Daniel Immerman
Intro to Moral Philosophy (Section C)

Final Draft Assignment

Instructions: this assignment is due by 11 AM on **December 12**. If you can't make the deadline, I'll be pretty open to extensions without penalty so long as you email beforehand. Otherwise, you lose a point per day it's late. You should email your final paper to me. It does not count as turned in until you get an email confirming that I have received it. It should be at least 1200 words. If you have any questions about how to complete the assignment, please let me know.

> The topic of this paper is your choice as long as it has to do with moral philosophy. It is fine to discuss a topic we didn't mention in class. Meanwhile, if there is some subject we have (or will) touch on in class that you find interesting, that is fine. But it would not be ok simply to recapitulate what we say in class; instead you should go beyond it in some way. The majority (if not all) of your paper should be new things. It should include a bibliography as well as the main text.

Here are several suggestions for picking a topic area:

- You could skim through an article on applied ethics like this one `http://www.iep.utm.edu/ap-ethic/` or a collection of sources on applied ethics like this one `http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195396577/obo-9780195396577-0006.xml`

- This website here `http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/browse?module_0=obo-9780195396577` contains a number of topics in moral philosophy (and, as a bonus, a number of helpful readings on each topic).

- You could play around on a site like the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (see `http://plato.stanford.edu/contents.html`) or the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (see `http://www.iep.utm.edu/`) until you find something that looks interesting.

- There are a number of textbooks that collect together classic and influential essays in moral philosophy. You can usually find the table of contents for them online and see if anything in them looks interesting. (On how to find such guides, see the bit on finding anthologies below)

- Perhaps you have some question in moral philosophy you always wondered about. Now would be the perfect time to look into it more.

- You can check the topics that were listed in our poll, and see if any of those appeal to you (see `http://civs.cs.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/results.pl?id=E_219db282f23efeaa`)

Here are several suggestions for finding readings, once you have picked a topic area:

- One way is to find anthologies that deal with the topic you're interested in and then go to the library, find them, and see if any of the articles in them look interesting. Usually they will have the word "debates", "guide", "companion", "readings" or "anthology" and also the word "ethics" "applied ethics" or "moral philosophy" in the title, so you can try googling e.g. "debates moral philosophy." Some examples of presses that produce them are Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, Routledge, and Continuum, so you could also try googling e.g. "Blackwell ethics."

- Another way is to search the internet for syllabi on the topic you're interested in (or just syllabi on moral philosophy in general). Usually, you'll be able to find some, and they often have readings that are especially important and influential for the topic you're interested in.

- If you can find an article on your topic in an online encyclopedia like the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (see `http://plato.stanford.edu/contents.html`), it will often have a bibliography with a bunch of articles on your topic. I would recommend reading through the article; it will probably talk about various arguments in it, so then you can see which arguments you find interesting, and look up the authors of those. Often, they will have personal webpages in which they list various things they've written that you can find by googling them.

- Another resource is PhilPapers (the website is `http://philpapers.org/`) which is searchable and has a huge collection of philosophy articles. It also has them categorized, so you can explore various categories in moral philosophy.

Once you've found the title of an article that sounds interesting, here's how to get access to it.

- Sometimes the article you're looking for is part of a collection in a book. In that case, you should check and see if the library has the book.

- Often, the article won't be part of a book, but will instead be printed in a journal:

  - If you're on campus, usually you can just do a google search for the article and find and download a copy of it.

  - If you're off campus, or you're having trouble getting access to the article through just googling it, you should go to the library website, which is here: `http://www.lib.k-state.edu/` and search for it.

Final Paper Rubric - Intro to Moral Philosophy - Daniel Immerman

Structuring	(3) It is extraordinarily clear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things follow in a logical order.	(2) It is quite clear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things for the most part follow in a logical order.	(1) It is somewhat unclear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things sometimes fail to follow in a logical order.	(0) It is massively unclear what the main goal of your paper is and there are several points in which it is unclear what you are doing in it. Things often fail to follow in a logical order.
Clarity and Precision	(3) Extremely clear and precise. This includes telling me exactly how your arguments go, exactly where you object to arguments you object to, etc.	(2) You are rather clear and precise.	(1) There are a fair number of places in which you fail to be clear and precise.	(0) Your paper is massively unclear and imprecise.
Interpretation	(2) Maximally accurate and charitable in interpretation, presenting keen insight into other author's ideas.	(1) Fairly accurate and charitable in interpretation.	(0) A number of problems in accuracy or charity of interpretation.	*Note: you only are eligible for points in rows after the first two if you get one or more points in each of the first two rows.*
Depth	(2) Discusses issues in depth, considering objections and responses, rather than talking through a number of points quickly.	(1) Discusses several issues in a moderate amount of depth.	(0) Discusses a large number of issues very quickly.	*Second Note: If you did perfectly on everything, you'd end up with a 17. This means that you can still get a 15, and thus an A, without doing perfectly on everything*
Persuasion	(2) The points you make in defense of your main claims are all extremely plausible, or if somewhat implausible, you consider and respond to the most important objections to them.	(1) The points you make in defense of your main claims are, for the most part, fairly plausible.	(0) The points you make in defense of your main claims are rather implausible.	
Concision	(2) No unnecessary sentences or words. Everything regarding what other authors say is necessary to explain the points you'll be making.	(1) Occasional extra words or sentences. Sometimes adds unnecessary remarks about what other authors say.	(0) Often adds extra words or sentences or talks about irrelevant points.	
Creativity	(2) You make some extremely creative points.	(1) Your points are rather creative.	(0) Your points are not especially creative, but rather fairly standard.	
Ambition	(1) Your conclusions are extremely surprising.	(.5) Your conclusions are rather controversial.	(0) Your conclusions are not particularly controversial, but rather fairly mainstream.	