

WRITING 323: ADVANCED WRITING & ARGUMENTATION

Prerequisite or Corequisite: WR 121 or WR 121H.

Office: Moreland 314. Office Hours: MW 12-2 pm or via Zoom

Email: marcos.norris@oregonstate.edu. Website: <https://marcosantonionorris.com/>



CATALOG COURSE DESCRIPTION

Builds advanced argumentation skills in cultural and academic conversations by writing research-based arguments. Focuses on crafting arguments and communicating ideas, facts, and perspectives to multiple audiences, both inside and outside of academia. Analyzes real-world arguments from a range of genres and contexts. Develops academic research and information literacy skills, evaluating and incorporating appropriate sources and citations. Emphasizes stylistic awareness and crafts advanced strategies for writing processes. Prepares students for writing in a range of contexts, with emphasis on writing in the liberal arts.

PERSONALIZED COURSE DESCRIPTION

In this course, you will learn to write argument essays with an emphasis on careful reading, empathetic critical thinking, thoughtful discussion, and independent research. You will examine essays and video lectures to develop personal stances on the topics of feminism and Men's Rights Activism, gender identity and transphobia, racial identity and racism, environmentalism and animal rights, and finally—the element that ties these disparate topics together—the role played by “human identity” in society's construction of equal rights. Arguments can change the world; they incite revolutions and stabilize governments; they have even been known to destroy lives. For this reason, students will approach argumentative writing as a form of civil public discourse. This class is built on the premise that careful thinking results in quality writing.

CLOSED CAPTIONING

All of my lectures are captioned. This may seem a bit unusual at first, but I caption my lectures for a number of very good reasons. Captions boost your comprehension of the material by combining what you hear with what you see, improving not only your focus but your ability to recall information. More importantly, captions help students with learning disabilities like ADHD, Dyslexia, and Auditory Processing Disorder (ADP), as well as second-language learners. Finally, captioning gives us all the freedom to revisit past material and it supplies me (and potentially others) with concrete evidence of what we discussed in the classroom.

CONTENT NOTE/ TRIGGER WARNING

This course discusses topics like feminism, men's rights activism, gender identity, racial identity, systemic oppression, animal rights, and human rights. The readings will be intellectually challenging and emotionally difficult at times. I encourage you to lean into these challenges as opportunities for growth. That being said, if the topics listed above are too difficult for you to read about and debate in a group setting, I recommend not taking this class.

Oregon State University protects Free Expression and Academic Freedom, in accordance with federal law. Following these guidelines, my course embraces the Heterodox

Academy principles of open inquiry, viewpoint diversity, and constructive disagreement to combat the spread of political tribalism, close-mindedness, and moral authoritarianism in higher education.

Open Inquiry: Open Inquiry means asking questions, sharing ideas, and challenging norms without the fear of punishment. It supports intellectual growth.

Viewpoint Diversity: Viewpoint Diversity means considering different perspectives and backgrounds with an open mind. It encourages respectful debate and the search for truth.

Constructive Disagreement: Constructive Disagreement means working with people who hold different views. It helps people learn from each other and improve their ideas.

I am committed to creating a classroom environment that welcomes diverse people with diverse viewpoints, an environment that equips learners with the habits of heart and mind to engage opposing viewpoints with empathy, intellectual humility, and respect. If at any point during the term, you are unsettled by the course material, my comments, or comments made by your classmates, I request that you arrange a meeting with me to discuss the matter. Whenever possible, I will provide alternate assignments and/or accommodations to ensure your success in the class. That being said, if you are not able to engage your peers in open inquiry, viewpoint diversity, and constructive disagreement—the very cornerstones of my pedagogy—I urge you not to take this class.

ATTENDANCE AND LATE WORK

1. **LATE WORK POLICY:** Every day that an assignment is late, it will receive a 10% grade reduction. As you can see below, this adds up rather quickly. For this reason, it is essential that you anticipate assignment due dates and plan accordingly. You will not be granted an extension unless you face truly extenuating circumstances, such as a major health crisis or death in the family.
 - 1 day late = 10%
 - 2 days late = 20%
 - 3 days late = 30%
2. **ATTENDANCE POLICY:** You are allowed 2 “sick days” this term. Every absence beyond the 2 allotted sick days will reduce your course grade by 5%. For example:

- 3 absences = 5% penalty
- 4 absences = 10% penalty
- 5 absences = 15% penalty

Missing class is an easy way to fail the course. If your excess absences are the result of a family or health emergency, however, your absences will be excused. But you must inform me of your situation and form an agreement with me beforehand.

3. **TARDINESS POLICY:** You should be seated at your desk when class begins. Tardiness is not only disrespectful, it disrupts the lesson. For this reason, every 3 tardies will result in a 5% penalty to your grade in the class.

- 3 tardies = 5%
- 6 tardies = 10%

If you cannot make it to class on time regularly, due to a schedule conflict or any other reason, I recommend not taking this class, as the tardiness policy will be upheld regardless of your personal circumstances.

ASSIGNMENTS

Participation Assignments: 15%

Argument Proposal: 10%

Detailed Outline: 20%

Annotated Bibliography: 10%

Argument Essay First Draft: 10%

Argument Essay Final Draft: 35%

Grade Scale

97-100	A+
94-96	A
90-93	A-
87-89	B+
84-86	B
80-83	B-
77-79	C+
74-76	C
70-73	C-
67-69	D+
64-68	D
60-63	D-
59 and below	F

Participation Assignments

Weeks 1-5

During Weeks 1–5, you will answer a series of free-writing questions on both Mondays and Wednesdays. The questions are based on that day’s reading/viewing assignments and clearly labeled as “Participation Assignments” in the weekly modules on Canvas. To avoid late penalties, pay close attention to submission deadlines.

Weeks 6–10

During Weeks 6–10, you will complete an in-class exercise during each of our in-person meetings. These exercises will include group projects and peer review. You must be present in class and participate actively to receive credit on those days.

On days that we don’t meet in person, you will still submit a Participation Assignment to Canvas, but it will include exercises you complete with the help of ChatGPT. Your instructions will be sent via email. To avoid late penalties, pay close attention to submission deadlines.

Grading

Each Participation Assignment is worth 10 points; together, they account for 15% of your course grade.

Argument Proposal

The main goal of this assignment is to practice “steelmanning,” the act of representing your interlocutor’s argument in its strongest, most accurate form. This is the crucial first step of developing an effective counterargument. After submitting the proposal, you must meet with me in person or over Zoom to discuss your plan and assess your ideas.

Strawmanning Vs. Steelmanning

A “strawman” argument misrepresents your opponent’s position by making it weaker, simpler, or more extreme than it actually is. This is dishonest, unfair, and unconvincing.

A “steelman” argument does the opposite, presenting your opponent’s position in its strongest, most accurate form. Steelmanning demonstrates intellectual honesty, adds to your credibility, and provides a strong foundation for your counterargument.

Instructions

Submit a one-page proposal with two clearly labeled sections:

1. Interlocutor’s Argument (200 words or less)

- Identify the source you plan to counter from the “List of Approved Interlocutors” found later in the syllabus.
- Summarize their thesis and supporting points as accurately as possible.

2. My Counterargument (200 words or less)

- Start with a clear thesis, stating what you disagree with and why.
- Summarize your counter argument and supporting points.

Use Times New Roman, 12-point font, and [MLA format](#).

Grading

The Argument Proposal is worth 10% of your grade. To receive credit, you must 1) submit your proposal to Canvas and 2) discuss it with me in person, either during office hours or over Zoom. It is your responsibility to schedule our meeting, which must take place during weeks 5-8.

Detailed Outline

For this assignment, you must create a detailed outline in preparation for your Argument Essay. You should think of this assignment as the first step of writing your paper, plotting out the structure of your essay before you actually sit down to write it. Because your essay should follow the “They Say/I Say” format described by Amy Guptill in “Listening to Sources, Talking to Sources,” the first half of your outline should be a detailed account of your interlocutor's argument, and the second half should be a detailed account of your counter argument, as you can see illustrated in the example below.

SUMMARY OF MATT WALSH’S “DEBUNKING TRANSGENDERISM”

- Thesis: Trans Activism promotes contradictory positions: Gender Identity is both an Essence and a Construct.

- Walsh agrees with Gender Constructivism that feelings are not gendered. Men and women experience the same range of feelings, and no single feeling is unique to either sex.
 - This premise supports the Sex-Gender Distinction: femininity/masculinity are social constructs distinct from sex, so men can feel both feminine and masculine just as women can feel both feminine and masculine.
 - Gender Constructs do not indicate womanhood/manhood
- Building on this position, Trans Activism introduces a new claim: biological sex does not determine womanhood/manhood anymore than social constructs do. But this necessarily results in one of two logical consequences:
 - The first option is an abstraction. If womanhood/manhood are not defined by gendered feelings like femininity/masculinity, and they are also not defined by a person's biological sex, then "man" and "woman" become sounds without meaning.
 - And yet, we continue using these sounds as if they were meaningful. This "foment[s] confusion," as in "Why do you keep using this sound if it doesn't have any meaning?"
 - The second option is a contradiction. By rejecting biological sex as the indicator of womanhood/manhood in favor of "gendered feelings" as the indicator of womanhood/manhood, Trans Activism essentializes the gender constructs of femininity/masculinity, just as Minstrelsy essentialized racial constructs in the past.
 - Feminists should object to this because it overturns the very Sex/Gender Distinction they fought so hard to establish. [It should be noted that many feminists do, precisely for this reason].
- Conclusion: Trans Activism essentializes "gendered feelings," but this contradicts the Sex/Gender Distinction. Gender Identity cannot be an Essence and a Construct at the same time because Essentialism and Constructivism are irreconcilable opposites.

COUNTER ARGUMENT

- Thesis: Walsh contends that transgender ideology contradicts itself, attempting to be essentialist and constructivist simultaneously. Challenging this view, I argue that Walsh misunderstands a central component of gender dysphoria and, as a result, makes several logical mistakes.
 - To begin, it's essential to correct Walsh's misunderstanding of gender dysphoria.
 - As the gender theorist Judith Butler explains ... [you would go on to explain how Butler's argument corrects Walsh's misunderstanding]

- With this point established, I will demonstrate how Walsh's misunderstanding of gender dysphoria leads to a series of logical missteps.
 - The first logical mistake ... [you would go on to identify the mistake, illustrating why it's illogical]
 - The second logical mistake ...
 - The third logical mistake ...
- In conclusion, Walsh's argument rests on a misunderstanding that, after being corrected, exposes the illogic of his argument.

Following this model, illustrate the internal logic of both your interlocutor's argument and your counter argument. Make sure to:

- Use clear, grammatical sentences throughout
- Present your thesis as the first line of your counter argument
- Use bullets and indentations to indicate the relationships among primary and secondary claims.

When I grade your Detailed Outline, I will check to see 1) that you have accurately represented a source from the "List of Approved Interlocutors" found later in the syllabus, 2) that your counter argument is both accurate and logical, and 3) that your sentences are clear and grammatically correct. You will receive substantial feedback on the quality of your counter argument. To browse examples of my feedback from previous terms, see "Instructor Feedback" under "Student Examples" on Canvas (especially if you plan to counter Emma Camp or Matt Walsh).

There is no length requirement for this assignment. Use Times New Roman, 12-point font, and [MLA format](#).

Annotated Bibliography

For this assignment, you must annotate 3 outside sources. These sources will be used to support your counter argument and must be located through the OSU Library. Articles from popular magazines, websites, substacks, or social media accounts will not be accepted.

Begin each of your 3 annotations by listing the bibliographic information in MLA format. Write the annotation itself one line below. The annotation should begin with a brief summary of the source and end with its assessment. Again, that's two parts: one part summary, one part assessment.

The summary portion should give a clear account of the author's argument. The assessment portion should answer the following questions: Why is the author's argument important? How will this source be used to support your counter argument?

As such, each of your 3 entries should include the following:

1. Citation of the work being annotated
2. Summary of the work (this is part one of the annotation)
3. Assessment of the work (this is part two of the annotation)

Each annotation must be at least 10 sentences long. I recommend a 5-sentence summary followed by a 5-sentence assessment, but how you choose to distribute sentences is ultimately your choice. Use Times New Roman, 12-point font, and [MLA format](#). For specific instructions on how to format your citations, see the section titled "How to Cite Your Sources" found later in the syllabus.

Follow the instructions below to find sources for your Annotated Bibliography.

- Go to the library search page: <https://library.oregonstate.edu/>
- Enter your search terms. This can be anything like "men's rights activism," "transracialism and rachel dolezal," "free speech in the classroom," etc. Honestly, it's not that different from a Google search; experiment with different phrases to yield various results.
- Under the right column titled "Refine my results," check the boxes for "Full Text Online," "Articles," "Magazine Articles," and "Book chapters." This will limit your search to shorter texts that are immediately available online. I recommend these types of sources over books because they require less reading and are often more focused.
- From here, look for intriguing titles related to your topic and read their abstracts. If the abstract looks promising, commit to reading the entire article.

Quality research takes a long time, so you are strongly encouraged to begin your research as soon as possible. If you follow these steps and still struggle to locate sources, arrange to see me during office hours for additional help.

Argument Essay First Draft

Your Argument Essay must counter one of the assigned readings/viewings from the "List of Approved Interlocutors" found later in the syllabus. For example, you can counter the arguments made by Cassie Jay, Coleman Hughes, Jaswinder Bolina, Giorgio Agamben, etc. The purpose of this assignment is to demonstrate your ability to engage

meaningfully with another human being. Do you understand their point of view, can you articulate their argument clearly and accurately, can you outsmart them? In other words, can you form a counter argument that effectively dismantles their argument without misrepresenting them?

Here's what your paper should look like. First, summarize an assigned reading/viewing from the "List of Approved Interlocutors," identifying its thesis and main points. You can think of this part of your essay as a broad overview that will lead into a more detailed summary in the following pages. This first part of your essay should be between half a page and a full page.

Next, summarize the points you plan to counter in greater detail. As I alluded to in the previous paragraph, you can think of this section of your essay as an extended, more detailed summary that zeroes in for a closer look at the points that you plan to dismantle and refute. Represent the author's views accurately, directly quote from the text or video to provide evidence of their views, and write in a neutral tone (readers should not be able to tell at this point if you agree or disagree with the argument under analysis). This section should be around 2 pages.

Finally, respond with your counter argument. This begins with a thesis statement that in some manner reflects the position held by your interlocutor. For example, you could write something like the following: "While my interlocutor believes that A and B are true, I believe that A is only partly true and that B is false." This kind of thesis statement ensures that you will remain *in conversation* with your interlocutor. Your counter argument should be logical, truthful, and incorporate the three sources from your Annotated Bibliography. This part of your essay must be at least 3 pages long.

Your first draft will be graded for completion. A complete draft will be properly formatted and at least 5 full pages in length (this number does not include your Works Cited page, which must be included as well). Formatting should align with the [MLA Sample Paper](#) on Owl Purdue, including in-text citations and the Works Cited page. For additional instruction on how to format a Works Cited page in MLA, see the section titled "How to Cite Your Sources" later in the syllabus.

Submissions will lose 5% for improper formatting and 20% for every missing or incomplete page.

Argument Essay Final Draft

Building upon the preceding assignments, you will now write the final draft of your Argument Essay. Essays should consist of 1) an accurate, thorough summary of an assigned reading/viewing from the “List of Approved Interlocutors” below, 2) a clearly stated thesis that counters the work summarized, 3) a logical, well-developed counter argument, and 4) the support of three outside sources from your Annotated Bibliography. Essays must be at least 5 full pages in length (this number does not include your Works Cited page, which must be included as well).

Click on “Argument Essay Final Draft” under “Student Examples” on Canvas to see what an A-paper looks like and familiarize yourself with the grading rubric. Formatting should align with the [MLA Sample Paper](#) on Owl Purdue, including in-text citations and the Works Cited page. For additional instruction on how to format a Works Cited page in MLA, see the section titled “How to Cite Your Sources” below.

List of Approved Interlocutors

Please note that your Argument Essay must counter one of the following sources:

Emma Camp, [“I Came to College Eager to Debate”](#)

Trevor Floyd, [“When Arguing for Free Speech is Really Arguing Against It”](#)

American Association of University Professors, [“Defining Academic Freedom”](#)

Marcos Sabio, [“Where is Feminism Now?”](#)

Lindy West, [“What No One Else Will Tell You About Feminism”](#)

Jordan Peterson, [Cathy Newman Debates Jordan Peterson](#)

Paul Elam, [“Bash a Violent Bitch Month”](#)

Cassie Jaye, [Meeting the Enemy](#)

Christina Hoff Sommers, [Do Men Need to Check Their Privilege?](#)

Colin Wright, [“Why There Are Exactly Two Sexes”](#)

Mey Rude, ["It's Time for People to Stop Using the Social Construct of 'Biological Sex' to Defend Their Transmisogyny"](#)

Paul Vasey, [Gender: A Wider Lens Podcast: Male Femininity](#)

Sophie Grace Chappell, ["Being Transgender and Transgender Being"](#)

Matt Walsh, [Debunking Transgenderism](#)

Ibram X. Kendi, [How to Be an Antiracist](#)

Coleman Hughes, [The End of Race Politics](#)

Walter Benn Michaels and Adolph Reed, Jr., ["The Trouble With Disparity"](#)

Thomas Sowell, ["The Real History of Slavery"](#)

Brent Staples, ["Black Men and Public Space"](#)

Jaswinder Bolina, ["Writing Like a White Guy"](#)

Rebecca Tuvel, ["In Defense of Transracialism"](#)

Tom Regan, ["The Case for Animal Rights"](#)

Michael Pollan, ["An Animal's Place"](#)

Aeon J. Skoble, ["The Conscience of an Omnivore"](#)

Giorgio Agamben, pages 23-38 of [The Open](#)

How to Cite Your Sources

In this class, you will cite scholarly articles, book chapters, essay collections, or news articles in your Argument Essay. For your convenience, I have provided instructions on how to cite each of these sources below. If the type of source you are citing is not listed here, see [OWL Purdue](#) for additional instruction.

How to cite a scholarly article in MLA format:

Author(s). "Title of Article." *Title of Journal*, Volume, Issue, Year, pages.

Concrete examples of how to cite a scholarly article in MLA format:

Bagchi, Alaknanda. "Conflicting Nationalisms: The Voice of the Subaltern in Mahasweta Devi's *Bashai Tudu*." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, vol. 15, no. 1, 1996, pp. 41-50.

Duvall, John N. "The (Super)Marketplace of Images: Television as Unmediated Mediation in DeLillo's *White Noise*." *Arizona Quarterly*, vol. 50, no. 3, 1994, pp. 127-53.

How to cite a book in MLA format:

Last Name, First Name. *Title of Book*. City of Publication, Publisher, Publication Date.

Concrete examples of how to cite a book in MLA format:

Gleick, James. *Chaos: Making a New Science*. Penguin, 1987.

Henley, Patricia. *The Hummingbird House*. MacMurray, 1999.

How to cite a work from an essay collection in MLA format:

Last name, First name. "Title of Essay." *Title of Collection*, edited by Editor's Name(s), Publisher, Year, Page range of entry.

Concrete examples of how to cite a work from an essay collection in MLA format:

Pasco, Allan H. "On Defining Short Stories." *The New Short Story Theories*, edited by Charles E. May, Ohio University Press, 1994, pp. 14-130.

Poe, Edgar Allan. "Poe on Short Fiction." *The New Short Story Theories*, edited by Charles E. May, Ohio University Press, 1994, pp. 59-72.

How to cite a news articles in MLA format:

Author(s). "Title of Article." *Title of Periodical*, Day Month Year, pages.

Concrete examples of how to cite news articles in MLA format:

Brubaker, Bill. "New Health Center Targets County's Uninsured Patients." *Washington Post*, 24 May 2007, p. LZ01.

For additional instruction, follow this link to the [MLA Formatting and Style Guide](#) provided by Purdue Owl. Follow this link for the Purdue Owl [MLA Sample Paper](#).

RESOURCES

ACADEMIC CALENDAR: All students are subject to the registration and refund deadlines as stated in the Academic Calendar:

<https://registrar.oregonstate.edu/osu-academic-calendar>

STATEMENT REGARDING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES: Oregon State University is committed to making learning experiences accessible to all, which includes consideration of the course design, course learning outcomes, and barriers experienced by the disabled student. Disability Access Services (DAS) staff and students work together to determine reasonable accommodations. Students connected with DAS who have questions about their accommodations should reach out to their DAS Adviser. Students who have not yet completed the process for setting up accommodations, please contact DAS at 541-737-4098, visit the [DAS website](#) or email disability.services@oregonstate.edu to explore accommodations for a disability (e.g., mental health diagnoses, chronic health conditions, learning disabilities, physical conditions/injuries, etc.). Students and faculty members are encouraged to collaborate around the implementation of accommodations.

STUDENT CONDUCT EXPECTATIONS LINK: <https://beav.es/codeofconduct>

REACH OUT FOR SUCCESS: University students encounter setbacks from time to time. If you encounter difficulties and need assistance, it's important to reach out. Consider discussing the situation with an instructor or academic advisor. Learn about resources that assist with wellness and academic success at oregonstate.edu/ReachOut. If you are in immediate crisis, please call or text the Suicide & Crisis Lifeline at 988.

ACADEMIC HONESTY: Cheating, in any form, is not tolerated at Oregon State University. Any plagiarism – that is, using ideas, information, words, phrases, sentences, or paragraphs from someone else's essay, book, article, website, etc. without giving full accurate credit to the original source – and this includes forgetting to put quote marks on copy-paste – has serious consequences, up to an F for the class and/or a written report to Student Conduct for further disciplinary action. See

<http://studentlife.oregonstate.edu/studentconduct/offenses-0> for further information. Recycling your own work from other classes is considered self-plagiarism and is not allowed without prior written approval from me.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF COURSES: During Fall, Winter, and Spring term the online Student Evaluation of Teaching system opens to students the Wednesday of week 8 and closes the Sunday before Finals Week. Students will receive notification, instructions and the link through their ONID email. They may also log into the system via Online Services. Course evaluation results are extremely important and used to help improve courses and the learning experience of future students. Responses are anonymous (unless a student chooses to “sign” their comments, agreeing to relinquish anonymity) and unavailable to instructors until after grades have been posted. The results of scaled questions and signed comments go to both the instructor and their unit head/supervisor. Anonymous (unsigned) comments go to the instructor only.

CORE ED CATEGORY LEARNING OUTCOMES

This is a Core Education course that fulfills the requirements for the Writing Elevation category. In addition, this course also fulfills the Baccalaureate Core requirements for the Writing II category.

Core Ed Category Outcome	How this outcome will be addressed in the course	How this outcome will be assessed in the course
1. Construct rhetorically informed texts that adapt to new writing situations, audiences, and relevant knowledge domains.	Students write discussion board entries throughout the term. Discussion questions ask for responses to a variety of sources, academic and non-academic, across a variety of subjects. As a result, students must learn to adapt to new writing situations, audiences, and knowledge domains in rhetorically effective ways. This practice is subsequently applied in	Instructor assesses the discussion board entries in terms of their logic, rhetoric, and writing quality. Instructor will be looking for evidence of adjusted vocabulary, supporting arguments, and evidence based on the audience and what is persuasive in that context.

	classroom discussions with their peers.	
2.Synthesize diverse perspectives in complex conversations using critical analysis and genre-appropriate writing styles and conventions.	Students explore different stakeholder perspectives in order to make more rhetorically-informed arguments. They will establish key voices and perspectives on the topic to situate their own argument. They will address counterarguments and look for common ground when possible.	Instructor assesses the establishment of an academic conversation in the Argument Essay. Instructor assesses the complexity and analysis of the conversation in the Argument Essay, specifically looking for direct engagement with counter arguments.
3.Integrate critically-evaluated sources in knowledge-domain-specific documents and arguments.	Students incorporate knowledge-domain-specific scholarly sources in the Annotated Bibliography and all three drafts of the Argument Essay, including a mix of journalistic and academic sources.	Instructor assesses the quality and quantity of the sources used for the Annotated Bibliography and all three drafts of the Argument Essay, as well as how they are incorporated into the argument. Assesses in-text and end citation for completeness and accuracy.

WR 323 Course Specific Learning Outcomes

Successful students in WR 323 will demonstrate their ability to understand, read, and write at the 300-level in the following areas:

1. Analyze and evaluate rhetorical goals, quality of reasoning, and genre conventions across a variety of texts.
2. Write original, rhetorically-informed, research-based arguments using sound reasoning and evidence to persuade specific audiences.
3. Develop advanced information literacy skills, evaluating research sources for credibility, bias, and effectiveness; navigate complex conversations by integrating appropriate sources.
4. Demonstrate stylistic awareness in writing by making audience-driven choices about word choice, tone, voice, and conventions.

- Practice advanced strategies for writing processes, such as generating ideas, deepening topics, collaborating with peers and instructor to develop drafts, revising, and reflecting to improve transfer to future writing contexts

COURSE SCHEDULE



SECTION 1: EMPATHETIC CRITICAL THINKING

WEEK 1

MONDAY

Syllabus Review & Name Game

WEDNESDAY

Emma Camp, [“I Came to College Eager to Debate”](#)

Trevor Floyd, [“When Arguing for Free Speech is Really Arguing Against It”](#)

American Association of University Professors, [“Defining Academic Freedom”](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 1

WEEK 2

MONDAY

Marcos Sabio, [“Where is Feminism Now?”](#)

Lindy West, [“What No One Else Will Tell You About Feminism”](#)

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, [“Declaration of Sentiments”](#)

Jordan Peterson, [Cathy Newman Debates Jordan Peterson](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 2

WEDNESDAY

Paul Elam, [“Bash a Violent Bitch Month”](#)

Cassie Jaye, [The Red Pill](#) [NOTE: YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO WATCH THE ENTIRE DOCUMENTARY, JUST ENOUGH TO UNDERSTAND THE ARGUMENT ACCURATELY]

Cassie Jaye, [Meeting the Enemy](#)

Christina Hoff Sommers, [Do Men Need to Check Their Privilege?](#)

Richie Reseda, [The Feminist in Cell Block Y](#) [NOTE: YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO WATCH THE ENTIRE DOCUMENTARY, JUST ENOUGH TO UNDERSTAND THE ARGUMENT ACCURATELY]

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 3

WEEK 3

MONDAY

Colin Wright, [“Why There Are Exactly Two Sexes”](#)

Mey Rude, [“It’s Time for People to Stop Using the Social Construct of ‘Biological Sex’ to Defend Their Transmisogyny”](#)

Sophie Grace Chappell, [“Being Transgender and Transgender Being”](#)

Paul Vasey, [Gender: A Wider Lens Podcast: Male Femininity](#)

Matt Walsh, [Debunking Transgenderism](#) & [Companion Text](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 4

WEDNESDAY

Ibram X. Kendi, [*How to Be an Antiracist*](#)

Coleman Hughes, [*The End of Race Politics*](#)

Walter Benn Michaels and Adolph Reed, Jr., [*"The Trouble With Disparity"*](#)

Thomas Sowell, [*"The Real History of Slavery"*](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 5

WEEK 4

MONDAY

Brent Staples, [*"Black Men and Public Space"*](#)

Jaswinder Bolina, [*"Writing Like a White Guy"*](#)

Rebecca Tuvel, [*"In Defense of Transracialism"*](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 6

WEDNESDAY

Tom Regan, [*"The Case for Animal Rights"*](#)

Michael Pollan, [*"An Animal's Place"*](#)

Aeon J. Skoble, [*"The Conscience of an Omnivore"*](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 7

WEEK 5

MONDAY

Giorgio Agamben, pages 23-38 of [*The Open*](#)

Thomas Jefferson and Others, [*"The Declaration of Independence"*](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 8

SECTION 2: BEST WRITING PRACTICES

WEDNESDAY

Amy Guptill, ["Constructing the Thesis and Argument from the Ground Up"](#)

Amy Guptill, ["What Does the Instructor Want?"](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 9

FRIDAY

DUE: ARGUMENT PROPOSAL

WEEK 6

MONDAY

Amy Guptill, ["Listening to Sources, Talking to Sources"](#)

John Oliver, ["Scientific Studies"](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 10

WEDNESDAY

Stanley Fish, ["Why You Won't Find the Answer in Strunk and White"](#)

George Gopen and Judith Swan, ["The Science of Scientific Writing"](#)

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 11

FRIDAY

DUE: DETAILED OUTLINE

SECTION 3: DRAFTING YOUR ARGUMENT

WEEK 7

MONDAY

Debates

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 12

WEDNESDAY

Debates

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 13

FRIDAY

DUE: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

WEEK 8

MONDAY

Debates

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 14

WEDNESDAY

Debates

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 15

FRIDAY

DUE: ARGUMENT ESSAY FIRST DRAFT

WEEK 9

MONDAY

Peer Review

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 16

WEDNESDAY

Peer Review

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 17

WEEK 10

MONDAY

Peer Review

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 18

WEDNESDAY

Peer Review

DUE: PARTICIPATION ASSIGNMENT 19

FRIDAY

DUE: ARGUMENT ESSAY FINAL DRAFT