Writer's Task:

Consider the concepts of **geocentricity** and **heliocentricity** in the context of their advocates. Think of these concepts not as end products but as active ways of looking at the world. What observations do – and do not - distinguish the two? What distinctions and connections about them can be made? How does one’s preconceived expectations influence how we decide to weigh the various lines of evidence, and, ultimately, these world-views?

In order to support your claim, **choose at least 1 thinker from each list below** to consider how advocates of each world-view (listed below) might respond. The Hetherington text has chapters devoted to each of these thinkers.

Pre-Socratics Copernicus

Plato Galileo

Aristotle Kepler

Ptolemy

Strategies for approaching this topic may be to introduce the motion of stars on the sky, retrograde motion of the superior planets, parallax, and phases of illumination as examples of the relevant evidence. Consider how the philosophical preference for one or another world-view depends on, and potentially influences, how the evidence is weighed.

**Important Due Dates:**

First Draft: Feb. 9

Drafts to peers: Feb. 19

Peer Review: Feb. 20

Final Version: Feb. 25

**Length:** 5 pages (1750 words)

You should come within 10% of this target.

**Formatting:** Times New Roman, 12 pt. font, double-spaced, with 1" margins all-around.

**Goals:**

* Create a thesis statement that is supported with outside sources (class readings) and the student's own ideas as main points.
* Demonstrate an understanding of terms, such as **world-view, parallax, retrograde, epicycle**.
* Critically analyze and evaluate class readings.
* Integrate sources smoothly into the paper's prose using accurate and appropriate summary, paraphrase, and quotation.
* Employ rhetorical strategies of exposition (compare/contrast, cause/effect, definition, classification).
* Cite sources using MLA style in-text parenthetical citations and works cited page. Use attributive phrases and follow citation conventions to give appropriate credit for all external material that is not common knowledge.