**Worksheet 2**

**Phil 117**

**Due: Upload this worksheet to Canvas by November 3 class time**

**20 points**

**DIRECTIONS:**

In this worksheet, you will describe your chosen issue using research charts derived from 3 different sources, utilizing the *Bedford Handbook*.

**Step 1:** Locate three sources that describe your chosen issue. These should be peer-reviewed sources. However, they precise kind of source will differ depending on your issues. Possible sources include:

* a peer-reviewed online encyclopedia (no more than 1)
* a peer-reviewed article/s found through the UCI library or Google Scholar
* a book/s located through UCI or Amazon “Search” (I’ll describe the latter in class)
* a local or investigative news article—this is especially relevant for regional issues; this kind of source is sometimes less peer-reviewed because of the quick time cycle of news but should nonetheless have adequately sourced content (no more than 1)
* other possible sources

**Step 2 (Turn in!):** Create a Research Chart for each of the sources, including a Bibliography entry using the pdf of the *Bedford Handbook*, located in syllabus “Resources”. These charts should be as long as they need to be for you to get the basic points, terms, arguments. Please include the page you found your bibliography model on. \*See sample Research Chart in this worksheet below.

**Step 3 (Turn in!):**Create a concise *2-3 paragraph summary* (approx. 300-400 words; about 1.5 pages double spaced) including:

* What the issue IS (define, describe as clearly as possible, using sources)
* Key concepts or terms essential to understand this issue
* Ethical tensions, that is, why is this an ethical issue? What are the various positions, disputes and/or counter claims? This should include at least two counter perspectives, if not more.

**Step 4:** Upload a single document including (1) Research Charts with Bibliography entries, and (2) Summary of issue by November 3 Class time

**Grading Rubric**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | Points |
| Locate at least three peer-reviewed sources that describe your chosen issue | 3 |
| Research Charts content* adequate content and relevant notes, where applicable, with content sufficient to inform the paragraphs you have to produce
 | 12 |
| Bibliography entries, including the page of the *Bedford Handbook* you found your bibliography entry model on | 5 |

**Sample Bibliography and Research Charts**
Gross, Aaron. “The Study of Religion After the Animal.” *Animals as Religious Subjects: Transdisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Cecilia Deane-Drummond et al., T & T Clark, 2013, pp. 59–72.

Page # of *The Bedford Handbook* you used as a model for your entry: page 17

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PAGE**  | **CONCEPT, DEFINITIONS, OR QUOTES, ETC.**  | **NOTES/CONNECTIONS TO MYSELF**  |
| N/A  | Aaron Gross is a professor of Theology and Religious Studies at UCSD, and he focuses on topics in modern Jewish ethics, animals and religion, and other related issues.  |  |
| 59  | “Questions about what animals are, and whether animals can partcipate in the phenomena of religion, are also *founding* questions in religious studies”.  |  |
| 59  | Gross Thesis 1: The theorists who founded the studies into religions and the humanities at large have done so by defining themselves in regard to a certain understanding of the animal.  |  |
| 61  | Gross’ third approach: “...adending to how the question of the animal founds the very discourses that now, belatedly, have turned to inquire about animals”.  | A key point, as progress and understanding of animals and religion can only be found once one uncovers the assumptions that have been buried since the conception of religious and humanities studies.  |
| 62  | Emilie Durkheim main focus: “Durkheim’s inquiry into religion is simultaneously an inquiry into the origins of conceptual thought, the emergence of the human out of animality, and the foundations of society — all four of these are intimately bound together”.  |  |
| 62  | For Durkheim, the emergency of the human out of animality and the emergence of properly conceptual thought is the same process.  | what would Durkheim define as “proper conceptual thought”?  |
| 62  | Durkheim Main Point 2: Through the emergence of conceptual thought the “human” emerges from the animal, and in doing so creates society.  |  |
| 63  | Durkheim’s “religious”: the phenomenon of humans understanding the difference between the “sacred”, that being special shared group activities, and the “profane”, that being regular individual activities of daily life. This is the “sacred- profane” binary.  | An interesting defini]on of religion, one to keep in mind as discussions of religion gets more complicated.  |
| 63-64  | Durkheim argues that the distinction between human and animal is one that is constructed, but still very real. This is because such a distinction is constructed via the understanding of the sacred-profane binary.  | This as opposed to something more biological, like opposable thumbs.  |
| 64  | For Durkheim, humans have arisen with conceptual thought, but because for him, animals have a fixed nature, they are cut off from having access to religion, society, or conceptual thought.  |  |
| 64  | “For Eliade the human is produced in the act of myth-making, which is essentially an act of meaning-making”.  | Here is Eliade’s claim, where the dis]nc]on between humans and animals is the human trait of crea]ng myth or meaning. A build off of Durkheim.  |
| 65  | “Religion, for both thinkers begins where the animal ends. As Eliade has it, ‘In other words, to be—or, rather, to become—*a man* signifies being **religious***’”.*  |  |
| 65  | Eliade’s opening quote seems to reflect the idea that humans are far better or improved when compared to primates, that primates are a past condition that humans have risen above.  |  |
| 65  | Eliade three distinctions: Verticality, where humans have the ability to develop sacred spaces, the use of tools such as fire, and the decision to kill in order to survive.  |  |
| 67  | “Our imagination of the human and religion is constrained less because of evidence than because of a hidden theologically and culturally specific assumption”.  | This hidden assumption being that “religious” is to not be animal.  |
| 68  | Jonathan Z. Smith, while looking at the legacy of Durkheim and Eliade’s work, reminds a reader that the study of religion is at bottom the study of the human  |  |