Aristotle and Plato have very different views of knowledge; the former believes we do not have innate knowledge, and the latter believes we do. [This discusses Plato and Aristotle, when the paper should only be about Aristotle. Only mention what author(s) you will be explaining, so you don’t tease the reader into believing you’ll be examining something you will not be addressing. This also goes for mentioning innate knowledge, since the topic states not to discuss this issue. So this whole sentence is poorly done and not following the instructions.] Knowledge is a very important topic about which everyone should be concerned, because if someone thinks he or she has knowledge but does not, that can affect other people negatively. [This is a filler sentence that doesn’t need to be mentioned; the reader can guess why knowledge matters and doesn’t need to be told this. Leave this kind of thing out.] Aristotle mentions many terms when discussing demonstrative knowledge, including sense perception, memory, experience, syllogism, starting points, intuition, and induction. [Notice that this author is not stating that the author him or herself will explain these terms, and what they have to do with our gaining knowledge, according to Aristotle. This author is merely stringing a lot of terms together and stating that Aristotle mentions them, which does not fulfill the function of an introduction; namely, stating exactly what you will be explaining.] He states that “Demonstrative knowledge is knowledge we have in virtue of a demonstration” (19). [This is an incredibly unhelpful sentence (it’s a circular definition that uses the terms it’s supposed to define), and the author is explaining the view here in the introduction — just list what you will explain in the introduction; don’t begin quoting and explaining the philosopher’s view here.] This paper will argue whether Aristotle is correct about his view of knowledge and consider an objection. [The reader needs to know if you be arguing in favor or against the view here: maybe the reader only wants to read papers in favor for his/her research; be specific and do not write this like a mystery novel, trying to tantalize the reader with wondering which side you’ll be arguing for. Moreover, you shouldn’t think that you’re going to prove that a view is correct; I’d recommend stating that you’re going to argue that someone’s view is plausible or implausible instead. Lastly, write that you will raise and respond to an objection.]

See the “Good” Paper Sample and Hints in the paper topic for the kind of introduction you should write.