2

Reading a Philosophical text

You may have heard that philosophical texts are extremely difficult to read and that they often require a great deal of effort to comprehend. We are not going to try to deceive you into thinking that reading philosophy will be a "piece of cake" or that you won't have to struggle a bit to understand what's going on in a philosophical work. Certainly the kind of reading that you will be asked to do in philosophy will present a much greater intellectual challenge than you may typically be accustomed to—even in your other college classes.

Our promise to you is that if you faithfully follow the suggestions in this guide, you should be able to navigate your way through the complex arguments in the typical philosophical work. And perhaps—if you are very fortunate indeed—you may even become part of that elite group of college students who actually derive some kind of pleasure from joining the great philosophers in their pursuit of wisdom.

Reading for Understanding

Before we get down to the nitty-gritty of how to read a philosophical work, a distinction should be made between reading for information and reading for understanding. In reading for information, one reads something that requires very little effort to comprehend—an article in the *New York Post*, for example—and which therefore increases information about the world, but not understanding about yourself and the world in which you live. Growth in understanding, by comparison, comes when one reads material that is difficult to comprehend, and which forces one to rise to the more elevated level of the written material. In general, the more effort that you are forced to make in reading, the greater will be your growth in understanding. To quote the old adage, "No pain, no gain."

Try to keep in mind that the goal of reading in a liberal arts education—and this is particularly true in the discipline of philosophy—is neither pleasure nor information per se; it is rather to help expand your understanding of yourself and your universe. This is not to say that you shouldn't derive some pleasure from reading Milton's *Paradise Lost* or receive useful information from reading a work like Plato's *Republic*. But these concerns should be secondary to your ultimate aim of reading great works in order to expand your intellectual horizons and to broaden your

understanding of the meaning of your existence.

Helpful Hints on Philosophical Reading

Because philosophical reading is by its very nature deep reading, in your attempt to derive some understanding of a philosophical text, you are probably going to have to put aside some of the lazy reading habits that you've developed over the years. Many students have the tendency to breeze through most of their college readings rather quickly and haphazardly in order to get through reading assignments as "painlessly" as possible. While this kind of quick-read might work if you are reading the typical college textbook that is written on a 9th grade reading level, it will not work if you are reading the works of great philosophers.

1. Savoring the Delectable. Almost all philosophers tend to write in a very dense style that demands a slow and careful reading. You should try to savor their ideas the way you would a delicious meal at a fancy restaurant. If you were dining at the Russian Tea Room you would dine slowly, attempting to appreciate every mouthful of food. Try to read philosophy in the same way: take the time to mull over every sentence that you read, and to reflect carefully upon the author's meaning. You may even have to reread a section of text several times before you get what the author is trying to say.

As an illustration of what I mean, try reading the following selection from the opening paragraphs of Kierkegaard's *Sickness Unto Death* in your normal style of reading:

> A human being is spirit. But what is spirit? Spirit is the self. But what is the self? The self is a relation that relates itself to itself or is the relation's relating itself to itself in the relation; the self is not the relation but is the relation's relating itself to itself. A human being is a synthesis of the infinite and the finite, of the temporal and the eternal, of freedom and necessity, in short, a synthesis. A synthesis is a relation between two. Considered in this way, a human being is still not a self.
>
> In the relation between the two, the relation is the third as a negative unity, and the two relate to the relation and in the relation to the relation; thus under the qualification of the psychical the relation between the psychical and the physical is a relation. If, however, the relation relates itself to itself, this relation is the positive third, and this is the self.
>
> Søren Kierkegaard. *The Sickness Unto Death*. Trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna Hong. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1980.

Doesn't make much sense, does it? If you were asked to read this work in a philosophy class on Existentialism, you might find yourself frustrated by your inability to break through Kierkegaard's rather difficult style of writing. You might even be tempted to give up on him as soon as you got to the end of the second paragraph. So what can you do to prevent yourself from falling into despair when you encounter complicated writing of this sort in your philosophy classes? Here are just a few general suggestions:

2. Slow Down Some More. The first time I read Kierkegaard's *Sickness Unto Death* as a college student I was just as confused as you probably were reading the above selection (sometimes I still get confused when I read Kierkegaard). Confusion is perfectly natural when you are reading any kind of challenging literature. The trick is not to try to rush through your

reading in the misguided hope that the author's writing will get easier later on. Instead try slowing your reading down even more, concentrating on the relations between the various terms that the author is using in each sentence and paragraph. If nothing else you should be able to figure out that Kierkegaard is defining a human being as a "self." You may not fully understand yet what a self is, but you should have a vague idea that it has something to do with being a "relation" and a "synthesis." That is more than enough for a start.

3. Understanding Those Wacky Words. One of the main reasons why many students have difficulty reading great works is because they get stumped by unfamiliar terms and expressions. Just try picking up Dicken's *Pickwick Papers* and you will find a large number of words that are probably completely alien to you. Sadly, the vocabulary of the average college-educated person today is much more limited than it was even 100 years ago, making it difficult for many students to read great works of literature and philosophy. One simple solution is to read these works with a dictionary beside you, and to take note of any words that are unfamiliar to you. Not only will this help you make more sense of the work that you are reading, but it may also improve your vocabulary at the same time!

Unfortunately, this problem is compounded even further in philosophy, where quite often you have a specialized vocabulary being used. Notice that in the Kierkegaard passage above none of the words that are being used are complicated in themselves. The difficulty in the passage lies in the way that Kierkegaard takes rather ordinary words and assigns them his own specific meanings ("self" and "relation" for example). If you are stuck with an author who doesn't define his terms carefully or an edition that doesn't have extensive notes on the text or a glossary, then you will just have to try to figure out the specialized meaning of these terms through their contexts or by referring to some outside source for help.

4. Text Marking. One way to force yourself to read more deliberately is to do what scholars for centuries have done with great works: use different devices for marking important terms, ideas, and concepts in the work. Among the most common methods of marking a text are the following:

- Underline crucial words, phrases and sentences.
- Use checks (v) and stars (*) in the margins to emphasize important sections of text.
- Make brief notes in the margins of the text to help sum up the author's main points.
- Put a question mark (?) next to passages that are problematic, ambiguous or unintelligible to you.

Text marking can help you to concentrate more intensely on a philosopher's line of argumentation, and will make life much easier when you have to go back to the text later to study for an exam or to write a paper. Consider the following suggestions for marking a text effectively:

- Use a pencil rather than a pen or highlighter to mark text.
- Mark your text lightly so that it can later be erased/changed if necessary.
- Mark a text sparingly—only in the most crucial sections.
- Never mark a book that doesn't belong to you—especially a library book.

5. Just Keep on Trucking. In the event that slowing yourself down and rereading a passage several times does not help you to make sense of a text, don't despair. After all, no one profits if you hurl your philosophy text against a wall, screaming obscenities about how stupid Kierkegaard is. Instead try reading further on in the work. Usually a philosophical text will get clearer as the author elaborates upon his ideas and his arguments begin to unfold. If you were

to continue to read *Sickness Unto Death*, for example, you would find that many of the terms that so confused you in the opening paragraphs are clarified by Kierkergaard later on in the first few chapters.

6. It's OK To Get Some Help. If you find it simply impossible to make any sense of a philosophical work that you have been assigned to read, then it might behoove you to get some help in understanding it. Of course, you can always ask your course instructor for assistance, but this is not going to help you to become an autonomous reader of great works. A more effective option is to find a secondary source that will help you make sense of the author's ideas. Some possibilities include:

- Don't forget to read the introduction to the work that is provided by the editor or translator. These introductions are put at the beginning of a text in order to give the reader the background information that he will need to read the text profitably.
- Read the chapter on your author from one of the many histories of philosophy that are available in every college library (Copleston's *History of Philosophy* may be a tad dull, but he does treat almost every notable figure in Western Philosophy in a fairly thorough fashion).
- Read a brief intellectual biography of your author that will help to put some of his ideas in context for you.
- Find a respectable on-line commentary on the text that can help guide you through it. Many philosophy departments around the country are developing such commentaries, and some are extremely well done.

Exercise

Instructions: Read the following selection from Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals *slowly, trying to get a sense of what Kant is getting at in the passage:*

Immanuel Kant
The Good Will

It is impossible to conceive anything at all in the world, or even out of it, which can be taken as good without qualification, except a good will. Intelligence, wit, judgment, and any other talents of the mind we may care to name, or courage, resolution, and constancy of the mind we may care to name, or courage, resolution, and constancy of purpose, as qualities of temperament, are without doubt good and desirable in many respects; but they can also be extremely bad and hurtful when the will is not good which has to make use of these gifts of nature, and which for this reason has the term 'character' applied to its peculiar quality. It is exactly the same with gifts of fortune. Power, wealth, honor, even health and that complete well-being and contentment with one's state which goes by the name of 'happiness,' produce boldness, and as a consequence often over-boldness as well, unless a good will is present by which their influence on the mind—and so too

the whole principle of action—may be corrected and adjusted to universal ends; not to mention that a rational and impartial spectator can never feel approval in contemplating the uninterrupted prosperity of a being graced by no touch of a pure and good will, and that consequently a good will seems to constitute the indispensable condition of our very worthiness to be happy.

Some qualities are even helpful to this good will itself and can make its task very much easier. They have none the less no inner unconditioned worth, but rather presuppose a good will which sets a limit to the esteem in which they are rightly held and does not permit us to regard them as absolutely good. Moderation in affections and passions, self-control, and sober reflection are not only good in many respects: they may even seem to constitute part of the inner worth of a person. Yet they are far from being properly described as good without qualification (however unconditionally they have been commended by the ancients). For without the principles of a good will they may become exceedingly bad; and the very coolness of a scoundrel makes him, not merely more dangerous, but also immediately more abominable in our eyes than we should have taken him to be without it.

Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans. H. J. Paton. NY: Harper and Row, 1964.

1. *List any terms in the selection that you are unfamilar with. Can you determine the meaning of these terms from their context in the passage? If not, try looking them up in the dictionary.*

2. *Briefly summarize the point of the text in 2-3 sentences.*

Three Levels of Philosophical Reading

Our aim in the previous exercise was to help you to learn how to *make some sense* of a few rather basic philosophical passages. In fact, all you were really doing in this exercise was trying to *sum up* or *get the main point* of these passages. Believe it or not, this kind of "summing up" (what I will call explication) represents the most basic type of reading. "Summing up" is basically the same skills that you used in the seventh grade, when your teacher asked you to write a book report on *Huckleberry Finn.* The texts that we asked you to read may be a bit more difficult than those you read in the seventh grade, but the skills that you employed in summing up the text are essentially the same.

If all we did in reading a work of philosophy was to explain in the most elementary terms what the author's basic arguments are, we would not be doing anything very profound or interesting. The real task of the student of philosophy is to further investigate the text in order to discover its deeper meaning (what I refer to as the process of elucidation) and to assess whether the ideas presented in the text are right or wrong (the act of evaluation).

These three levels of philosophical reading can be broken down in the following way:

Three Levels of Philosophical Reading

SKILL	OBJECT	ACTIVITY
Explication	What does the author say?	• State the author's thesis. • Outline the author's arguments. • Sum up the author's position.
Elucidation	What does the author mean?	• Identify the implications of the author's position. • Unveil the relevance of the author's position for our own times.
Evaluation	Is the author right or wrong?	• Assess the strength of the author's arguments. • Judge the author's position as tenable/ untenable.

Reading as Explication

The term "explication" has its root in the Latin word "explicare," which means literally "to unfold." When we explicate a text what we are trying to do is to unfold or unravel the author's basic position in this text. Think of a philosophical work as a "gordian knot" that must be carefully pulled apart in order to discover the essence of the author's position. In explicating a text, all we expect you to do is to be able to explain the author's position in as simple terms as possible.

There are three steps involved in the act of explicating a text:

1. Stating the Author's Thesis. The thesis of a text is that overall point that the author is trying to make in the work. Authors typically will reveal the thesis of their work in their preface, introduction or first chapter. In other words, read the beginning of the work carefully in order to determine its overriding thesis. The first book of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, for example, enables the careful reader to summarize the thesis of the work in the following way: "Happiness is the supreme good of human existence. It is achieved through the possession of virtue, although other worldly goods, such as health, wealth and friendship, are also necessary in order to ensure supreme happiness."

2. Outlining the Author's Arguments. Arguments are the building blocks that a philosopher will use to advance his thesis. Remember: every book has a point that it is trying to make. Every author is trying to "sell" you something. The point that the author is trying to make, the thing that he is trying to sell you, is the thesis of the text. Arguments are the tools that author uses to sell you his thesis. Unless an author backs up his thesis with strong arguments, his thesis is nothing more than mere opinion.

We will see later that arguments can either be sound or unsound. Right now it is simply important to be able to identify an author's arguments, and to understand how he uses them to support his thesis.

3. Summing Up the Author's Position (in your own words, of course). A position (literally "that which is put forth") is nothing more than the author's thesis combined with the arguments that he uses to support that thesis. It is extremely important for you to be able to sum up the author's position in your own language in order to demonstrate that you fully understand what he is arguing for or against.

To give you an example of what we mean by a position, a political candidate who is asked to give his position on the death penalty might respond in the following way: "It's my belief that the death penalty is dead wrong (thesis). In the first place, it is far more expensive than life in prison (argument 1), and in the second place it can lead to the State mistakenly taking the life of an innocent person (argument 2)." Of course, a philosophical position will probably be much longer and more complicated than the one used in this example, but it will still always involve some thesis supported by some kind of arguments

Exercise

Read the following text from Machiavelli's The Prince, making sure that you understand what you are reading. When you are finished, answer the following questions about the text:

1. State the thesis of the Machiavelli selection below in one sentence.

2. What are the arguments that Machiavelli gives to support his thesis?

Niccolò Machiavelli
In What Way Princes Must Keep Faith

How laudable it is for a prince to keep good faith and live with integrity, and not with astuteness, everyone knows. Still the experience of our times shows those princes to have done great things who have little regard for good faith, and have been able by astuteness to confuse men's brains, and who have ultimately overcome those who have made loyalty their foundation.

You must know, then, that there are two methods of fighting, the one by law, the other by force: the first method is that of men, the second of beasts; but as the first method is often insufficient, one must have recourse to the second. It is therefore necessary for a prince to know well how to use both the beast and the man….

A prince being thus obligated to know well how to act as a beast must imitate the fox and the lion, for the lion cannot protect himself from traps and the fox cannot defend himself from wolves. One must therefore be a fox to recognize traps, and a lion to frighten wolves. Those who wish to be only lions do not understand this. Therefore, a prudent ruler ought not to keep faith when by doing so it would be against his interest, and when the reasons which made him bind himself no longer exist. If all men were good, this precept would not be a good one; but as they are bad, and would not observe their faith with you, so you are not bound to keep faith with them. Nor have legitimate grounds ever failed a prince who wished to show colourable excuses for the non-fulfillment of his promise. Of this one could furnish an infinite number of modern examples, and show how many times peace has been broken, and how many promises rendered worthless, by the faithlessness of princes, and those that have been best able to imitate the fox have succeeded best. But it is necessary to be able to disguise this character well, and to be a great feigner and dissembler; and men are so simple and so ready to obey present necessities, that one who deceives will always find those who allow themselves to be deceived.

Reading as Elucidation

The second stage in reading a philosophical work is to elucidate the text. The term elucidation comes from the Latin "elucidare" meaning to shine light upon or to completely illuminate. Simply being able to sum up an author's position is not enough to fully penetrate the vast recesses of his ideas—particularly if he is a seriously profound kind of guy as most philosophers are. We need to get behind the words of the texts to "shed light" upon its deeper (less apparent) meaning.

This quest for the deeper meaning of a text will demand some kind of interpretation, and this interpretation will vary somewhat depending upon the unique perspective of the reader.

Among the tasks you will have to perform in elucidating a text are the following:

1. Identifying Implications. If we are to fully appreciate the significance of an author's position, all of the implications of that position must be fully drawn out from the text. Implications are logical outcomes of an author's position that are implied, suggested or inferred from a text, rather than being openly expressed. No author is capable of drawing out all of the implications of his ideas (he may not even be aware of all of them); it is the reader's job to do this.

When you are contemplating the implications of an author's position, always ask yourself what the consequences would be (to yourself, to human society, to our understanding of the world) if his view is accepted. If, in reading a great work of philosophy, you are unable to uncover any hidden implications in the author's position, the problem probably lies with you and not with the text. Remember: great works always have great implications!

2. Unveiling Relevance. The great philosophical works have stood the test of time and possess a depth that enables them to speak to a wide variety of people from diverse backgrounds. Plato's *Republic*, for example, has provoked readers for over 2,500 years, and continues to be cited by contemporary authors for its relevance to our own times. Such "staying power" is common to most great works, since these works typically offer an insight into the human condition that transcends the cultures in which they were written.

When you are reading a great philosophical work, then, you should always be on the lookout to see how that work may have relevance for your own life. Some of the questions that you should constantly be reflecting upon as you read are: What does this work have to say to me about the meaning of my own existence and my place in the cosmos? What can it tell me about the way to live a good life? Does it offer any positive solutions to some of the social or political problems facing the human race in the 21st century? What insights can it give me about the nature of God and my relationship to him? It is only when these questions are asked of a given text that the real work of deep reading has begun.

Exercise

1. *Read the selection from Karl Marx below.*
2. *What are the implications of Marx's position for the religious believer today?*
3. *Does Marx's view of the origins of religious belief have any relevance for your own life? Why or why not?*

Karl Marx
Critique of Religious Belief

The basis of irreligious criticism is this: man makes religion; religion does not make

man. Religion is indeed man's self-consciousness and self-awareness so long as he has not found himself or has lost himself again. But man is not an abstract being, squatting outside the world. Man is the human world, a state, society. This state, this society, produce religion which is an inverted world consciousness, because they are an inverted world. Religion is the general theory of this world, its encyclopedic compendium, its logic in popular form, its spiritual point d'honneur, its enthusiasm, its moral sanction, its solemn complement, its general basis of consolation and justification. It is the fantastic realization of the human being inasmuch as the human being possesses no true reality. The struggle against religion is, therefore, indirectly a struggle against that world whose spiritual aroma is religion.

Religious suffering is at the same time an expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religious is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.

The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of men, is a demand for their real happiness. The call to abandon their illusions about their condition is a call to abandon a condition which requires illusions. The criticism of religion is, therefore, the embryonic criticism of this vale of tears of which religion is the halo.

Criticism has plucked the imaginary flowers from the chain, not in order that man shall bear the chain without caprice or consolation but so that he shall cast off the chain and pluck the living flower. The criticism of religion disillusions man so that he will think, act and fashion his reality as a man who has lost his illusions and regained his reason; so that he will revolve about himself as his own true sun. Religion is only the illusory sun about which man revolves so long as he does not revolve about himself.....

Karl Marx, "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right." *Karl Marx: Early Writings*. Trans. T. Bottomore New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Reading as Evaluation

Once you have figured out what the author is saying in the text (explication) and have unveiled the deeper meaning of the text (elucidation), you are then ready for the most important part of reading—entering into a critical dialogue with the author (evaluation). If we never step back from a text that we are reading and ask whether the author's perspective is right or wrong, then we are really not reading in an active way. In this case, we are just taking for granted that what the author says is true, when, in fact, this could be far from the case.

There are two steps that you will have to take as you attempt to evaluate a philosophical text:

1. Assessing the Strength of the Author's Arguments. A philosophical work will be made up of many interdependent arguments that are used by an author to advance his thesis. Some of these arguments will be stronger than others, and it is your job as a reader to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the various arguments that an author presents to you.

We'll be talking at length about what makes for a good argument. For now it suffices to say that a good argument is one in which you are almost obligated to accept the author's conclusion. If a philosopher has done he job properly the conclusions that he or she makes seem to flow by necessity from his or her premises.

2. Judging Whether the Author's Position is Tenable: An author's position is tenable if his thesis is backed up by a number of strong (sound) arguments. In other words, do the author's arguments actually offer a justification for his thesis or do they not? If they do, then you will probably feel compelled to agree with the author's position. If they don't, you are probably going to want to reject it.

Remember most philosophers will offer a number of interrelated arguments to defend their theses. Some of these arguments will be better (more sound) than others. What you need to determine is whether the author provides enough sound arguments in support of his thesis to make his position a tenable one.

Whether you agree or disagree with the author's position, it is essential to explain why you agree or disagree with it. Specify which of his arguments you find persuasive or unpersuasive and why.

Exercise

Read the following selections carefully, making sure that you understand everything that you've read. When you are finished reading, write a 1 page essay, treating the following:

- *Paragraphs 1 and 2: Summarize each author's position in 2-3 sentences and then draw out the implications of each position in 2-3 sentences.*
- *Paragraph 3: Explain which position you find the more tenable and why.*

Peter Singer
The Obligation to Assist

The path from the library at my university to the humanities lecture theatre passes a shallow ornamental pond. Suppose that on my way to give a lecture I notice that a small child has fallen in and is in danger of drowning. Would anyone deny that I ought to wade in and pull the child out? This will mean getting my clothes muddy and either canceling my lecture or delaying it until I can find something dry to change into; but compared with the avoidable death of a child this is insignificant.

A plausible principle that would support the judgment that I ought to pull the child out is this: if it is in my our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral significance, we ought to so do it. This principle seems uncontroversial....

Nevertheless the uncontroversial appearance of the principle that we ought to prevent what is bad when we can do so without sacrificing anything of comparable moral significance is deceptive. If it were taken seriously and acted upon, our lives and our world would be fundamentally changed. For the principle applies, not just to rare situations in which one can save a child from a pond, but to the everyday situation in which we can assist those living in absolute poverty. In saying this I assume that absolute poverty, with its hunger and malnutrition, lack of shelter, illiteracy, disease, high infant mortality, and low life expectancy, is a bad thing. And I assume that it is within the power of the affluent to reduce absolute poverty, without sacrificing anything of comparable

moral significance. If these two assumptions and the principle we have been discussing are correct, we have an obligation to help those in absolute poverty that is no less strong than our obligation to rescue a drowning child from a pond. Not to help would be wrong, whether or not it is intrinsically equivalent to killing. Helping is not, as conventionally thought, a charitable act that is praiseworthy to do, but not wrong to omit; it is something that everyone ought to do....

I have left the notion of moral significance unexamined in order to show that the argument does not depend on any specific values or ethical principles....[The affluence of those of us living in the First World] means that we have income we can dispose of without giving up the basic necessities of life, and we can use this income to reduce absolute poverty. Just how much we think ourselves obligated to give up will depend on what we consider to be of comparable moral significance to the poverty we could prevent: stylish clothes, expensive dinners, a sophisticated stereo system, overseas holidays, a (second?) car, a large house, private schools for our children, and so on.

Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Harry Browne
A Plea for Selfishness

It's often said that it would be a better world if everyone were unselfish. But would it be?

If it were somehow possible for everyone to give up his own happiness, what would be the result? Let's carry it to its logical conclusion and see what we find.

To visualize it, let's imagine that happiness is symbolized by a big red rubber ball. I have that ball in my hands—meaning that I hold the ability to be happy. But since I'm not going to be selfish, I quickly pass the ball to you. I've given up my happiness for you.

What will you do? Since you're not selfish either, you won't keep the ball; you'll quickly pass it on to your next-door neighbor. But he doesn't want to be selfish either, so he passes it to his wife, who likewise gives it to her children.

The children have been taught the virtue of unselfishness, so they pass it to playmates, who pass it to parents, who pass it to neighbors, and on and on and on.

I think we can stop the analogy at this point and ask what's been accomplished by all this effort. Who's better off for these demonstrations of pure unselfishness?

How would it be a better world if everyone acted that way? Whom would we be unselfish for? There would have to be a selfish person who would receive, accept, and enjoy the benefits of our unselfishness for there to be any purpose to it. But that selfish person (the object of our generosity) would be living by lower standards than we do.

For a more practical example, what is achieved by the parent who "sacrifices" himself for his children, who in turn are expected to sacrifice themselves for their children, etc.? The unselfish concept is a merry-go-round that has no ultimate purpose. No one's self-

intererst is enhanced by the continual relaying of gifts from one person to another.

Perhaps most people have never carried the concept of unselfishness to this logical conclusion. If they did, they might reconsider their pleas for an unselfish world.

Harry Browne, *How I Found Freedom in an Unfree World*. New York: MacMillan, 1973.

Michael S. Russo. *The Problems of Philosophy*. New York: SophiaOmni, 2012.