

Example of a paper outline:

Case: Imagine that Jim must decide to kill one Indian or Pedro will kill twenty.

Thesis: I will argue that Jim should kill the Indian because it is better to promote good consequences on balance than to respect people's rights against murder.

Premise-Conclusion Argument:

My argument goes like this:

P1: People ought to promote good consequences on balance.

P2: By killing the Indian, Jim would promote good consequences on balance

C1: Jim should kill the Indian.

Roadmap/Outline: First, I will argue that Singer was right and that we should try to save lives whenever we can if doing so does not compromise something of comparable moral importance. Then I will argue that any costs to Jim and the one Indian would not be of comparable moral importance to the lives of the other 19, especially since the one Indian will die anyhow. Next, I consider an objection that Jim would not be able to live with himself if he shot the Indian. This objection fails because even if Jim's life was worse because he shot the Indian, the other 19 Indians would have happy lives that would outweigh Jim's sadness and the one Indian's death.

Example of another paper outline:

Case: Imagine that Jim finds himself confronted by Pedro, and he must either kill one Indian (thereby violating that Indian's right against murder) or let Pedro kill twenty (which would be a much worse consequence on balance).

Thesis: I will argue that Jim should kill the Indian because either way, that Indian's right to life will be violated, so Jim does not harm the one by killing him, but he harms the other 19 by letting them die.

Premise-Conclusion Argument:

My argument goes like this:

P1: A person cannot claim he was harmed by an action or inaction if it made him no worse than he would have been otherwise.

P2: If Jim murders the one or doesn't, he makes the Indian no worse than he otherwise would have been.

C1: The One is not harmed by Jim's actions either way.

P3: A person can claim he was harmed by an action or inaction if it made him worse than he would have been otherwise.

P4: If Jim does not murder the one Indian, he makes the nineteen much worse off than they otherwise would have been

C2: The nineteen are harmed if Jim chooses not to shoot the one.

P5: If one action harms no one and one action harms nineteen people, morality requires that we choose the action that harms no one.

C3: Jim should shoot the one.

Roadmap/Outline: First, I will argue that Jim's shooting the one doesn't harm anyone because Jim shooting him does not make the One worse off. Then I will argue that Jim *not* shooting the One is harmful to the nineteen. I, therefore, conclude that Jim should refrain from harming people, so surprisingly a prohibition on harm tells in favor of murder. Next, I consider Williams' integrity objection, and I use a thought experiment to respond to his challenge.