

## **Final Essay Prompt**

**Due Date: April 23, 11:59 pm**

**Length: 5 - 6 pages, double spaced, times new roman font.**

**30 points - 30% of final grade**

**Citations Page Required**

**Prompt:** In class, we discussed Buddhist ethics, focusing on the ethics of suicide, euthanasia, and abortion. The reading responses made a lot of interesting points regarding this topic, and so I want to make this paper an opportunity to think more about this and develop our thoughts in more detail. I don't want you using outside sources, but I have attached some extra readings for you to use and pull material from on CarmenCanvas. Here is what I want you to do.

**Intro Paragraph:** In this paper, I want you to first write a good introductory paragraph. It should be four to five sentences long, and tell me what your thesis is, and what you'll do in the rest of the paper. In the body of the paper, I then want you to do the following.

**First section:** I want you to describe the Buddhist position in detail regarding **one of** the following issues: {suicide, euthanasia, abortion}. Do Buddhists think this action is permissible? Why, or why not? What kinds of material can you offer to support your claim that Buddhists think that {suicide, euthanasia, abortion} is permissible? You should spend some time spelling out the Buddhist's argument, roughly two pages. Make sure to explain how the doctrine of two truths (conventional and fundamental truths) connects to the Buddhist's argument.

**Second Section:** Following that, I then want you to first: tell me whether or not you think {suicide, euthanasia, abortion} is permissible (here I am assuming that you will disagree with the Buddhist). Then, I want you to tell me where you think the Buddhist goes wrong in their

argument. What part of their argument for/against {suicide, euthanasia, abortion} is false, and why? I then want you to make an argument for your position using claims the Buddhist would accept. That is, I want you to make an argument that the Buddhist would find persuasive.

**Conclusion:** To round out this paper, I want you to evaluate your own argument. Is there a flaw in it, and if so, where? How do you think a Buddhist would respond to your argument?

## Rubric:

Category/Points	6	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Formating</b>	The paper includes citations, is in TNR font, double spaced, and has no spaces between paragraphs, with proper indentation.	The paper adheres to format for the majority of its duration.	The paper has spaces between the paragraphs, or completely ignores some other formatting requirement.	The paper only follows the formatting requirements half the time.	The paper follows the formatting requirements rarely, and when so, it looks like it is by accident.	The paper looks like a copy and pasted shambolic mess. There are missed citations, or citations of unauthorized texts.
<b>Intro Paragraph</b>	The paper meets all requirements, avoiding any flowery language, and tells the reader what to look for in the paper, keeping to 4-5 sentences.	The paper slips into some flowery language, but is otherwise focused and clearly conveys the goals of the paper.	The paper is a bit fuzzy on what happens later on, but the reader gets a general sense of what to look forward to	The paper tends to meander in the introductory paragraph, overstaying its welcome, and conveys some of	The paper's introductory paragraph looks like it contains more filler than content about what happens in the rest of the paper.	The paper begins with either a full on biography describing the history of Buddhism in Shakespearean English, or some flowery equivalent. The reader cannot make out what happens in the rest of the paper.

			in the rest of the paper.	what happens later in the paper.		
<b>Body First Section</b>	The author clearly and cleanly reconstructs the Buddhist's arguments for a conclusion.	The author for the most part does a good job of reconstructing the Buddhist's arguments, but flubs a point once or twice.	The author does a competent job of recreating the Buddhist's arguments, but usually looks like they are having a hard time grasping the points, and merely parroting quotations.	The author recreates the Buddhist's arguments in an understandable enough fashion, but mostly relies on paraphrasing texts.	The author presents the Buddhist's arguments, but may as well read the readings from class to me.	The paper completely misrepresents the Buddhist's view, describing someone else's views.
<b>Body Second Section</b>	The author gives a thoughtful and articulate defense of their position, and is able to give a reasonably convincing case using premises the Buddhist would accept.	The author does a reasonably good job of articulating their views, but occasionally their argument could be a bit deeper in terms of explanation of points.	I am able to make out the author's viewpoint, and know why they believe it, but the reasons backing up the author's belief are a bit fuzzy.	I can tell what the author believes, and can recreate their thinking to a good degree, but some points remain unclear to me.	The author of this paper definitely has a view, but the depth of argumentation is as deep as a puddle.	The author of this paper appears allergic to using the word "I", and also appears terrified to take a stand on any issue. The writing looks more like a report on what some people think, and fails to come up with an interesting way of defending their view on terms the Buddhist would accept.

<b>Conclusion</b>	The author engages in a thoughtful discussion of their argument, and is able to point out where the weak points may be.	The author is generally reflective and is able to point out a genuine flaw in their argument.	The author does engage in relatively good reflection on their argument, but where they think they go wrong is a bit questionable.	The author engages in good self-reflection, but why they think a particular argument they make is flawed requires some reconstruction on my part.	The author engages in reflection on their arguments, but their reasons for thinking some argument is flawed are highly idiosyncratic.	There is no conclusion, or the author thinks that their argument is completely flawless, revealing a complete lack of self-reflection.
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--