

TEMPLATE FOR YOUR FIRST PAPER INTRODUCTIONS

I. Introduction

- (a) Sentence to introduce your readings: **In this paper I will discuss (philosopher's name)'s argument in "(article title)" and (philosopher's name)'s argument in "(article title)."**

Example: In this paper I will discuss philosopher Elizabeth Scarbrough's argument in her article, "Why did I have to read this?" and sociologist Mickey Mouse's argument in his book *A Mouse's Life*.

Things to notice:

- I introduced the profession of the authors (Elizabeth's and Mickey's)
- I put article titles "in quotes" while book titles *were italicized*.
- Please do not misgender the authors! Mickey = his, Elizabeth = her.¹

- (b) Transition sentence to topic at hand: **Specifically, I will discuss X's and Y's view on (insert topic here).**

Example: Specifically I will discuss Scarbrough's and Mouse's views on global famine relief.

Things to notice:

- Now that I have used the author's full names, I can now just use their last names (Scarbrough & Mouse).
- Make the topic specific but not verbose ("global famine" rather than "the issue of how we distribute food to those in need when there is a draught")

- (c) Say something brief about the two views: **While X believes A, Y believes B.**

Example: While Scarbrough argues we have a straightforward duty to send all of our latte money to starving children, Mouse believes that people should get to drink as many lattes as they want.

Things to notice:

- Here you are setting up the debate. Make sure you state each person's position so that a naïve reader (i.e., someone who hasn't read the articles that you have) understands the two positions.

- (d) Write your thesis statement: **I will argue (X v Y) is right and that (A v B).**

Example: I will argue that Mouse is right and that we do not have an obligation to send our coffee money to starving children. Rather, we should be able to drink as many lattes as we want without having to worry about others.

¹ While singular they has not become common place in academic philosophical writing, if you want to use singular they that's fine with me as long as you either: (a) use it consistently throughout your paper or (b) use it for people who are gender non-conforming only (and revert to he/she his/her for other folks in the paper).

- (e) **Roadmap:** I will first present X's view that A. I will then present Y's view that B. After this exegesis, I will present my original argument that B's view is better than A's view. I will look at one objection to my view before responding to it. Finally I will draw some conclusions about this topic.

Example: I will first present Scarbrough's view that based on her notion of respect for persons, we have an obligation to send any money we might have for frivolous things to famine relief. I will then present Mouse's view that any money we might earn is rightfully ours and we have no such obligation to give that money away. After this exegesis, I will present my original argument that Mouse's view of entitlement is better than Scarbrough's view based on respect for persons. After my argument I will look at one objection to my view before responding to it. Finally, I will draw some conclusions about this important topic and the need to address problems with the global poor.

- (f) **Template:** In this paper I will discuss (philosopher's name)'s argument in "(article title)" and (philosopher's name)'s argument in "(article title)." Specifically, I will discuss X's and Y's view on (insert topic here). While X believes A, Y believes B. I will argue (X v Y) is right and that (A v B). I will first present X's view that A. I will then present Y's view that B. After this exegesis, I will present my original argument that B's view is better than A's view. I will look at one objection to my view before responding to it. Finally I will draw some conclusions about this topic.

Example of putting it all together: In this paper, I will discuss philosopher Elizabeth Scarbrough's argument in her article, "Why did I have to read this?" and sociologist Mickey Mouse's argument in his book *A Mouse's Life*. Specifically I will discuss Scarbrough's and Mouse's views on global famine. While Scarbrough argues we have a straightforward duty to send all of our latte money to starving children, Mouse believes that people should get to drink as many lattes as they want. In this paper, I will argue that Mouse is right and that we do not have an obligation to send our coffee money to starving children. Rather, we should be able to drink as many lattes as we want without having to worry about others. I will first present Scarbrough's view that based on her notion of respect for persons, we have an obligation to send any money we might have for frivolous things to famine relief. I will then present Mouse's view that any money we might earn is rightfully ours and we have no such obligation to give that money away. After this exegesis, I will present my original argument that Mouse's view of entitlement is better than Scarbrough's view based on respect for persons. After my argument I will look at one objection to my view before responding to it. Finally, I will draw some conclusions about this important topic and the need to address problems with the global poor.