

# HPSC0109 Philosophy of Medicine

## Course Syllabus

2019-20 session | Erman Sozudogru | erman.sozudogru@ucl.ac.uk

This module provides students with an overview of the exciting field of philosophy of medicine. Based on case-studies drawn from contemporary medical practice, the module will be themed around eight key topics. These are:

1. what philosophy of medicine is, and is not
2. discovery in medicine
3. definitions of disease
4. disease causation
5. models and model organisms
6. scientific pluralism in medicine
7. classification
8. data and evidence in medicine

The teaching will be a mixture of lectures, giving topic overviews, critical reading of philosophical and medical sources, and seminar activities, intended to allow students to autonomously develop their analytical skills. This module has no pre-requisites.

### Course Information

#### Basic course information

Moodle Web site:	see moodle
Assessment:	80% Essay (4000 words)
	20% Write-up of class presentation (1000 words)
Timetable:	<a href="http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sts/hpsc">www.ucl.ac.uk/sts/hpsc</a>
Prerequisites:	None. Note that students previously enrolled on HPSC2020 (Philosophy of Medicine) are not eligible to enroll on this module.
Required texts:	Readings listed below. All readings are available through the <a href="#">UCL reading list service</a> (search for HPSC3028)
Course tutor(s):	Erman Sozudogru
Contact:	<a href="mailto:erman.sozudogru@ucl.ac.uk">erman.sozudogru@ucl.ac.uk</a>   t: 020 7679 32959
Web:	
Office location:	22 Gordon Square, Room 2.1
Office hours:	Wednesday 11:30 - 12:30 and Thursdays 12:30 - 13:30.

## Schedule

UCL Wk	Lecture number	Topic	Reading
6	1	Introduction	No set reading, but please familiarise yourself with course materials on Moodle (including topic guides)
	2	Does philosophy of medicine exist?	Caplan 1992
7	3	Discovery: case	Burkitt 1983 Optional: Lane 2006
	4	Discovery: Kuhn and Hanson	Kuhn 1962 Optional: Hanson 1960
8	5	Definitions of disease: CFS	CFS topic guide (available on Moodle)
	6	Definitions of disease: literature	Ereshefsky 2009 Optional: Boorse 1977, Cooper 2004
9	7	Causation: changing concepts in disease aetiology	Evans 1976 Optional: Carter 2003 chapter 8
	8	Causation: Hume's problem, etc.	Ilari and Russo (2014) Chapter 1,2,3,15 Optional: Mackie 1965
10	9	Causation: mechanisms	Machamer, Darden and Craver 2000 Optional: Russo and Williamson 2007
	10	Models: model organisms	Ankeny 2007 Optional: Leonelli 2008
11	<b>Reading week – no lectures</b>		
12	11	Models: models as mediators	Morgan and Morrison 1999 Optional: Grisemer 2004
	12	<b>Essay Session</b>	
13	13	Pluralism: EBM case	Guyatt et al 1992 Optional: Clarke et al 2013
	14	Pluralism: scientific pluralism (Minnesota)	Kellert, Longino and Waters, 2006. Optional: Giere 2006
14	15	Pluralism: Chang	Chang 2012, chapter 5 Optional: Nye 2013
	16	Classification: diagnosis case	Henry 2006
15	17	Classification: Dupre and others	Dupré, 2001 Optional: Cooper 2004
	18	Data and evidence in medicine: Whipple disease	Whipple disease topic guide (available on Moodle)

16	19	Data and evidence in medicine: Simpson's paradox and the reference- class problem	Hájek 2007 Optional: Haack 2008
	20	Data and evidence in medicine: thinking with cases	Forrester 1996

## Assessments

---

### Summary

	Description	Deadline	Word limit
80%	Essay	08/04/2020 5pm	4000 words
20%	Presentation write-up	30/03/2020 5pm	1000 words

### Assignments

There are two elements of coursework for this module. While each – as with most university assessments - tests many different skills, I think that the most important objectives of this module (and hence its assessments) are concerned with ways of engaging with philosophical arguments. Particularly if you haven't done much philosophy before, the idea of arguing can be a bit daunting, but really it's not too complicated. Briefly, for this module, I would expect you to be able to engage with arguments in the following ways:

**Describe:** ('x's argument here is as follows...')

**To analyse and critique:** ('I do not, however, think that this argument is successful, because....')

**Improve:** ('I would instead argue that....because....')

This means that assessment for this module is designed to help you become comfortable with these three forms of engagement with arguing. In more detail...

### The essay

This is a standard scholarly essay of 4000 words, which is due very early in term two (**deadline Wed 10<sup>th</sup> Jan**). You'll notice that I haven't provided any sample titles here. This is because an integral part of this assignment is for **you to develop your own essay topic**. Again, I know that this might feel a bit daunting. However, we will spend lots of time during the term discussing how you might go about doing this. For example, we'll collectively have a look at some sample essays, submitted by students in previous years. This will happen during the essay tutorial just after reading week, where you'll work in small groups to critique these essays using the departmental marking criteria. You can also have a look at the sample dissections of arguments that can be found in the topic guides. I've done my best to simplify, and to pick out the relevant bits of these arguments. A good place to start would be the one provided for the lecture on the question of whether philosophy of medicine exists, or not. This has lots of material on the argument in Caplan's 1992 paper. Finally, you should agree an essay topic with me well in advance

of the deadline, which you can do by email or (better) by coming to see me during office hours. **I think a sensible deadline for this would be by close of business on 19/03/2020.** If I haven't heard from you by then, you can expect to receive a grumpy email or something.

### **The presentation write-up**

During one of the lectures this term, you will give a very short (ideally, about two minutes long) presentation to the class that presents the argument from one of the papers on the core reading list. If you wish to suggest an additional reading for your presentation that is relevant to the topic, discuss this with Erman on week 1. As well as giving a very short summary of the paper, you should also try to critique one aspect of the argument. This presentation is completely formative, so I encourage you to be bold. Other students will be encouraged to offer feedback and comments on these summaries. This presentation will then feed into a small piece of assessment. You will produce a short (1000 word) summary of your presentation. I encourage you to take account of peer review comments (after your presentation) as well as later class conversations that your presentation had kick-started. Again, you should discuss this with me as early as possible if you have any concerns. **The deadline for this assessment is very near the end of term 2.**

### **Criteria for assessment**

The departmental marking guidelines for individual items of assessment can be found in the STS Student Handbook.

## **Aims & objectives**

### **Aims**

This module provides an introduction to analytic philosophy of medicine. As such, the aims of the module are:

1. to note that there is a degree of continuity between philosophy of medicine and general philosophy of science.
2. to argue that careful consideration of historical and pragmatic factors are generally a significant part of doing good philosophy of medicine.
3. to prepare students for further study of this subject.

### **Objectives**

By the end of this course students will:

1. understand the major issues at stake in the philosophical topics covered in the course
2. appreciate the role of historical and pragmatic factors in shaping philosophical discourse
3. develop appropriate critical, reading, writing, and presentation skills. Most importantly, by the end of this module, you will be expected to be capable of engaging with philosophical arguments drawn from the philosophy of medicine literature. You will also be expected to be capable of producing your own argument as part of your assessment.

## Reading list

Readings are indicated in the schedule above, and are made available on the module in Moodle.

Ankeny, R. 2007. "Wormy Logic: Model Organisms as Case-Based Reasoning." in Creager, Lunbeck and Wise (eds.) *Science without Laws: Model Systems, Cases, Exemplary Narratives*. Chapel Hill, NC: Duke University Press.

Burkitt, D.P. 1983. [The Discovery of Burkitt's Lymphoma](#). *Cancer*, **51**(10): 1777-86.

Caplan, A.L., 1992. [Does the philosophy of medicine exist?](#) *Theoretical Medicine* **13**, 67–77.

Carter, K.C. 2003. *The Rise of Causal Concepts of Disease: Case Histories*. Aldershot UK: Ashgate Publishing. Chapter 8 – The etiological standpoint. pp. 129-146.

Chang, H. 2012. *Is Water H<sub>2</sub>O? Evidence, Realism and Pluralism*. Springer. Chapter 5, pp. 253-98. Available as an ebook via UCL library.

Clarke, B., Gillies, D., Illari, P., Russo, F. and Williamson, J. 2013. [The evidence that evidence-based medicine omits](#). *Preventive Medicine*.**57**(6): 745-7.

Cooper, R. 2004. [What is Wrong with the DSM?](#) *History of Psychiatry*. **15**(1): 5-25.

Dupré, J. 2001. [In defence of classification](#). *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C*. **32**(2): 203-19.

Ereshefsky, M. 2009 [Defining 'health' and 'disease'](#). *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C* **40**: 221–227

Evans, A.S. 1976. [Causation and Disease: The Henle-Koch Postulates Revisited](#). *The Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine*, **49**(2): 175-95.

Forrester, J., 1996. [If p, then what? Thinking in cases](#). *History of the Human Sciences*, **9**(3), pp.1-25.

Giere, R. 2006. Perspectival Pluralism. In Kellert, S.H., Longino, H.E. and Waters, C.K. (eds) *Scientific Pluralism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Griesemer, J. 2004. "Three-Dimensional Models in Philosophical Perspective" in de Chadarevian, S. and Hopwood, N. (eds) 2004. *Models: The Third Dimension of Science*, Stanford University Press. 433-442.

Guyatt, G. et al. 1992. Evidence-Based Medicine. a New Approach to Teaching the Practice of Medicine. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, **268**(17): 2420-5. (moodle)

Haack, S. 2008. [Warrant, Causation, and the Atomism of Evidence Law](#). *Episteme*, **5**: 253-66.

Hájek, A. 2007. [The reference class problem is your problem too](#). *Synthese*. **156**(3): 563-85.

Hanson, N.R., 1960. [Is there a logic of scientific discovery?](#) *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*. **38**: 91–106.

Henry, S.G. 2006. [Recognizing Tacit Knowledge in Medical Epistemology](#). *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*. **27**:187–213.

Hume, D. 1975 (1777). *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*, in *Enquiries concerning Human Understanding and concerning the Principles of Morals*, edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge, 3rd edition, revised by P. H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Please read sections IV--VI quickly, and section VII carefully. Many alternative editions are available: you can also [find it online](#). The section numbers should be the same in all cases.

Illari, P., Russo, F., 2014. "Causality: Philosophical Theory Meets Scientific Practice" Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kellert, S.H., Longino, H.E. and Waters, C.K. 2006. "[Introduction: The Pluralist Stance](#)," in Kellert, S.H., Longino, H.E. and Waters, C.K. (eds)*Scientific Pluralism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kuhn, T.S. 1962. [Historical Structure of Scientific Discovery](#). *Science*, **136**(3518): 760-4.

Lane, C. 2006. [How shyness became an illness: a brief history of social phobia](#). *Common Knowledge*, **12**(3): 388-409.

Leonelli, S. 2008. [Circulating evidence across research contexts: The locality of data and claims in model organism research](#). Working papers on the nature of evidence: how well do 'facts' travel?, 25/08. Department of Economic History, LSE.

Machamer, P., Darden, L. and Craver, C. 2000. [Thinking about Mechanisms](#). *Philosophy of Science*. **67**(1): 1-25.

Morgan, Mary S., Morrison, Margaret, 1999. "Models as mediating instruments". in Morrison , M. and Morgan M. 1999. *Models as mediators: perspectives on natural and social sciences*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2.

Mackie, J.L. 1965. [Causes and conditions](#). *American Philosophical Quarterly*. 2(4): 245-64.

Nye, J. 2013. [Review: Is Water H2O? Evidence, Realism and Pluralism - by Hasok Chang](#). *Centaurus*. **55**(4): 433-4.

Russo, F. and Williamson, J. 2007. [Interpreting Causality in the Health Sciences](#). *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 21(2): 157-70.

### **Important Policy Information**

---

Details of college and departmental policies relating to modules and assessments can be found in the STS Student Handbook [www.ucl.ac.uk/sts/handbook](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sts/handbook)

All students taking modules in the STS department are expected to read these policies.