

Philosophy

phi·los·o·phy (fī-lŏ's'ə-fē)

n. Literally, the love of, including the search after, wisdom;
in actual usage, the knowledge of phenomena as explained by,
and resolved into, causes and reasons, powers, and laws.

Basic Readings

2nd Edition

bas·ic (bā's'ik) read·ings (rē'd'ings)

adj. Of, being, or ^{serving} ~~standing~~ as a starting point or basis. n.-pl. personal interpretations or appraisals.

Edited by

Nigel Warburton

**Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details**

PHILOSOPHY

BASIC READINGS

Nigel Warburton brings philosophy to life with an imaginative selection of philosophical writings on key topics. *Philosophy: Basic Readings* is structured around the same key themes as its companion volume, *Philosophy: The Basics*, but is also ideal for independent use on any introductory philosophy course.

Philosophy: Basic Readings includes short and accessible sections from:

- classic works of philosophy such as Descartes' *Meditations* and Hobbes' *Leviathan*
- contemporary thinkers such as Richard Dawkins and Daniel Dennett
- thought-provoking works by figures outside philosophy such as Jorge Luis Borges and Martin Luther King Jr

The second edition has been revised and expanded to include nineteen new readings. The introductory section, *What Is Philosophy?*, has new selections from Thomas Nagel, Simon Blackburn, Edward Craig and Bryan Magee. Other new readings include:

- Jean-Paul Sartre on nature
- Hubert Dreyfus on the internet
- Ronald Dworkin on censorship
- Bernard Williams on immortality
- Peter Singer on ethics

Nigel Warburton is Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at the Open University. He is the author of *Philosophy: The Basics* (4th edition 2004), *Thinking From A to Z* (2nd edition 2001), *Philosophy: The Classics* (2nd edition 2001), *The Art Question* (2003) and *Philosophy: The Essential Study Guide* (2004), all available from Routledge.

PHILOSOPHY

BASIC READINGS

Second edition

edited by
nigel warburton

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First edition published 1999
Reprinted 2001, 2003, 2004
Second edition published 2005
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

© 2005 Selection and editorial matter, Nigel Warburton

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-203-50642-1 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-57492-3 (Adobe eReader Format)

ISBN 0-415-33797-6 (hbk)

ISBN 0-415-33798-4 (pbk)

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Preface to the second edition</i>	xiii
INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?	1
1 Thomas Nagel WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?	3
2 Edward Craig PHILOSOPHY	5
3 Simon Blackburn THINK	11
4 D. H. Mellor ANALYTIC PHILOSOPHY	17
5 A. J. Ayer THE METHOD OF PHILOSOPHY	21
6 Bertrand Russell THE VALUE OF PHILOSOPHY	24
7 Bryan Magee SENSE AND NONSENSE	29
SECTION I: GOD	39
8 Martin Gardner PROOFS OF GOD	41

9	Blaise Pascal THE WAGER	55
10	J. L. Mackie EVIL AND OMNIPOTENCE	58
11	Richard Swinburne WHY GOD ALLOWS EVIL	69
12	David Hume OF MIRACLES	80
13	Richard Dawkins VIRUSES OF THE MIND	91
14	Robin Le Poidevin IS GOD A FICTION?	103
15	Bernard Williams THE MAKROPULOS CASE: REFLECTIONS ON THE TEDIUM OF IMMORTALITY	118
SECTION II: RIGHT AND WRONG		135
16	Peter Singer ABOUT ETHICS	137
17	Immanuel Kant THE CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE	146
18	Robert Nozick THE EXPERIENCE MACHINE	148
19	John Stuart Mill HIGHER AND LOWER PLEASURES	151
20	Bernard Williams A CRITIQUE OF UTILITARIANISM	156
21	Jonathan Glover THE SOLZHENITSYN PRINCIPLE	170
22	Rosalind Hursthouse NEO-ARISTOTELIANISM	174
23	Judith Jarvis Thomson A DEFENCE OF ABORTION	187
24	Thomas Nagel MORAL LUCK	202

25	Bernard Williams RELATIVISM	214
26	Simon Blackburn DESIRE AND THE MEANING OF LIFE	218
SECTION III: POLITICS		223
27	Jonathan Wolff POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY	225
28	Thomas Hobbes OF THE NATURAL CONDITION OF MANKIND	228
29	Isaiah Berlin TWO CONCEPTS OF LIBERTY	232
30	Ronald Dworkin A NEW MAP OF CENSORSHIP	243
31	Jonathan Wolff PLAYTHINGS OF ALIEN FORCES: KARL MARX AND THE REJECTION OF THE MARKET ECONOMY	249
32	Janet Radcliffe Richards DISCRIMINATION AND SEXUAL JUSTICE	258
33	Martin Luther King Jr LETTER FROM BIRMINGHAM CITY JAIL	270
34	Peter Singer ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL	277
SECTION IV: THE EXTERNAL WORLD		289
35	René Descartes ABOUT THE THINGS WE MAY DOUBT	291
36	Bernard Williams and Bryan Magee DESCARTES	298
37	George Berkeley COLOURS	315
38	David Hume OF THE ORIGIN OF IDEAS	318
39	Hubert Dreyfus DISEMBODIED TELEPRESENCE AND THE REMOTENESS OF THE REAL	322

SECTION V: SCIENCE	337
40 Stephen Law WHY EXPECT THE SUN TO RISE TOMORROW?	339
41 Jean-Paul Sartre NATURE	348
42 Karl Popper THE PROBLEM OF DEMARCATION	351
43 Thomas Kuhn ANOMALY AND THE EMERGENCE OF SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES	362
44 Paul Feyerabend HOW TO DEFEND SOCIETY AGAINST SCIENCE	365
45 Alain Sokal and Jean Bricmont FEYERABEND: ANYTHING GOES	376
46 Ray Monk WITTGENSTEIN AND THE TWO CULTURES	382
SECTION VI: MIND	387
47 Ludwig Wittgenstein 'THE DIARY' AND 'THE BEETLE IN THE BOX'	389
48 J. J. C. Smart SENSATIONS AND BRAIN PROCESSES	391
49 John R. Searle MINDS, BRAINS, AND PROGRAMS	403
50 Thomas Nagel WHAT IS IT LIKE TO BE A BAT?	422
51 Daniel C. Dennett WHERE AM I?	434
52 Oliver Sacks THE DISEMBODIED LADY	446
SECTION VII: ART	455
53 M. F. Burnyeat ART AND MIMESIS IN PLATO'S 'REPUBLIC'	457
54 Clive Bell SIGNIFICANT FORM	475

55	W. K. Wimsatt Jr and Monroe C. Beardsley THE INTENTIONAL FALLACY	480
56	David Hume OF THE STANDARD OF TASTE	493
57	Michael Clark TWO PARADOXES	508
58	Roger Scruton PHOTOGRAPHY AND REPRESENTATION	512
59	Alfred Lessing WHAT IS WRONG WITH A FORGERY?	536
60	Jorge Luis Borges PIERRE MENARD, AUTHOR OF THE <i>Quixote</i>	550
	<i>Appendix 1: suggestions for further reading</i>	557
	<i>Appendix 2: acknowledgements and sources</i>	560
	<i>Index</i>	564

PREFACE

Philosophy can be an exhilarating subject to study. At its best it challenges previously unquestioned beliefs, develops transferable thinking skills, and gives students a chance to interact with the ideas of some of the greatest thinkers known to humanity. One reason for it being such a stimulating subject is that it is anything but a spectator sport: in order to study it you have to do it. You have to enter into the debate rather than observe it from the sidelines. Unfortunately many anthologies of readings in philosophy kill the subject for the reader: worthy but dull articles are the staple of introductory philosophy courses and textbooks. Much of the standard material used to introduce philosophy to beginning students gives the impression that it is little more than a sophisticated form of nit-picking. I hope my selection of readings here counteracts that impression. My aim has been to select writing that will repay study, and which is, above all, interesting. Part of the point of this anthology is to demonstrate philosophy in action.

I have deliberately kept my introductions to readings brief: too often with collections of this kind it is simpler just to read the summary of the article given in the introduction and to dispense with reading the article itself. The point of my introductions is to aid the reader, not provide him or her with an excuse not to read the article. Above all studying philosophy should involve thinking and critical reading rather than regurgitation and learning by rote. I have provided a range of readings which will, I hope, encourage this approach.

Inevitably the difficulty of the readings varies. In some cases, such as the readings by David Hume, this is due in large part to the eighteenth-century prose style; in other cases difficulty comes from the abstraction characteristic of much philosophical writing. Philosophy is not the obscure and esoteric subject it is sometimes made out to be, but it is not always easy to read philosophical writing. It often requires closer attention and greater critical engagement than that demanded by other types of writing.

This book follows the structure of my book *Philosophy: The Basics* (4th edn, London: Routledge, 2004) though it can be used independently of it. The area headings should be self-explanatory. My aim has not been comprehensive coverage of all the central topics in philosophy but, rather, interesting coverage of a selection of topics.

Nigel Warburton,
Oxford, 1998

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

For this new edition I have removed several readings and added new ones using the same principles of selection as for the first edition. I have also brought the further reading up to date. I am particularly grateful to Zoe Drayson and Tony Bruce for comments on my selection of texts for this edition.

Nigel Warburton, 2004

Email: n.warburton@open.ac.uk

Websites: www.open.ac.uk/Arts/philos/warburton.htm and
www.thinking-big.co.uk

INTRODUCTION

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?

- 1 What does it all mean?
THOMAS NAGEL
- 2 Philosophy
EDWARD CRAIG
- 3 Think
SIMON BLACKBURN
- 4 Analytic philosophy
D. H. MELLOR
- 5 The method of philosophy
A. J. AYER
- 6 The value of philosophy
BERTRAND RUSSELL
- 7 Sense and nonsense
BRYAN MAGEE

WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

Thomas Nagel

Many students coming to philosophy for the first time are unclear about the nature of the subject they are studying. What is distinctive about philosophy and about being a philosopher? What distinguishes it from other subjects? In this brief extract from his short and lucid introduction to philosophy, *What Does It All Mean?*, Thomas Nagel (1937–) gives a succinct overview of what philosophy is and how it differs from mathematics and science.

*

Our analytical capacities are often highly developed before we have learned a great deal about the world, and around the age of fourteen many people start to think about philosophical problems on their own—about what really exists, whether we can know anything, whether anything is really right or wrong, whether life has any meaning, whether death is the end. These problems have been written about for thousands of years, but the philosophical raw material comes directly from the world and our relation to it, not from writings of the past. That is why they come up again and again, in the heads of people who haven't read about them. [. . .]

The center of philosophy lies in certain questions that the reflective human mind finds naturally puzzling, and the best way to begin the study of philosophy is to think about them directly. Once you've done that, you are in a better position to appreciate the work of others who have tried to solve the same problems.

Philosophy is different from science and from mathematics. Unlike science it doesn't rely on experiments or observation, but only on thought. And unlike mathematics it has no formal methods of proof. It is done just by asking questions, arguing, trying out ideas and thinking of possible arguments against them, and wondering how our concepts really work.

From Thomas Nagel, *What Does It All Mean?: A very short introduction to philosophy*, 1987

The main concern of philosophy is to question and understand very common ideas that all of us use every day without thinking about them. A historian may ask what happened at some time in the past, but a philosopher will ask, "What is time?" A mathematician may investigate the relations among numbers, but a philosopher will ask, "What is a number?" A physicist will ask what atoms are made of or what explains gravity, but a philosopher will ask how we can know there is anything outside of our own minds. A psychologist may investigate how children learn a language, but a philosopher will ask, "What makes a word mean anything?" Anyone can ask whether it's wrong to sneak into a movie without paying, but a philosopher will ask, "What makes an action right or wrong?"

We couldn't get along in life without taking the ideas of time, number, knowledge, language, right and wrong for granted most of the time; but in philosophy we investigate those things themselves. The aim is to push our understanding of the world and ourselves a bit deeper. Obviously, it isn't easy. The more basic the ideas you are trying to investigate, the fewer tools you have to work with. There isn't much you can assume or take for granted. So philosophy is a somewhat dizzying activity, and few of its results go unchallenged for long.

PHILOSOPHY

Edward Craig

Philosophy, according to Edward Craig (1942–) is hard to avoid. In some sense we are all philosophers. Beginning from these thoughts, Craig gives us his picture of what philosophy is. His is a broader and more inclusive account of philosophy than you might expect from someone within the university system (Craig is a professor at Cambridge University). It should serve as a useful antidote to those who declare that philosophy is simply whatever happens to be taught within reputable university philosophy departments.

*

Anyone reading this book is to some extent a philosopher already. Nearly all of us are, because we have some kind of values by which we live our lives (or like to think we do, or feel uncomfortable when we don't). And most of us favour some very general picture of what the world is like. Perhaps we think there's a god who made it all, including us; or, on the contrary, we think it's all a matter of chance and natural selection. Perhaps we believe that people have immortal, non-material parts called souls or spirits; or, quite the opposite, that we are just complicated arrangements of matter that gradually fall to bits after we die. So most of us, even those who don't *think about it* at all, have something like answers to the two basic philosophical questions, namely: what should we do? and, what is there? And there's a third basic question, to which again most of us have some kind of an answer, which kicks in the moment we get self-conscious about either of the first two questions, namely: how do we know, or if we don't know how should we set about finding out – use our eyes, think, consult an oracle, ask a scientist? Philosophy, thought of as a subject that you can study, be ignorant of, get better at, even be an expert on, simply means being rather more reflective about some of these questions and their interrelations, learning what has already been said about them and why.

From Edward Craig, *Philosophy: A very short introduction*, 2002

In fact, philosophy is extremely hard to avoid, even with a conscious effort. Consider someone who rejects it, telling us that 'Philosophy is useless'. For a start, they are evidently measuring it against some system of values. Secondly, the moment they are prepared to say, however briefly and dogmatically, why it is useless, they will be talking about the ineffectuality of certain types of thought, or of human beings' incapacity to deal with certain types of question. And then instead of rejecting philosophy they will have become another voice *within* it – a sceptical voice, admittedly, but then philosophy has never been short of sceptical voices, from the earliest times to the present day.

If they take the second of those lines, they may also be implying that making the discovery that human beings just can't cope with certain kinds of question, and making that discovery *for yourself* – and actually *making it*, rather than just lazily assuming that you know it already – isn't a valuable experience, or is an experience without effects. Surely that cannot be true? Imagine how different the world would have been if we were all convinced that human beings just aren't up to answering any questions about the nature or even existence of a god, in other words, if all human beings were religious agnostics. Imagine how different it would have been if we were all convinced that there was no answer to the question of what legitimates the political authority that states habitually exercise over their members, in other words, if none of us believed that there was any good answer to the anarchist. It may well be controversial whether the differences would have been for the good, or for the bad, or whether in fact they wouldn't have mattered as much as you might at first think; but that there would have been differences, and very big ones, is surely beyond question. That how people think alters things, and that how lots of people think alters things for nearly everyone, is undeniable. A more sensible objection to philosophy than that it is ineffectual is pretty much the opposite: that it is *too dangerous*. (Nietzsche called a philosopher 'a terrible explosive from which nothing is safe' – though he didn't mean that as an objection.) But what this usually means is that any philosophy is dangerous *except the speaker's own*, and what it amounts to is fear of what might happen if things change.

It might occur to you that perhaps there are people who don't even think it worthwhile to enter into this discussion at all, however briefly, not even to support the sceptical stance that I have just mentioned. And you would be right, but that doesn't mean to say that they don't have a philosophy. Far from it. It may mean that they are not prepared to 'philosophize' – to state their views and argue for them or discourse upon them. But it doesn't mean that they have no abiding values, nothing which they systematically regard as worthwhile. They might think, for instance, that real expertise at *doing* something is more desirable than any amount of theoretical knowledge. Their ideal would not so much be insight into the nature of reality as the capacity to become one with it in the execution of some particular activity, to have trained oneself to do something without conscious effort as if by a perfectly honed natural instinct. I am not just making these people up: a lot of Zen Buddhist thought, or perhaps I should say Zen Buddhist practice, leans strongly in this direction. And this

ideal, of aiming at a certain kind of thoughtlessness, was the outcome of a great deal of previous thinking.

If philosophy is so close to us, why do so many people think that it is something very abstruse and rather weird? It isn't that they are simply wrong: some philosophy is abstruse and weird, and a lot of the best philosophy is likely to *seem* abstruse or weird at first. That's because the best philosophy doesn't just come up with a few new facts that we can simply add to our stock of information, or a few new maxims to extend our list of dos and don'ts, but embodies a picture of the world and/or a set of values; and unless these happen to be yours already (remember that in a vague and unreflective way we all have them) it is bound to seem very peculiar – if it doesn't seem peculiar you haven't understood it. Good philosophy expands your imagination. Some philosophy is close to us, whoever we are. Then of course some is further away, and some is further still, and some is very alien indeed. It would be disappointing if that were not so, because it would imply that human beings are intellectually rather monotonous. But there's no need to start at the deep end; we start at the shallow end, where (as I've said) we are all standing in the water already. Do remember, however (here the analogy with the swimming-pool leaves me in the lurch, the way analogies often do), that this doesn't necessarily mean that we are all standing in the same place: what is shallow and familiar, and what is deep and weird, may depend on where you got in, and when.

We may be standing in the water, but why try to swim? In other words, what is philosophy for? There is far too much philosophy, composed under far too wide a range of conditions, for there to be a general answer to that question. But it can certainly be said that a great deal of philosophy has been intended as (understanding the words very broadly) a means to salvation, though what we are to understand by salvation, and salvation from what, has varied as widely as the philosophies themselves. A Buddhist will tell you that the purpose of philosophy is the relief of human suffering and the attainment of 'enlightenment'; a Hindu will say something similar, if in slightly different terminology; both will speak of escape from a supposed cycle of death and rebirth in which one's moral deserts determine one's future forms. An Epicurean (if you can find one nowadays) will pooh-pooh all the stuff about rebirth, but offer you a recipe for maximizing pleasure and minimizing suffering in this your one and only life.

Not all philosophy has sprung out of a need for a comprehensive way of living and dying. But most of the philosophy that has lasted has arisen from some pressing motivation or deeply felt belief – seeking truth and wisdom purely for their own sakes may be a nice idea, but history suggests that a nice idea is pretty much all it is. Thus classical Indian philosophy represents the internal struggle between the schools of Hinduism, and between them all and the Buddhists, for intellectual supremacy; the battle for the preferred balance between human reason and scriptural revelation has been fought in many cultures, and in some is still going on; Thomas Hobbes's famous political

theory [. . .] tries to teach us the lessons he felt had to be learnt in the aftermath of the English Civil War; Descartes and many of his contemporaries wanted medieval views, rooted nearly two thousand years back in the work of Aristotle, to move aside and make room for a modern conception of science; Kant sought to advance the autonomy of the individual in the face of illiberal and autocratic regimes, Marx to liberate the working classes from poverty and drudgery, feminists of all epochs to improve the status of women. None of these people were just solving little puzzles (though they did sometimes have to solve little puzzles on the way); they entered into debate in order to change the course of civilization.

The reader will notice that I haven't made any attempt to define philosophy, but have just implied that it is an extremely broad term covering a very wide range of intellectual activities. Some think that nothing is to be gained from trying to define it. I can sympathize with that thought, since most attempts strike me as much too restrictive, and therefore harmful rather than helpful in so far as they have any effect at all. But I will at least have a shot at saying what philosophy is; whether what I have to offer counts as a definition or not is something about which we needn't, indeed positively shouldn't, bother too much.

Once, a very long time ago, our ancestors were animals, and simply did whatever came naturally without noticing that that was what *they* were doing, or indeed without noticing that they were doing anything at all. Then, somehow, they acquired the capacities to ask why things happen (as opposed to just registering that they do), and to look at themselves and their actions. That is not as big a jump as may at first sight appear. Starting to ask why things happen is in the first place only a matter of becoming a little more conscious of aspects of one's own behaviour. A hunting animal that follows a scent is acting as if aware that the scent is there because its prey has recently passed that way – and it is because that really is why the scent is there that it often succeeds in its hunt. Knowledge of this sort of connection can be very useful: it tells us what to expect. Furthermore, to know that A happens because B happened may improve your control over things: in some cases B will be something that you can bring about, or prevent – which will be very useful if A is something you want, or want to avoid. Many of these connections animals, humans included, follow naturally and unconsciously. And the practice, once one is aware of it, can valuably be extended by consciously raising such questions in cases where we do not have conveniently built-in answers.

There could be no guarantee, however, that this generally valuable tendency would always pay off, let alone always pay off quickly. Asking why fruit falls off a branch pretty soon leads one to shake the tree. Asking why it rains, or why it doesn't rain, takes us into a different league, especially when the real motive underlying the question is whether we can influence whether it rains or not. Often we can influence events, and it may well pay to develop the habit of asking, when things (a hunting expedition, for example) have gone wrong, whether that was because we failed in our part of the performance, as opposed

to being defeated by matters beyond our control. That same useful habit might have generated the thought that a drought is to some extent due to a failure of ours – and now what failure, what have we done wrong? And then an idea might crop up which served us well in our infancy: there are parents, who do things for us that we can't do ourselves, but only if we've been good and they aren't cross with us. Might there be beings that decide whether the rain falls, and shouldn't we be trying to get on the right side of them?

That is all it would take for human beings to be launched into the investigation of nature and belief in the supernatural. So as their mental capacities developed our ancestors found their power increasing; but they also found themselves confronted by options and mysteries – life raised a host of questions, where previously it had simply been lived, unquestioningly. It is just as well that all this happened gradually, but even so it was the biggest shock the species has ever encountered. Some people, thinking more in intellectual than biological terms, might like to say that it was what made us human at all.

Think of philosophy as the sound of humanity trying to recover from this crisis. Thinking of it like that will protect you from certain common misapprehensions. One is that philosophy is a rather narrow operation that only occurs in universities, or (less absurdly) only in particular epochs or particular cultures; another, related to the first, is that it is something of an intellectual game, answering to no very deep need. On the positive side, it may lead you to expect that the history of philosophy is likely to contain some fascinating episodes, as indeed it does, and it certainly adds to the excitement if we bear in mind that view of what is really going on. Can reeling *homo sapiens* think his way back to the vertical? We have no good reason to answer that question either way, Yes or No. Are we even sure that we know where the vertical is? That's the kind of open-ended adventure we are stuck with, like it or not.

But isn't that just too broad? Surely philosophy doesn't include everything that this account of it implies? Well, in the first place, it will do us less harm to err on the broad side than the narrow. And in the second place, the scope of the word 'philosophy' has itself varied considerably through history, not to mention the fact that there has probably never been a time at which it meant the same thing to everyone. Recently something rather strange has happened to it. On the one hand it has become so broad as to be close to meaningless, as when almost every commercial organization speaks of itself as having a philosophy – usually meaning a policy. On the other hand it has become very narrow. A major factor here has been the development of the natural sciences. It has often been remarked that when an area of inquiry begins to find its feet as a discipline, with clearly agreed methods and a clearly agreed body of knowledge, fairly soon it separates off from what has up to then been known as philosophy and goes its own way, as for instance physics, chemistry, astronomy, psychology. So the range of questions considered by people who think of themselves as philosophers shrinks; and furthermore, philosophy tends to be left in charge of those questions which we are not sure how best to formulate, those inquiries we are not sure how best to set about.

sample content of Philosophy: Basic Readings

- [download online *The Cortázar Enigma \(2nd Edition\)*](#)
- [download Seeing the Light: Inside the Velvet Underground pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
- [download La Mort d'Ivan Ilitch : Nouvelles et récits \(1851-1885\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
- [read Desire & Prejudice here](#)
- [*A Christmas Secret \(Christmas Story, Book 4\) for free*](#)
- [*The Unsettled Dust pdf, azw \(kindle\)*](#)

- <http://thermco.pl/library/ Twice-Dead--Organ-Transplants-and-the-Reinvention-of-Death--California-Series-in-Public-Anthropology--Volume-1->
- <http://nexson.arzamashev.com/library/Seeing-the-Light--Inside-the-Velvet-Underground.pdf>
- <http://www.netc-bd.com/ebooks/Thermoplastics-Directory-and-Databook.pdf>
- <http://wind-in-herleshausen.de/?freebooks/The-West-without-Water--What-Past-Floods--Droughts--and-Other-Climatic-Clues-Tell-Us-about-Tomorrow.pdf>
- <http://junkrobots.com/ebooks/Yoga-and-Body-Image--25-Personal-Stories-About-Beauty--Bravery---Loving-Your-Body.pdf>
- <http://conexdx.com/library/The-Conquest-of-Cool--Business-Culture--Counterculture--and-the-Rise-of-Hip-Consumerism.pdf>