

## Developing Ideas into Working Thesis Statements

### Options for Response to Author's Argument

Agree	Agree in Part	Disagree
<p>New/different evidence supports the claim</p> <p>No other conclusion is logically possible. (Rebut the counterargument).</p> <p>Evidence is authoritative or matches examples/personal experience.</p> <p>An analogy or comparison effectively supports the claim.</p>	<p>A qualified, more specific position exists</p> <p>Argument holds under reservation(s)—my position only applies under specific circumstances.</p> <p>Claim only follows with probability (inductive reasoning) not with necessity (deductive reasoning)</p>	<p>Evidence is false</p> <p>Claim does not follow logically from the evidence.</p> <p>Logic is circular: The claim is the same as the evidence!</p> <p>Claim is too broad/accounts for too much.</p> <p>Argument creates a false dilemma—it's not a black and white situation.</p>

**Original claim:** America's anti-pollution efforts should focus on privately owned cars.

<b>Ask Questions to Develop Working Thesis Statements</b>	
<b>Add "because"</b>	<p>America's anti-pollution efforts should focus on privately owned cars <u>because this focus would allow most citizens to contribute to national efforts and invest in America's sustainable future.</u></p>
<b>Use words like "but" and "however" to encourage counterargument development.</b>	<p><u>But</u> privately owned cars do not create the majority of pollution. Therefore, focusing on privately owned cars won't have any real impact.</p> <p><u>However, if</u> Americans are asked by politicians to change their lifestyles and do not see any tangible proof of environmental change, it could cause a major political backlash against energy policies of any kind.</p> <p><u>However,</u> Americans often become involved in larger problems after first getting involved in symbolic action, such as most personal recycling programs to make people aware and concerned about global warming.</p>

<p><b>Be specific in position.</b></p>	<p>Pollution is bad for the environment.</p> <p>Vs.</p> <p>At least twenty-five percent of the federal budget should be spent on efforts to limit pollution.</p>
<p><b>Interrogate definitions and question specifics.</b></p>	<p>Why only 25% of the federal budget? Why not 50%? Why not 10%?</p> <p>Why not talk about the budget and not policy documents?</p> <p>How would/could the federal government go about "limiting pollution?" What would this look like? What can the federal government do and what can it not do? What does it mean to "limit pollution?"</p>
<p><b>Then, generate a working thesis statement.</b></p>	<p><b>In order to control, and eventually eliminate, pollution, at least twenty-five percent of the federal budget should be spent on helping upgrade businesses to clean technologies, researching renewable energy sources, and planting more trees.</b></p>

Create a working introduction that includes statement of the problem and counter-arguments such as:

Throughout the last decade, Americans have debated whether individual anti-pollution efforts, such as reducing the use of privately owned cars or increasing recycling, are more or less effective than federal regulations designed to decrease pollution. Though individual Americans' anti-pollution efforts help spread awareness about the harm pollution causes, the country will not curb pollution by relying solely on private citizens. Instead, the federal government must promote a diverse array of anti-pollution research and programs. In order for the federal government to do so, though, the government must increase the portion of its budget dedicated to the cause. In 2012, the federal government dedicated ten percent of its budget to anti-pollution efforts but failed to implement any substantial programs (Paulson 22). In order to control, and eventually eliminate, pollution, at least twenty-five percent of the federal budget should be spent on helping upgrade businesses to clean technologies, researching renewable energy sources, and planting more trees.