The specific requirements, method of evaluation, manners of support and distinctive options for your term paper that are listed here will remain consistent from the beginning of the course and the Term Paper's due date in the last week of the semester. REQUIREMENTS The term paper must make an argument with the following parts in approximately 2000 words: 1. Introduction: states the main argument and explains how it will be argued; 2. Interpretive Sub-Argument: interprets the meaning of a primary source and provides textual evidence from a primary source to support this interpretation; 3. Evaluative Sub-Argument: evaluates the significance of a primary source and provides persuasive reasons to support this evaluation; 4. Conclusion: re-states the main argument and its significance. 5. Bibliography: lists all sources viewed for preparation and cited in this paper. Note: No paper can be accepted without a bibliography. The citation format is flexible, so long as references include page numbers where appropriate and online sources are listed with functioning URLs. If you do not already know a citation style, you can refer to the Chicago Manual of Style Quick Guide to use its simple author-date format. EVALUATION The term paper is worth 42% of your final grade with 2% earned through participation in the Incentives Program's online Workshop linked in Module 2 and the remaining 40% earned by the submitted paper itself. Every successful term paper for this course will demonstrate the skills of argumentation, interpretation and critique, as explained and trained in the workshops and assignment rubric. You can download and refer to this PDF of the term paper grading guidelines that will be used to grade your assignment. Each day of lateness without appropriate documentation (see Instructor's Policies in the Course Outline) will deduct one gradepoint (e.g. A to A-, A- to B+, B+ to B, etc.) from the grade earned by the assignment itself. SUPPORTS • The Writing Centre’s online workshop, “Writing for Academic Purposes," is included in Module 2 of this course as part of Carleton's Incentive Program and has helpful information on how to write an argumentative paper, including thesis formation and paragraph structure. • Within the course, there are four workshop modules that aid in the development of your term paper. The first two workshops are discussions in their own right, but also introduce and support the development of an evaluative perspective on the following topics relevant for the term paper: Workshop 1 - a recent North American interpretation of Asian philosophy; Workshop 2 - a contemporary analytic notion of self or ethical theory. The last two workshops are more directly geared towards the term paper, as they present and provide feedback on your understanding of expectations for the following sections of your term paper: Workshop 3 - Interpretive Arguments; Workshop 4 - Evaluative Arguments. • In addition to information about Asian philosophy in the course modules, you will also find reading guides that treat the historical sources that are the focii of each topic option. These guides provide support for unfamiliar terminology, complex structure and difficult concepts: Module 3 - Katha Upanishad Reading Guide; Module 4 - Buddha's Discourses Reading Guide, Module 6 - Zhuangzi's Section Reading Guide; Module 7 - Linji's Discourses Reading Guide. • The instructor is happy to discuss ideas or drafts during office hours or by appointment, but cannot review drafts over email. For asynchronous feedback, students are encouraged to participate in Workshops 3 and 4’s rubric-supported peer exchanges of the interpretive and evaluative sub-arguments required for the term paper. TERM PAPER TOPIC OPTIONS You are to choose one (1) of the following topics for your term paper. The topic options cover both the geographical and the thematic scope of the course with a view to allowing you to focus on the parts of the course that interest you the most. Each topic option has an interpretive part, which asks you to say something about the philosophical position of a figure in a primary historical source, and an evaluative part, which asks you to offer a reasoned judgment of that philosophical position. The secondary source interpretation of that position indicated in the option you choose (regardless of whether the secondary source is a recent interpretation, e.g. Goodman, or a more ancient interpretation, e.g. Shankara) can be incorporated in either or both of these parts. Note: Options I or II use sources from South Asian philosophy Option I What ethical position does Yama propose in the Katha Upanishad? Do you agree or disagree with this position and why? In your paper, discuss the connection that Shankara draws between this ethical position and the nature of the self in his interpretation of the chariot analogy. • Instructions: discuss the ethical position you find in the Katha Upanishad with respect to Shankara’s interpretation of the chariot analogy. In other words, you should use the secondary source information provided on the page about Shankara in Module 3 as one possible interpretation of the meaning/significance of the ethical position in the Katha Upanishad. Specifically, your task is to either agree or disagree with Shankara’s interpretation and, in either case, give your own reasons for doing so based on your own opinions about what is true/real/important, etc.. Option II What theory of self does Buddha propose in the "Setting the Dharma Wheel in Motion" and "Characteristic of Nonself" discourses? Do you agree or disagree with this theory and why? In your paper, discuss the connection that Shantideva draws between this theory of self and the ethical significance of suffering in his interpretation of the bodhisattva ideal. • Instructions: discuss the theory of self that you find in these two early discourses of the Buddha with respect to Shantideva’s interpretation of the ethical significance of nonself. In other words, you should use the secondary source information provided on the page about Shantideva in Module 4 as one possible interpretation of the meaning/significance of the theory of self in the two discourses.