the reasons you offer should be, as far as possible, ones that any sane, rational, clear-thinking person could be expected to accept, or at any rate, recognize even if they don't agree with the conclusions you draw from those reasons. Though, as a Christian, I care about your what you *think* about any particular issue, what matters most to me (as your instructor) are the kinds of *reasons* you provide for what you think. So, that's what I'll evaluate. I'll evaluate *your reasons* for a particular position; I won't evaluate the position itself (though I almost surely will comment on it). And I expect the same from you, too! I'll expect you to evaluate *the reasons* given for a particular position, whether they are from a particular theologian or philosopher you're reading, your classmates, or your instructor. But this

takes for granted that you'll do your best to respect those with whom you're engaging, that you'll keep your cool and try your best to see things from the side of your opponent. This takes it for granted that you'll assume (as you ought) that each philosopher or theologian you read, each classmate with whom you interact, and your instructor are all rational, sane, clear-thinking people. Perhaps not all of us are; but you'll be expected to engage with us as if we are.

You must be reachable via your university email. I cannot stress this enough: you will be notified of any changes that occur to the course over the semester (if there are any changes, that is) via email. Moreover, if I need to contact you, personally, for any reason at all, this will be the method through which I contact you. Do not neglect to check your university email often! **If a student wishes to email the instructor, s/he can expect a reply within 48 hours *except on weekends and holidays*.**

- Begin all of your emails to me a greeting, using my proper title (either Dr. or Prof.) End all of your emails with a salutation (e.g., all the best, Jim Smith). See the above about disrespect.

- Include your name, class, and section in your emails to me.

This course meets entirely online. So, you must have consistent and reliable access to the internet.

Late Assignment Policy:

- Critical Response Papers will be deducted 11% off their grade for every day they are late.

- Late Reflective Notes will receive a '0' grade.

- If you wish to appeal to turn in an assignment late, appeal to your instructor *prior* to the assignment's due date. ***All appeals submitted on an assignment's due date will be denied unless the reason is an emergency (e.g., the student was in the hospital).***

- The instructor reserves the right to grant appeals as s/he deems reasonable.

Drop Deadline (with no grade): _____

Withdrawal deadline (with 'W' grade): _____

Academic Honesty: Students at Anderson University are expected to conduct themselves with integrity and to be honest and forthright in their academic endeavors. The University faculty's expectations define the following areas that would violate Academic Honesty: plagiarism, fabrication, cheating, and academic misconduct. The policy, process, and penalties for academic dishonesty are described in the Student Handbook. (Excerpt from AU Catalog)

Extra credit: There is no extra credit in this course

Disabilities: If you have a disability that may interfere with your learning, testing, or assignment completion in this course, you may be eligible to receive an academic adjustment to help provide you with an equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from this course. Please contact the Coordinator of Accessibility Services in the Center for Student Success, who will advise you on appropriate documentation, determine reasonable adjustments, and notify me of any adjustments for which you are eligible. Once you have been approved for an academic adjustment through

the Center for Student Success, please discuss with me its appropriate implementation in this course. Documentation must meet the guidelines specified by university policy, and no one else can be notified of your disability or adjustment without your written consent. This process must be repeated for every semester you are enrolled at Anderson University and wish to receive an adjustment. Academic adjustments are intended to “level the playing field” so that students with disabilities can demonstrate their true abilities in their courses. Changes cannot be made to grades earned before a student has requested an adjustment, so please attend to this early in the semester.

VIII. Important Dates:

_____ : First Day of Class

_____ : Reflective Note 1 Due

_____ : Reflective Notes 2 and 3 (DB) Due

Note: The first part (the initial post) of RN 3 is due _____. The second part, the reply-to-a-classmate, is due on _____.

_____ : **First Critical Response Due**

_____ : Reflective Note 4 Due

_____ : Reflective Notes 5 and 6 Due

_____ : Reflective Notes 7 and 8 Due

_____ : **Second Critical Response Due**

_____ : Thanksgiving Break

_____ : Reflective Notes 9 and 10 (DB) Due

Note: The first part (the initial post) of RN 10 is due _____. The second part, the reply-to-a-classmate, is due _____.

_____ : **Third Critical Response Due and Last Day of Class**

IX. Reading Schedule (RR = *Reason and Responsibility*; FE = *The Fundamentals of Ethics*; CP = CANVAS Page; * = RN option):

Weeks 1 and 2 (10/14 – 10/27): UNIT 1: Preliminaries and Metaphysics

Preliminaries:

- **(RR)** Joel Feinberg, “A Logic Lesson,” pp. 1 – 8.
- **(RR)** Bertrand Russell, “The Value of Philosophy,” pp. 22 – 25.
- **(RR)** Plato, “Apology,” pp. 8 – 21.

Truth and Things

- (CP) Bradley Dowden and Norman Swartz, “Truth,” in *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, sections 1 – 3, 5 – 6.
- (CP) Peter van Inwagen, “Individuality.” (*)
- (CP) Robert Koons and Timothy Pickavance, “Properties.” (*)

The Mind-Body Problem

- (RR) Brie Gertler, “In Defense of Mind-Body Dualism,” pp. 359 – 372. (*)
- (RR) Frank Jackson, “The Qualia Problem,” pp. 372 – 376. (*)
- (RR) David Papineau, “The Case for Materialism,” pp. 376 – 382. (*)
- (CP) William Jaworski, “Hylomorphism: What it is, and What it isn’t.”
- (CP) Patrick Toner, “Hylomorphic Animalism.” (CP)

Personal Identity and persistence

- (RR) John Locke, “The Prince and the Cobbler”, pp. 413 – 416. (*)
- (RR) Thomas Reid, “Of Mr. Locke’s Account of Our Personal Identity,” pp. 416 – 419. (*)
- (RR) Derek Parfit, “Divided Minds and the Nature of Persons,” pp. 421 – 427.
- (CP) Trenton Merricks, “There are No Criteria of Identity Over Time.”

Week 3 (10/28 – 11/3): UNIT 2: Epistemology: What is knowledge and how do we know what we know?

- (RR) Feinberg and Shafer-Landau, “Human Knowledge: Its Grounds and Limits,” pp. 185 – 193.
- (RR) John Pollock, “A Brain in a Vat,” pp. 193 – 195. (*)
- (RR) Huemer, “Three Skeptical Arguments,” pp. 195 – 200. (*)
- (RR) Robert Audi, “Skepticism,” pp. 201 – 210.
- (RR) René Descartes; “Meditations on First Philosophy: First Meditation,” pp. 242 – 244.
- (RR) E. Moore, “Proof of an External World,” pp. 290 – 292. (*)
- (RR) Plato, “Knowledge as Justified True Belief,” pp. 210 – 214. (*)
- (RR) Edmund Gettier, “Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?”, pp. 215 – 216. (*)
- **FIRST CRITICAL RESPONSE DUE ON OR BEFORE (Friday, 11/1)**

Weeks 4 and 5 (11/4 – 11/17): UNIT 3: Does God exist? And, if so, is anyone ever intellectually justified in believing that God exists?

The Cosmological Argument

- (RR) Thomas Aquinas, “The Five Ways,” pp. 47 – 48. (*)
- (RR) Samuel Clarke, “A Modern Formulation of the Cosmological Argument,” pp. 49 – 50. (*)
- (RR) David Hume, “Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion,” Part IX, pp. 99 – 101. (*)
- (RR) William Rowe, “The Cosmological Argument,” pp. 50 – 58. (*)

The Ontological Argument

- (RR) Anselm, “The Ontological Argument,” pp. 31 – 33. (*)
- (RR) Gaunilo, “On Behalf of the Fool,” pp. 33 – 36. (*)
- (RR) René Descartes, “Mediations on First Philosophy: Fifth Meditation,” pp. 260 – 264. (*)
- (CP) Alvin Plantinga, “A Modal Version of the Ontological Argument.” (*)

What’s Required for Intellectually Justified Belief in God?

- (RR) K. Clifford, “The Ethics of Belief,” pp. 151 – 154. (*)
- (RR) William James, “The Will to Believe,” pp. 155 – 164. (*)
- (CP) Alvin Plantinga, “Religious Belief Without Evidence.” (*)

The Problem of Evil

- (RR) L. Mackie, “Evil and Omnipotence,” pp. 118 – 126. (*)
- (CP) Alvin Plantinga, “The Free Will Defense.” (*)
- (CP) William Rowe, “The Problem of Evil and Some Varieties of Atheism.” (*)
- (RR) Fyodor Dostoevsky, “Rebellion,” pp. 112 – 118.
- (RR) Plato, “Euthyphro,” pp. 628 – 638.
- (FE) Chapter 5, “Morality and Religion,” pp. 63 – 75.

Weeks 6 and 7 (11/18 – 12/6): UNIT 4: Moral Reasoning and Moral Responsibility: What actions are good and do we ever deserve moral praise or criticism for our actions?

Moral Responsibility and the Good Life

- (RR) Robert Kane, “Free Will: Ancient Dispute, New Themes,” pp. 467 – 481.
- (RR) Harry Frankfurt, “Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility,” pp. 528 – 534. (*)
- (RR) Derk Pereboom, “Why We Have No Free Will and Can Live Without it,” pp. 491 – 504. (*)
- (CP) Peter van Inwagen, “The Incompatibility of Responsibility and Determinism.” (*)
- (FE) “Introduction,” pp. 1 – 19.
- (FE) Chapter 1, “Hedonism,” pp. 23 – 31.
- (FE) Chapter 2, “Is Happiness all that Matters?” pp. 32 – 43.
- (FE) Chapter 3, “Getting What You Want,” pp. 44 – 50.
- (FE) Chapter 4, “Problems for the Desire Theory,” pp. 51 – 60.
- (FE) Chapter 19, “Ethical Relativism,” pp. 293 – 309.
- **SECOND CRITICAL RESPONSE DUE ON OR BEFORE (Monday, 11/18)**

Utilitarianism and Deontology

- (RR) John Stuart Mill, “Utilitarianism,” pp. 546 – 660. (*)
- (RR) Immanuel Kant, “The Good Will and the Categorical Imperative,” pp. 638 – 645. (*)
- (RR) Thomas Nagel, “Moral Luck,” pp. 534 – 541. (*)
- (FE) Chapter 9, “Consequentialism: Its Nature and Attractions,” pp. 120 – 138.
- (FE) Chapter 10, “Consequentialism: Its Difficulties,” pp. 139 – 159.
- (FE) Chapter 11, “The Kantian Perspective: Fairness and Justice,” pp. 160 – 174. (*)
- (FE) Chapter 12, “The Kantian Perspective: Autonomy and Respect,” pp. 175 – 193. (*)

Moral Pluralism, Virtue, and the Natural Law

- **(RR)** Mary Midgley, “Trying Out One’s New Sword,” pp. 610 – 613. (*)
- **(RR)** Aristotle, “Virtue and the Good Life,” pp. 613 – 622. (*)
- **(FE)** Chapter 6, “Natural Law,” pp. 76 – 90.

- **(FE)** Chapter 15, “Ethical Pluralism and Absolute Morals,” pp. 221 – 238.
- **(FE)** Chapter 16, “Ethical Pluralism: Prima Facie Duties and Ethical Particularism,” pp. 239 – 255.
- **(FE)** Chapter 17, “Virtue Ethics,” pp. 256 – 275.
- **(FE)** Chapter 21, “Eleven Arguments Against Moral Objectivity,” pp. 323 – 342.
- **THIRD CRITICAL RESPONSE PAPER DUE ON OR BEFORE FINAL DAY OF CLASS (Friday, 12/6)**

X. Other Learning Facilities and Resources Pertinent to Course

Thrift Library

Hours are posted at <https://www.andersonuniversity.edu/library> (Links to an external site.) (Closed on all university holidays.)

Bunton Lab

Located in Thrift Library, 2nd floor.

The Writing and Multi-Media Center

Located in Thrift Library, 2nd floor. For drop-in hours and appointment-based tutoring for all your writing needs, see <https://www.andersonuniversity.edu/writing-center> (Links to an external site.). Schedule an appointment by visiting <https://anderson.mywconline.com> (Links to an external site.).

The Center for Student Success

Located in in Thrift Library, 2nd floor. The Center provides support for academic assistance, tutoring services, as well as study skills seminars. Call 864-328-1420 to contact the Center or visit their website at <http://www.andersonuniversity.edu/student-success> (Links to an external site.).

Technical Support:

If you encounter technical support issues (e.g., LMS is unavailable, username and password are not working), you should immediately contact the IT Help Desk. In your communication with the IT Department, be sure to describe the nature of your problem with as much detail as possible so they can provide the best possible assistance. You are encouraged to first contact the IT Help Desk using the web-based support system listed below. If you are unable to login to the system, you can reach them via phone.

Help Desk Website: <https://helpdesk.andersonuniversity.edu> (Links to an external site.)

Help Desk Phone: (864) 231-2859

Course Related Support:

If you encounter problems in your online or blended course are beyond technical problems, contact the Center for Innovation and Digital Learning (CIDL). The CIDL manages online and blended learning at AU. The following issues are valid reasons to immediately contact the CIDL:

- An online exam or assignment is supposed to be open or made available and it is not (contact the instructor first)
- Instructor fails to respond to student questions more than 4 days.
- Instructor has not provided any grades or feedback 2+ weeks past the submission deadline.
- The instructor is not participating in the course at all.

CIDL Website: <http://www.aucidl.com> (Links to an external site.)

CIDL Phone: (864) 231-2199

Appendix 1: Sample 'Acceptable' RNs:

1. 'Question' RN:

One of Turner's main aims in this syllabus is to give us a clear sense of the questions and issues we'll explore in this course. Unfortunately, he sometimes slips into using unfamiliar terminology. One important place this happens is when Turner tries to describe the questions about God's existence that we'll be exploring. Here, he uses the expression 'intellectually justified': "is anyone ever *intellectually justified* in believing that God exists?" 'Intellectually justified' is not an "everyday" or "ordinary" expression: the typical person on the street probably won't know exactly what that means. Rather, this unfamiliar term seems to be one that's defined and used primarily within the field of Philosophy. So, my question: What does it mean for a belief in God to be intellectually justified?

1. 'Objection' RN:

According to Turner, the "main intellectual tool" we use to explore philosophical questions is what he calls the "power of *reason* or *rational insight*." Turner distinguishes what he calls 'reason' or 'rational insight' from the "five senses" (vision, touch, taste, smell, hearing). Apparently, then, Turner thinks that we can gain knowledge and/or intellectually justified beliefs using something *other than* the five senses. I don't buy this vaguely "spooky" idea. Instead, it seems to me that whatever knowledge we have comes *only* from the five senses. So, it looks like *either* Turner is wrong about the proper way to explore philosophical questions *or* Philosophy turns out to be a pretty dubious discipline. Either way, Turner seems to be wrong about Philosophy.