Course Description:

This class will provide you with the opportunity of learning how to:

1. Perceive and relate various perspectives on a question at issue and formulate generalizations about these relations;

2. Identify assumptions and criteria to use in analyzing the writing of others;

3. Analyze and synthesize multiple sources—identify varying perspectives and logical relations among the sources, and respond to a question at issue;

4. Use citation and documentation effectively;

5. Identify logical progression in arguments;

6. Describe the interrelationship between style and meaning in the writing of others and adjust style to enhance meaning in one's own writing;

7. Take a position on a question at issue by developing a focused assertion based on a shared assumption, presenting evidence in support of a line of reasoning, addressing divergent stances on the issue, and using a variety of appeals while avoiding rhetorical fallacies.

AND/OR

8. Critique source material by accurately summarizing all material used as well as identifying, analyzing, and appraising the source's assumptions, assertions, or textual features.

General:

Everything is indeed an argument. Hence, in this class you will write four analytical, well-researched and meticulously documented arguments: two of 1200 words; one of 750 words; one of 1400 words. As you construct these arguments — paragraph by paragraph — we will
occasionally and under my guidance and tutelage deconstruct in class a selected sampling of these papers to ensure that they address each and every one of the learning outcomes stated above. Hence, they will become our second second text. Our first second text will be the readings/video I will supply.

The Arguments:

Argument 1: Is the internet changing the way we think for the worse, the better, or not at all?
Main source: Carr, Nicholas, “Is Google Making Us Stupid?”;
Secondary sources: Hills et al: “Nicholas Carr: A Response”; your own research (required); your own informed experiences (required);
Length: 1200 words;
Style: MLA;
Points: 20.

Argument 2: Define, with explicit examples, the term courage.
Main source: your own informed experiences;
Secondary sources: your own research (required); Glenn, Sen. John, “Annie”;
Length: 750 words;
Style: MLA;
Points: 20.

Argument 3: Why are we all here (in an institution of higher learning); why should we be here; and how did such institutions evolve in the first place?
Main source: Foster-Wallace, David, “Water”;
Secondary sources: Gilpin Faust, Drew, “The University’s Crisis of Purpose”; your own research (required); your own informed experiences (required);
Length: 1200 words;
Style: MLA;
Points: 20.

Argument 4: Is “Will” in Shakespeare in Love really in love or is it just lust or limerence or infatuation; and where did we arrive at this peculiar notion of “love?”
Main source: Madden, John, Shakespeare in Love;
Secondary sources: Shakespeare, William, Romeo and Juliet (excerpt); Fischer, Helen, “Brains Do It: Lust, Attraction, and Attachment”; your own research (required); your own informed experiences (required);
Length: 1400 words;
Style: MLA;
Points: 20.

Class Schedule

03/31 — Introductions, syllabus;
04/02 — The grammar of clarity: sentence structure: the interrelationship between style and meaning;
04/05 — Clarity cont.: Writing Focused Paragraphs: the interrelationship between style and meaning; Reading: Rae-Dupree: “New Habits”;
04/07 — Clarity review and prep for grammar exercise: sentence structure and paragraph structure: the interrelationship between style and meaning;
04/09 — Grammar exercise, “The interrelationship between style and meaning,”;
04/12 — Return, take up and discuss Grammar Assign; Toulmin analyses: logical progression in arguments; reading: EAA pp. 147-165;
04/14 — Analysis: “Is Google Making Us Stupid?”: identifying the assumptions and criteria and its argument’s logical progression;
04/16 — CWU Writing Center: MLA style presentation: Using citation and documentation effectively;
04/19 — Reading: Hills et al: “Nicholas Carr: A Response”; class discussion: analyzing multiple sources and varying perspectives;
04/21 — Lecture: avoiding rhetorical fallacies review; EAA pp. 491-511; Analysis: Nicholas Carr’s rhetorical fallacies in “Is Google Making Us Stupid?”;
04/23 — Lecture: Presenting Evidence in a Line of Reasoning, EEA pp. 469-489; Rebuttal paragraphs and conclusions: identifying various perspectives and the logical relation between them: some examples;
04/26 — Google Argument due in class; Argument 2: The Quality of Courage: various perspectives and formulating generalizations on these perspectives: Class Discussion:
04/28 — The Revision Process: how to adjust style to enhance meaning in one’s writing; Discussion; Instructor’s Sample Argument 2: a deconstruction: the interrelationship between style and meaning;
04/30 — Return Argument 1 papers; Discussion of Assigned Grades and Critique: Review: Using citations and documentation effectively; Reading and analysis: Glenn, Senator J, “Annie”: discussion: his/our assumptions and criteria;
05/03 — Lecture: staying on topic: responding to the question at issue and only to the question at issue; “Courage” Argument due by day’s end;
05/05 — Argument 3 “Water”: class discussion: why students attend college: various perspectives on why they attend and generalizations about those perspectives;
05/07 — Midterm; adjusting style in the writing of others to enhance meaning; Return of Argument 2;
05/10 — Take up Midterm; Reading: Foster-Wallace, “Kenyon College Commencement Address”: identifying and analyzing its assumptions and criteria;
05/12 — Reading: Drew Gilpin Faust, “The University’s Crisis of Purpose”: discussion: identifying its perspective vis-a-vis Foster-Wallace and the relation between the two perspectives;
05/14 — Reading: past student sample “Water” Argument: a discussion of the logical progression of its argument; current student sample “Water” Arguments: a discussion of the logical progression of their arguments;
05/17 — Hand in Argument 3; Introduction to Argument 4 “Is Shakespeare in Love in Shakespeare in Love?”: discussion: the very truth and nature of romantic love: discussion of various perspectives on that very truth and nature and the formulation of generalizations about
those perspectives; reading and discussion: the final four chapters of *Shakespeare in Love*: their assumptions and criteria;

05/19 — Past student sample “Love” Argument: a deconstruction thereof to identify the logical progression of its argument; group analysis and synthesis and reasoning: Pedestals: the evolution of romantic love from 12th Century courtly love to Shakespeare’s late-16th Century England;

05/21 — Hand back Argument 3; “Images of Elevation”: analysis and critique of multiple source materials — visual, staged, and written — in *Shakespeare in Love* and “Is Shakespeare in Love in *Shakespeare in Love*?”;

05/24 — Reading and discussion: analysis and synthesis of Helen Fisher, “Lust, Attraction, and Attachment” vis-à-vis *Shakespeare in Love* and “Is Shakespeare in Love in *Shakespeare in Love*?”: identifying varying perspectives and logical relations among the sources;

05/26 — Instructor-led analysis of sample student “Love” Arguments: identifying the logical progression in their arguments and examining the interrelationship between style and meaning;

05/28 — Instructor-led analysis of sample student “Love” Arguments: identifying the logical progression in their arguments and examining the interrelationship between style and meaning;

05/31 — Memorial Day;

06/02 — SEOIs; reading, discussion and analysis of Joseph Williams’s “Ethical Writing”: the interrelationship between style and meaning;

06/04 — Final questions; Argument 4, “Is Shakespeare in Love in *Shakespeare in Love*?” due in class or by the end of the day;

06/11 — 12:00 noon deadline to submit Portfolio in Lieu of Final Exam to English Department.

**Important Dates:**

Grammar Exercise — 09 April 2010
Argument 1 “Google” — Due 26 April 2010
Argument 2 “Courage” — Due 3 May 2010
Midterm — 07 May 2010 in L&L 104
Argument 3 “Water” — Due 19 May 2010
Argument 4 “Is Shakespeare in Love” — Due 04 June 2010
Portfolio in Lieu of Final Exam — Deadline 12:00 Noon, 11 June 2010 in English Department

**Grading:**

Each argument will count 20 points: $4 \times 20 = 80$;
The grammar exercise and the midterm each count 10 points: $2 \times 10 = 20$;
$80 + 20 = 100$

**Attendance:**

You are allowed three excused absences and no more, regardless of the reason — influenza, stock market troughs, intergalactic war. For each subsequent absence beyond the third, your final grade will be lowered one step (i.e. a B sinks to a B-). By “attendance” I mean showing up to class with your required work-in-progress in-hand and/or assigned reading done. Otherwise you will be marked absent.
Late papers:
I don’t accept them — period!

More Bad News:
I accept only hard copy.

Classroom etiquette:
No cell phones, no head phones, no texting. And no talking — unless called upon. I have absolutely no tolerance for any of the former and if you resist you will be summarily dispatched. The class begins on the hour and by the time I’m finished roll, the door is locked and remains so.

Plagiarism:
Don’t. I’ll catch you and you’ll fail this class — and face certain expulsion.

Final:
The final exam is a submitted portfolio of your written work.

Revisions/Rewrites
I will allow you to revise/rewrite one paper to marginally improve its grade but only if you visit the Writing Center for a full hour’s consultation (you will need proof of doing so) and then meet personally with me for a 30-minute consultation.

ADA Statement:
If you have a disability and wish to set up academic adjustments in this class, please give me a copy of your “Confirmation of Eligibility for Academic Adjustments” as soon as possible so we can discuss how to implement the approved adjustments. If you do not have this form, contact the Disability Support Services Office, Bouillon 205 or dss@cwu.edu or 963-2171.

Diversity
In my classroom, diversity is welcomed and celebrated. I will not tolerate any forms of prejudice or discrimination, including those based on age, color, disability, gender, national origin, political affiliation, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status. We are here to learn in a climate of civility and mutual respect.