In order to free us of the constraints of a single writing form (i.e. the four or five paragraph essay), feel free (but don’t “be” free) to use a different method of writing. With that being said, you can use the good ole’ idea tree method if you feel that this organization will best suit your argument.

***You can try to emulate Wallace’s anecdotal style, but here are a couple of other approaches that you might find more engaging, interesting, or simply easier to write.***

**The Sherlock Holmes Approach:**

**Driving Question:** Are you the same person that started to read this article?

**Scenario #1:** Consider a photo of someone you think is you eight years ago. What makes that person you? You might say he or she was composed of the same cells as you now. But most of your cells are replaced every seven years. You might instead say you're an organism, a particular human being, and that organisms can survive cell replacement - this oak being the same tree as the sapling I planted last year.

**Scenario #2:** But are you really an entire human being? If surgeons swapped George Bush's brain for yours, surely the Bush look-alike, recovering from the operation in the White House, would be you. Hence it is tempting to say that you are a human brain, not a human being.

**Scenario #3:** But why the brain and not the spleen? Presumably because the brain supports your mental states, e.g. your hopes, fears, beliefs, values, and memories. But then it looks like it's actually those mental states that count, not the brain supporting them. So the view is that even if the surgeons didn't implant your brain in Bush's skull, but merely scanned it, wiped it, and then imprinted its states on to Bush's pre-wiped brain, the Bush look-alike recovering in the White House would again be you.

**Scenario #4:** But the view faces a problem: what if surgeons imprinted your mental states on two pre-wiped brains: George Bush's and Gordon Brown's? Would you be in the White House or in Downing Street? There's nothing on which to base a sensible choice. Yet one person cannot be in two places at once.

**Central Claim:** In the end, then, no attempt to make sense of your continued existence over time works. You are not the person who started reading this article.

**Dialogue Style:**

**SOCRATES:** To start all over again, then: what is one to say that knowledge is? For surely we are not going to give up yet.

**THEAETETUS:** Not unless you do so.

**SOCR.:** Then tell me: what definition can we give with the least risk of contradicting ourselves?

**THEAET.:** The one we tried before, Socrates. I have nothing else to suggest.

**SOCR.:** What was that?

**THEAET.:** That true belief is knowledge. Surely there can at least be no mistake in believing what is true and the consequences are always satisfactory.

**SOCR.:** Try, and you will see, Theaetetus, as the man said when he was asked if the river was too deep to ford. So here, if we go forward on our search, we may stumble upon something that will reveal the thing we are looking for. We shall make nothing out, if we stay where we are.

**THEAET.:** True; let us go forward and see.

**SOCR.:** Well, we need not go far to see this much: you will find a whole profession to prove that true belief is not knowledge.

**THEAET.:** How so? What profession?

**SOCR.:** The profession of those paragons of intellect known as orators and lawyers. There you have men who use their skill to produce conviction, not by instruction, but by making people believe whatever they want them to believe. You can hardly imagine teachers so clever as to be able, in the short time allowed by the clock, to instruct their hearers thoroughly in the true facts of a case of robbery or other violence which those hearers had not witnessed.

**THEAET.:** No, I cannot imagine that; but they can convince them.

**SOCR.:** And by convincing you mean making them believe something.

**THEAET.:** Of course.

**SOCR.:** And when a jury is rightly convinced of facts which can be known only by an eye-witness, then, judging by hearsay and accepting a true belief, they are judging without knowledge, although, if they find the right verdict, their conviction is correct?

**THEAET.:** Certainly.

**SOCR.:** But if true belief and knowledge were the same thing the best of jurymen could never have a correct belief without knowledge. It now appears that they must be different things.