### RHE 330D • Deliberating War 43350• Roberts-Miller, Patricia Meets MWF 1000am-1100am PAR 206

Office Hours: MWTh 11-12, and by appointment

Parlin 21 (Basement of Parlin); I’m also often available in the UWC (PCL 2.330)

232-4152 redball@mindspring or patriciarobertsmiller@gmail.com

Microthemes should be sent to: redball@mindspring.com

<http://www.drw.utexas.edu/roberts-miller>

**COURSE GOALS** This course has three main goals: to introduce rhetoric majors to classical rhetorical theory; to help rhetoric majors consider rhetoric as the art of community deliberation; and to explore when and how rhetoric helps a community come to reasonable decisions and when it is a hindrance to good deliberation.

The decision to go to war is probably one of the most important (perhaps the single most important) decisions a community makes—it should be our best deliberation. And, as common sense suggests, good deliberation involves a willingness to admit past mistakes, engage in worst-case scenario thinking, look at the issue from multiple perspectives, and clearly articulate our policy goals. To make good decisions, you have to admit that you've made bad ones, and learn from them; you also have to think realistically about limits and weaknesses. Yet, as we’ll see in this class, the question of whether to go to war seems to make people unwilling to act in precisely the ways we know contribute to good deliberation—admitting past mistakes seems to dishonor people who've died, acknowledging the weaknesses of our military seems to disrespect them, talking openly about options is hard when people are frightened.

This course will consider how we can try to reason well when we’re in conflict by looking at times people didn’t do it especially well. This course uses the history of rhetoric, especially classical rhetorical theory, in order to consider three basic questions:

1. What are useful concepts for helping communities think effectively about difficult issues?
2. How can we make rhetoric a method of community deliberation and not just a set of strategies for gaining compliance?
3. What are useful strategies for helping us realize when we're reasoning badly?

Some of the material required for the course is disturbing (such as arguments for genocide) and some is offensive (political positions with which you disagree, scatological and sexually explicit Greek comedy), so be forewarned. You don’t have to like or agree with anything you read, but you do need to understand why someone would, and how it is put together rhetorically. And you will need to read it.

You’ll also need to hear and read criticism of all the major political parties and positions, criticism of how wars have been conducted, things that criticize American troops, and criticism of our current political debate. No matter your political position, you will read and hear things that criticize it. If you are uncomfortable with hearing or reading criticism of your beliefs, you should not take this class.

**Books, Required:** Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War*

Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*

Plato, *Gorgias*

Coursepack (at Jenn’s)

The Jasinski *Sourcebook on Rhetoric* is available as an e-book through the library; if you’re a rhetoric major, you should consider purchasing it. http://utxa.eblib.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=996812&echo=1&userid=d3GlLf6XARSVZRWEVShhOQ%3d%3d&tstamp=1452701781&id=79265C391E7AF1EFF478627C8B88E001EE166402

**Recommended** Kagan, *The Peloponnesian War*

**COURSE GRADING**

**If you do not turn in a good faith first version of a paper (1.1) on time (unless you get an extension from me ahead of time), you may not revise the paper. Furthermore, you will receive a 0 (which is below an 'F') on that paper, so 20% of your final grade will be 0.**

First Exam: 10%

Second Exam: 10%

Microthemes, thesis statements, peer reviews, and other in-class: 10% (up to 10.2%)

Paper: 30%

Final Exam: 20%

Concept Quiz: 10%

Fallacy Quiz: 10%

**There will be an optional third exam that can replace an earlier exam grade if (and only if) you took the earlier exam.**

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

**PAPER.** The paper requires that you discuss material not covered in class—including the selection from Mary Gentile’s *Giving Voice to Values*—and apply it to a specific debate. You will have to do substantial research for the paper. Students say that this one cannot be written at the last minute. This paper will be 12-15 pages. If you don't turn in a good faith version March 28, you'll get a zero *and you won't be able to revise it*. If you need an extension, contact me before the paper is due.

**MICROTHEMES**. There are 29 microthemes—they make a major difference in your grade. Microthemes are exploratory, informal, short (400-750 words) responses to the reading. They have a profound impact on your overall grade both directly and indirectly; doing all of them (even turning in something that says you didn’t one) can help your grade substantially. **They should be 400-750 words (longer is fine)**. **Do not send them as an attachment; please put “Microthteme” in the subject line.** See the “grading” method below. You are not generally expected to consult outside sources for them; if you do, you should cite those sources. Presenting someone else’s words or language as your own in the microthemes will be treated as plagiarism, and may earn an ‘F’ in the course.

**Make sure to keep a copy in your sent mail.**

You’ll generally not get them back, but simply an email with the “grade” **if it is not a check**—they’re what’s called “expressive” writing. Even if you can’t come to class, then email your microtheme to me by class time.

The Microthemes have four major functions. First, they enhance your reading comprehension—research suggests that writing about a reading afterwards improves your understanding of the reading and also helps you identify what you didn’t understand about the reading. Second, they enable you to ask questions about the reading or indicate what concepts were unclear to you. I use them for class preparation (that’s why they’re due when they are), and therefore appreciate when students tell me what aspects of the reading they did or didn’t understand. Third, they can serve as notes for your studying. Fourth, they are the one part of the course that is essentially an effort grade. Notice that simply doing all of them adequately will get you an ‘A’ on that part of the grade.

Generally, what happens is that I will have talked a little in class about the reading, and it will seem to make sense. Then, when you do the reading, it might fall apart on you. Great. Write about how it did. If it didn’t while you were reading, it might get confusing as you write. That’s my goal: confusion is generally a good step on the way to learning. So, be open about what doesn’t make sense, or how the reading only sort of makes sense, or you don’t know what the prompt means, or you aren’t clear how this reading relates to other reading.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Points | Mark | Total possible points for this mark on every microtheme (unlikely, but possible) | Explanation |
| 4.5 | + | 102 | This mark is reserved for an extraordinarily good response, one that puts forward an insightful and excellent argument, on top of thoroughly answering the prompt. These are very rare. |
| 4.1 | √+ | 102  | An excellent (that is, excelling) answer to the prompt, with strong close analysis, original insight, and/or excellent questions. Many students (including ones who get good grades in the course) never get one.  |
| 3.6 | √  | 102 (note that getting 28 checks will earn 100.8 points) | A response that answers the prompt and poses good questions. This is the default. |
| 2.5 | √ - | 72.5 | A response that is inadequate in some way—too short, only responds to part of the prompt; a microtheme that would normally receive a √ received after the cutoff but before class.  |
| 1.8 | - | 48.6 | A timely microtheme that says the student did not do the reading or did not have time to write the response. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | No microtheme, or one that is submitted after class.  |

**COURSE POLICIES**

**LATE PAPERS**. Papers and work are due at the beginning of class. They will be dropped one-third grade if they are turned in during class, and a full grade for every day late **unless you contact me ahead of time.** If you do contact me ahead of time (which includes sending email any time before class starts), then the late paper policy will apply to whatever the extension is. In addition, if you turn a paper in late (even with an extension), chances are that you will not get it back before the next submission is due, and you may not be able to have a student conference.

I have a stringent (even Draconian) late paper policy for two reasons. First, our schedule is packed, and getting thrown off even slightly will make both our lives miserable. Second, in my experience, students have trouble completing the work in a writing class because they've mis-defined the task. If I get involved, I can help.

**ATTENDANCE**. **If you miss over six classes, DRW policy is that you will receive an 'F' in the course**. **In addition, coming to class more than ten minutes late or leaving class more than ten minutes early constitute absences. Sleeping in class or doing work for another class will be counted as ½ absence. Only religious holidays and military service are “excused” absences.**

When I first started teaching, I distinguished between excused and unexcused absences, and I found myself getting entangled in all sorts of ways. More important, I discovered that, even with the best of intentions, students just couldn't make up the work--students who missed a lot of class did poorly. Poor attendance and poor grades are probably associated in this kind of class because one cannot "make up" the class work (in the way that one can with a lecture course).

It is none of my business why you miss class. It is your business to contact me ahead of time if there is any work due on the day you miss (the late paper policy applies whether or not you are present in class), and also your business to find out from other students what happened in class.

If there are medical reasons for your absences, please talk to me so that we can arrange a medical withdrawal. If you miss close to six classes, you can expect that it will negatively affect your grade--not because I will punitively lower your grade, but just because you will have missed the discussions and information that would help you write better papers and exam answers.

If you miss class, please don’t expect that I can go over all the material with you in office hours. I wish I could, but it just isn’t possible for me to do that with every student. Instead, you should try to get notes from another student in class—one of many reasons that having a good cohort correlates strongly to doing well in college.

I don't want to have a tardy policy, but I will mention that students who continually show up a few minutes late also tend to do poorly in writing courses. My personal crank hypothesis is that students do poorly because important announcements are made in those first few minutes, so those students keep missing important information. It's also very rude to your classmates to show up late (as there's always a disruption when someone comes in late). So, please show up on time. If there is some reason that you have trouble getting to class on time (e.g., a physical disability that slows you down, a prof who tends to keep you late), please, please let me know. **If you have an issue with getting to class late, or with attendance, I will not write a letter of recommendation for you.**

**I’m sorry to have to do it, but I have to ban laptops, iphones, smartphones, ipads, and all such devices.** I’ve had too many students who spent their class time facebooking, texting, working on things for other classes, or generally not paying attention who then wanted me to make extra time for them outside of class because they were lost in class (or complained in teaching evaluations that I hadn’t explained things).

Also, those technologies distract students behind you (which is one of the ways that teachers know when you’re messing around and not just taking notes). Just as a general piece of advice, don’t underestimate the intelligence of your teachers. If you are really struggling in a class, and you look like you’re paying attention, most teachers will try to work with you as best they can. But you can imagine that it’s a little weird if a student doesn’t pay attention in class and then wants all sorts of extra time outside of class. If you need such a device as part of an accommodation, then please let me know, and you will sit in the front row.

Do not sign in for another student. If you are signed in on the roll sheet and not in class, I’ll send a note to that effect to the Dean. And, of course, I won’t serve as a reference or write a letter of recommendation for you.

If you have health or academic difficulties, do not simply disappear from your courses—you might find yourself responsible for returning grant, loan, or fellowship money.

**OFFICE HOURS**. Office hours are your time--you can come by just to chat about the class, talk about things only minimally related to the class, go over course material that's especially interesting or confusing, brainstorm your papers, go over paper comments, or even just shoot the breeze. Students sometimes come to me for help on writing statements of purpose, appeal letters, or papers for other courses--that's fine (and you're welcome to do that long after you take a course from me). Some students prefer to get help through email, which is perfectly fine by me (and can be especially convenient on weekends), but I can't guarantee I'll get back to you before the next class meeting. My office hours are generally in Parlin 21, but often in the Writing Center—just ask ahead of time—and I'll let you know about conference locations.

**PLAGIARISM**. Plagiarism is the **unattributed** borrowing of ideas or language. It does not matter if the original source is a published book or article, something from the web, something written (or told to you) by a student, or even work for another course. Changing a few words here and there does not solve the problem--correctly citing the source does. Any plagiarized coursework will receive a 0 (that is below an 'F'**). Even a single instance of plagiarism may result in an 'F' in the course, in addition to the matter being made part of your academic record.**

There's a handout in the coursepack on plagiarism, and most handbooks have good explanations of what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it. See this page:

<http://www.utexas.edu/cola/depts/rhetoric/firstyearwriting/plagiarismcollusion.php>

But, if you ever have any questions about how to cite, or if you are concerned that you have a borderline situation, just put a note in the margin of your paper saying that you are unsure, or put a note in the microtheme. There's a difference between bungling citation and not citing.

Part of what I hope you will learn in this course is that citation of your sources is not something one does to please obsessive teachers, but a basic ethical responsibility of anyone participating in public discourse. You should always try to be clear where you have gotten your information from, and you should always insist that others tell you where they got their information from. And you should know how to judge the basic credibility of those sources.

**ACADEMIC HONOR POLICY VIOLATIONS.** Any other violation of the Academic Honor Policy (e.g., using notes or prewritten material for the exams) may result in an ‘F’ in the course and the matter being made part of your academic record.

**DISABILITY STATEMENT** The University of Texas provides on request appropriate academic accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. At the beginning of the semester, students who need special accommodations should notify the instructor by presenting a letter prepared by the Service for Students with Disabilities (SSD) Office. Disabilities range from visual, hearing, and movement impairments to Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, psychological disorders (bipolar disorder, depression, Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, etc.), and chronic health conditions (diabetes, multiple sclerosis, cancer, etc.). These also include from temporary disabilities such as broken bones, recovery from surgery, etc. For more information, contact Services for Students with Disabilities at (512) 471-6259 [voice], (866) 329-3986 [video phone], via e-mail at ssd@austin.utexas.edu, or visit: <http://ddce.utexas.edu/disability/>.

If you have a disability that is temporary, or not quite in the realm of ADA recognized (e.g., you sprain an ankle, and are having trouble getting to class on time, or you need to be near the board to read it), let me know, and we can easily work something out.

**EMAIL NOTIFICATION.** The official policy of UT is:

Electronic mail (e-mail), like postal mail, is a mechanism for official University communication to students. The University will exercise the right to send e-mail communications to all students, and the University will expect that e-mail communications will be received and read in a timely manner.

UT uses whatever email you have listed on your UT Direct page, so make sure to keep that updated. Canvas will send notices to that address, so, if your email address is incorrect, you won't get notices when I clarify or change assignments. You need to make sure that you check whatever email address you use for UT Direct every couple of days—every day is better.

Whenever you have a question about an assignment, email me. If I hear from several student, I know that my instructions were unclear, and then I’ll send out an explanation via canvas. So, if the U doesn’t have your correct address, you won’t get the mail.

**CLASS CALENDAR**. **Work is due on the day shown on the calendar**. Following is the preliminary class calendar--as I learn more about your interests, strengths, and needs, I'll make some changes to the reading. I need you to look over this calendar and compare the due dates of the papers with the due dates of major projects in your other classes. I don't want to have papers due on days when several students have exams or projects due in other classes, so please let me know ASAP if there are problems with any of the dates. (As time passes, it will become increasingly difficult for us to make changes.) **Also, notice that, even when the information for a particular date goes on to the next page, there is a line, so check the next page!**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1/18MLK Day | 1/20 First day of classes [syllabus, course reqs] | 1/22 Read Jasinski “Case construction” and “stock issues.” Read "Peloponnesian War, Causes of" from*Greek Warfare*: *From the Battle of Marathon to the Conquests of Alexander the Great*. Ed. Lee L. Brice. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2012. [i]. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Web. 16 Jan. 2016. (available through canvas).  |
| 1/25 Read the first set of deliberations in the Spartan Assembly (there are two sets): Book I, sections 67-88 **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): apply the concepts of case construction and stock issues to the debate. | 1/27 Read Jasinski on “stasis” [in class, continue discussing Spartan deliberations]. | 1/29 Read “Hawkish Biases” <https://www.princeton.edu/~kahneman/docs/Publications/Hawkish%20Biases.pdf> **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): Give examples of your having engaged in each of the seven cognitive biases.  |
| 2/1 Read Thucydides, Book I, section119-125 (second set of Spartan deliberations). **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): what are the stases in the speeches? And in the debate generally? | 2/3 Read Corinthian and Corcyrean speeches to the Athenians (Bk I, 32-43).  | 2/5 Read Pericles’ first speech to the Athenian Assembly ([1.140](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=thuc.+1.140)) **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): Identify any hawkish biases or identify which of the case construction stock issues he uses.  |
| 2/8 Read Pericles' "Funeral Oration" ([2.35](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=thuc.+2.35)) and "Last Speech" ([2.60](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=thuc.+2.60)) and "Rhetoric, Epideictic" (in coursepack), and the selection from Aristotle (Book I, Chapter 3, also in the coursepack). **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): what kinds of speeches are these?  | 2/10 Read sample exams. **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): What are some striking characteristics of the exams?  | 2/12 First exam. **Bring a bluebook that does not have your name or any writing in it. Having a bluebook with an outline or any notes in it will be considered a violation of the academic honor policy, and will result in an ‘F’ in the course (not just on the exam). There may be additional penalties.** |
| 2/15 Read Cleon’s speech in the Mytilenean Debate. **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): What are Cleon’s main arguments? What kind of case does he make, and what stock issues does he use? | 2/17 Read Diodotus' speech in the Mytilenean Debate. **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): what are his main arguments? What kind of case does he make, and what stock issues does he use?  | 2/19 Read "Sicilian Expedition" speeches. **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): apply the concepts of case construction and stock issues to all three speeches.  |
| 2/22 Read section on revolt in Corcyra and “The Melian Dialogue” (in Th’s *HPW*), the selection from Gentile, the sample paper, and “Advice on Writing” (NOT the “Advice from other students”): <http://www.drw.utexas.edu/roberts-miller/handouts/advice-on-writing> **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): comment on the papers—what questions do you have about the papers for this class? what would you like me to cover in class today? | 2/24 Read LBJ’s “Peace Without Conquest” speech. <http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/johnson/archives.hom/speeches.hom/650407.asp> **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): Ignoring what you know about Vietnam, what would you infer from this speech are the major stock issues? | 2/26 Read Chapters Two and Three of *In Retrospect*. **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): apply the concepts of case construction and stock issues to the set of questions he lists on pages 72-73. Don’t try to take a stand on whether McNamara is right in his analysis, or even what the issues really were in Vietnam. Instead, I’m asking you to think about his analysis of the situation in terms of the rhetorical concepts of case construction and stock issues |
| 2/29 Read Burke’s “Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle’” and Hitler’s “Declaration of War on Poland.” You can hear much of it here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nnP-KlNVE2E><http://fcit.usf.edu/Holocaust/resource/DOCUMENT/HITLER1.htm>This has some good background information: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Invasion_of_Poland>**Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): apply Burke’s analysis of *Mein Kampf* to this declaration.  | 3/2 Read Kershaw on Hitler’s decision to invade the Soviet Union (in coursepack). **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): if your last name begins A-L, apply the concepts of case construction/stock issues to Hitler’s reasoning; if your last name begins with M-Z, apply Burke’s “unification” devices to Hitler’s reasoning.  | 3/4 Second exam**. Bring a bluebook that does not have your name or any writing in it. Having a bluebook with an outline or any notes in it will be considered a violation of the academic honor policy, and will result in an ‘F’ in the course (not just on the exam). There may be additional penalties.** |
| 3/7 Read Hitler’s Deliberations with his generals (coursepack). **Microtheme** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): apply stock issues, hawkish biases, or Burke to Hitler’s rhetoric in these deliberations.  | 3/9 **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): Turn in a list of sources for your paper, with a brief description of each one. Also turn in a summary of the need, your plan, and your assessment of its feasibility. **Turning in a good version of this material is a necessary but not sufficient requirement for getting an A on the final version of the paper.** [In class: go over fallacies.]  | 3/11 First half of quiz. You'll be given all the terms, but I don't expect that you'll finish the whole quiz. You will also be able to retake either part of the quiz during the final exam time.  |
| 3/14 SPRING BREAK | 3/16 SPRING BREAK | 3/18 SPRING BREAK |
| 3/21 **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): Introduction and “need” section of paper due, with a draft of the rest. Bring two copies to class.  | 3/23 **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): peer review of two other papers due.  | 3/25 Colin Powell. **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): apply the concepts of case construction to his speech. Given the rhetorical exigency, what kind of speech should it be (e.g., affirmative, negative)? What kind of speech is it, and how? |
| 3/28 Read *Gorgias* through the discussion with Polus. Keep in mind while you’re reading this that it’s set in the era during the war but written long after.Students have a hard time with this dialogue because it’s really hard to follow. I think it is supposed to be hard to follow, and you are supposed to get irritated with Socrates. So, just keep going with it, even when you have no idea why they’re suddenly talking about cobblers. **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): What is the argument about?  | 3/30 Paper due. Please turn in your draft(s) as well. | 4/1 Finish *Gorgias*. **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): what does the catamite argument mean, and why does the argument get there? What is Callicles’ argument? |
| 4/4 Read *Lysistrata*. It’s very explicit (the women refuse to have sex with their husbands till the men end the ewar) and is mostly very puerile jokes. **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): is it pro- or anti-war? Does the crude humor make the argument more or less effective? | 4/6 **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): peer review the material given out in class on Monday.  | 4/8 **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): revised introduction (send me both versions).  |
| 4/11 Revised paper due.  | 4/13 Read Declarations of Secession (read all four): <http://sunsite.utk.edu/civil-war/reasons.html>**Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): what are the recurrent topoi? How is threat inflation being used? | 4/15 Second half of quiz |
| 4/18 Read Jasinski on “manifesto” and various Declarations of War:Japan: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Japanese_declaration_of_war_on_the_United_States_and_the_British_Empire>Germany: <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Holocaust/hitler_declares_war.html>United States “Spanish-American War” <http://www.spanamwar.com/McKinleywardec.htm>and World War II: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_declaration_of_war_upon_Japan><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_declaration_of_war_upon_Germany_%281941%29>and FDR’s speech: <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrpearlharbor.htm>**Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): what are recurrent topoi in these declarations? | 4/20 Read "Threat inflation" (in coursepack). **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): what is threat inflation, what are some examples of it that we've seen in this class, and how is it like or unlike some rhetorical concept we've discussed? | 4/22 (Optional) Third Exam.  |
| 4/25 Read Van Evera, “Offense, Defense, and the Security Dilemma.” **This reading is LONG**! **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): Van Evera is a political scientist, and so is discussing the issue from that perspective—what rhetorical concepts explain the phenomena he is describing?  | 4/27 Read Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “Beyond Vietnam” <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/MRC/pacificaviet/riversidetranscript.html> **Microtheme:** (due in email redball@mindspring.com to me by 8:00 a.m.): what stock issues is King using? What rhetorical concepts discussed in this class does King use (or try to undermine)?  | Quiz: fallacies.  |
| 5/2 Evaluations | 5/4 Evaluations | Exam Review |

**EXAMS.** Notice that the exam questions are what some people call “cumulative,” meaning that they are not just over material learned between two exams—each exam asks that you consider themes and issues from the beginning of the course.

You’ll be given photocopies of the relevant speeches, so that you can (and should) give specific quotes, but don’t expect to be able to invent your argument during the exam. I’m looking for a clear argument with lots of support for your claims. Your exam answers should be clear, and that doesn’t mean they have to be formal—don’t try to sound scholarly. I’m not looking for a specific answer (there are lots of “right” answers) but a plausible interpretation grounded in close readings of the relevant texts. And don’t bs.

**First exam**: Apply the concepts of case construction and stock issues to the speech. Identify whether it's a policy speech, and, if so, what kind. What kind of speech should it be, given the historical situation? What stock issues does the rhetor discsss—and does he mention them, or deal with them in some detail? You'll be expected to use evidence from the speech (which you'll be given in class), so be prepared ahead of time—you don't want to be inventing your argument during the exam. The speech will be one of the ones we've already read in class from Thucydides.

**Second exam**: Apply the concepts of case construction and stock issues to the speech or deliberative situation (if it's McNamara). What kind of speech should it be, given the historical situation? What stock issues does the rhetor discsss—and does he mention them, or deal with them in some detail? You'll be expected to use evidence from the speech or text (which you'll be given in class), so be prepared ahead of time—you don't want to be inventing your argument during the exam. The text will be one of the ones we've already read in class between 2/15 and 3/2.

**Third exam**: What is Socrates’ criticism of rhetoric in *Gorgias*, and how does it confirm, complicate, or contradict how rhetoric functions in [debate to be selected the day of the exam—it will be the Mytilenean Debate, debate over the Sicilian Expedition, or disagreement described by McNamara]? You’ll be given a handout of the debate, but not of *Gorgias*.

**PAPER PROMPT.** In this course, we'll be discussing times people were persuaded to take courses of action they later regretted. The paper invites you to use concepts from rhetoric (discussed in this class), Gentile's *Giving Voice to Values*, and/or some concepts from political psychology (hawkish biases or threat inflation) to try to intervene productively. As Gentile says, a major part of that process is doing research on the situation—what does the person (or community) hope to achieve by the course of action they're taking? why does it seem to be a good course of action? what are other options? The next step is identifying potential allies—who else might be able to make the case for a different course of action? Third, what are other ways of achieving the same end goal? And, finally, what is the most persuasive way to present your plan?

Students typically have three main problems with this assignment. The first is that they ignore (or minimize) the research step, going on the basis of common knowledge. I can help you find good sources, as can the reference librarians. Second, keep in mind that simply telling someone that what they are doing is unethical rarely works, especially if there are various cognitive biases at play. The third problem (which is closely related to the above) is that students often make anachronistic arguments. Note that all three of these flaws come from failing to do adequate research.

The paper requires that you do both research and reading not assigned for any specific class meeting. In fact, you *must* include material not part of the assigned reading. Read the selections from Mary Gentile’s *Giving Voice to Values* (in the coursepack). Her basic argument (which isn’t hers alone) is that people who effectively give voice to their values in complicated situations tend to follow similar steps. Instead of seeing the situation in starkly binary terms (either I do exactly as I’m told or I quit), they work through a range of responses. And, when they do make their case, they do so by doing more than condemning a course of action as immoral or unethical; instead, they present a carefully researched case as to just what is wrong with the course of action (specifically, how it is imprudent); ideally, they also present alternatives. Their case is rhetorically savvy—attuned to the audience and rhetorical situation. For this paper, you are being asked to make just such a case for one of the (many) situations in this course material in which a community comes to a decision that is both unethical and unwise (those two things go together more than people think).

You will need to do considerable research for this paper, and much of what you need will probably not be available on-line, so you will almost certainly have to go to the library. You are expected to use scholarly sources for this paper—primary sources are appropriate, as are autobiographies and memoirs. Newspaper reports from the era are also good (they are considered primary). *The Pentagon Papers* is a great source, as it has all the documentation that was available to people at the time. **General interest encyclopedias (and that includes Wikipedia) and general interest dictionaries are not appropriate for college papers, including these.**

You will have a Works Consulted, as well as a Works Cited. It is fine to have general interest encyclopedias and dictionaries on the Works Consulted.

For this paper, you should pick a specific deliberative moment, and write the kind of researched, thoughtful, audience-savvy argument that Gentile recommends. The paper will probably be 12-15 pages, and will require considerable research in the precise historical conditions (not just what we now know about that moment, but what was known in the moment). Because of the way the assignment works, you have to argue *against* going to war (e.g., for 1, 5, or 6) or *against* the current manner of conducting the war (e.g., for 2, 3, 4). It’s a more straightforward paper if you really believe what you’re arguing, so if you think the Iraq invasion was a good plan, don’t pick 6, etc. You may pick from among:

1. The Sicilian Expedition. What is a rhetorically more effective speech that Nikias could have given? Keep in mind that we have one speech he gave—you could choose either the “first” speech (that Thucydides doesn’t include), or to rewrite the one he gives us. You could also write the letter he sends back from Sicily.
2. World War I. I’ll list several possibilities of long campaigns—you must pick a specific moment in that long campaign, and argue against a specific action. Gallipoli, any time after the initial naval bombardment has clearly not worked; Somme, any time after July 3, 1915; the Nivelle Offensive. The challenge with this paper is picking a specific moment to intervene.
3. Persuading Hitler. Trying to persuade Hitler to do something sensible that he doesn’t want to do is, oddly enough, the most and least likely scenario for you to encounter. Obviously, you’ll never meet Hitler, but you are very likely to find yourself in a deliberative situation with a narcissist who throws temper tantrums if contradicted. To suggest that any of Hitler’s generals would have contradicted him is impossible—by December 1943, he had cleared the room of anyone with a spine—but necessary for this assignment. Pick a specific meeting before Paulus was surrounded, and try to make a speech to Hitler arguing for ordering a retreat. For this paper, you’ll have to think carefully about the details—where should they retreat to, and how?
4. If you would like to do a different meeting between Hitler and his generals, but one that is in the Heiber collection, then you need to propose it to me by February 22. Tell me the specific meeting, and why you want to do it (some will work and some won’t).
5. In Chapters Seven and Eight of *In Retrospect*, McNamara describes various memos that he wrote. Rewrite one of them arguing for the position McNamara later came to see as the right course of action.
6. Respond to Colin Powell’s March 2003 speech to the UN, arguing against invading Iraq. You need to pick his speech specifically, because it is a smart and thorough case, among the best the Bush Administration offered. Or, write to Powell trying to persuade him to change his speech.
7. Andrew Bacevich, politically conservative (not neo-con) retired Army officer and political scientist, says of NSC 68, “to read NSC 68 today is to enter a hothouse of apprehension, and panic” and calls it “an exercise in fear-mongering” (*Limits* 112). If you agree with him, can you write a response that would persuade Truman not to go along with it? <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsc-hst/nsc-68.htm> For this prompt, you’ll find Gaddis on
8. Battle of Kasserine Pass. You might want to try to persuade someone involved to do things differently, or to handle the fallout differently. You’ll want to use this document: <http://www.history.army.mil/books/staff-rides/kasserine/vol-i-part_1.pdf>
9. Any of the incidents described in Alistair Horne's *Hubris* (the challenge here will be picking a very specific moment). Begin with his version of events—he has very cogent summaries.

Your paper will have three parts—need, plan, and stock issues on the plan.

·       one part will be a description of the context, and the need for intervention. This is where you explain what was going on in the moment, and why the decision that was made was a disaster. You will also "set up" your own intervention—explaining, for instance, why the person, moment, genre, and so on seem the most likely to have the desired impact. Much of what we say in class about “need” (or “ill”) arguments will be present in this part of your paper, such as what is to blame for the disastrous outcome.

·       you will also present the text itself that you think it likely to solve the problem you’ve identified in your need section. If you use material from an existing text (e.g., you decide to alter the memo that George Ball actually sent), then use a shift in fonts (italicize, underline, or shift font) to indicate what is from the original.

·       you will also need to persuade your reader that your rhetorical choices are the best possible. This is the point where you'll bring in rhetorical theory, Mary Gentile, and/or the material on cognitive biases. You can put that metadiscursive argument in the footnotes, or as a separate section. If you decide that there is no argument that would have been effective, for instance, you write the best you can, argue that it is the best that could have been done, and argue why there was nothing more effective.

Those “three parts” might actually be three sections, or you might prefer two sections—your setup and your text, with footnotes explaining what you did, why you did it, and whether you think it’s feasible, will solve the problem, and so on.

Recurrent comments on these papers from previous semesters:

* Think about genre. For some of the prompts, it’s appropriate to write a letter (or memo). For others, it must be a speech. Keep in mind the characteristics of which genre you choose—a memo is very different from a speech.
* Think about *who* is giving the speech, writing the letter, etc. What are the rhetorical constraints s/he faces? How would those constraints affect the arguments s/he could make and how s/he could make them?
* Pose the problem early on, and show it’s an interesting one. Posing the problem effectively means acknowledging the reasons your opposition has for advocating their policy.
* Don’t use CMS; MLA will work better for you—use explanatory footnotes. You don't have to use CMS; I have a pretty strong preference for MLA citation methods for this kind of paper. You're less likely to lose citations, and it's easier on the reader
* Be careful of “argumentum ad ignorantium”—it tends not to work with people who are committed to a policy. (They can respond with their own argument from ignorance.)
* “The opposition is better than we are” topos tends not to work very well. Sometimes you have to make that argument (because it's true), but think carefully about just how to make it.
* Presentation—give a full header on the first page; lots of teachers like a running header of your last name and the page number. (I don’t care.) Have fun with titles—your title has a disproportionate impact on your reader’s experience.
* Avoid hanging quotes. This is good advice for most papers.
* The arguments can be hard to follow, and lots of visual cues can help your reader a lot. Using a different font for the speech/memo/letter, or (at least) separating it with an extra line, indenting long quotes, using bullet points when it would be helpful, having sub-headings for different sections of the paper. If you keep material from the original text, then putting it in a different font will help your reader know you’re doing that.
* Make sure to give the opposition argument a fair hearing in your paper—it’s often most effective to begin with that argument.
* Use Gale Virtual Reference Library, not Wikipedia or webpages (even from PBS or History Channel)—those are non-academic sources.

**FINAL EXAM:** The final exam question will be one of the following. (I haven’t decided which one.)

1. How are the concerns of [Aristotle, Plato, Thucydides, Kershaw] about the ethics of rhetoric similar or dissimilar to the recommendations in *Giving Voice to Values*? To what extent do they make similar recommendations about exactly how one should go about giving voice to your values? Use an example from the course reading to make your point.
2. To what extent do the notions of case construction help foster ethical, effective, and/or prudent deliberation? Apply the concepts to one of Kershaw's cases—Mussolini, Japan, or Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union.
3. How do "hawkish biases," Burke's "unification devices," and case construction/stock issues interact? Do they help each other, hurt each other, work against each other, with each other? You'll find this more straightforward if you pick a specific example from class to use to make your points.
4. Using either the concept of "threat inflation" or Van Evera's discussion of the causes of war, show the connections (and disconnections) between the political science approach and the rhetorical one. Be specific in your claims. As with the previous prompt, continually referring back to an example from the course will help.

**CONCEPT QUIZ.** You will receive up to two points for every good definition (which can be a quote) and up to two points for an apt example (which should be your own—not an example I've used in class to explain the concept, or the example given in the reading, or on the google doc).

First half

Burke's "commercial use"

Burke's "unifying voice"

charismatic leadership
compliance-gaining v. deliberating (total of eight possible points)

confirmation bias
cunning projection
enthymeme
epistemology
case construction

hawkish bias: FAE

hawkish bias: endowment effect

hawkish bias: reactive devaluation

Second half

inconsistent appeals to major premises

necessary but not sufficient condition

needs case

skepticism

sunk costs

stock issue: solvency

stock issue: feasibility

stock issue: unintended consequences
threat inflation
naïve realism
strong father morality
ultimate terms
ingroup/outgroup

**FALLACY QUIZ** You will receive up to five points for a good definition (from this class) and up to five points for a good example. The example must be your own; while it makes sense to use something from class, you won't get any points if it's the example I used in class, or the example that was used in reading or on a class google doc.
argumentum ad ignorantiam

argumentum ad misercordiam

fallacy of the false dilemma

argumentum ad hominem

post hoc ergo propter hoc

red herring

straw man

argumentum ad vericundiam

no true Scotsman

equivocation

**SOME RULES OF THUMB ABOUT THE THESIS QUESTION** As I keep saying in class (and in the course material), I don’t want you to put your thesis statement in your introduction. But you need *something* to communicate clearly with the reader what your paper will be about, and why it will be interesting. In other words, your introduction should set up the question. There are a few rules of thumb about the question:

* It doesn’t have to be a question per se. An introduction that describes an interpretive problem might have a “contract” that says something like, “Thus, one might wonder why Chester Burnette spends half his speech talking about something that might appear irrelevant.”
* On the days when you should turn in a thesis question, however, it would be easier on all of us if you did word it as a question. Your question should be more specific than the prompt—it needs to be specific enough that you can answer it in the relatively short space you have. So, for instance, “What rhetorical strategies does Chester Burnette use?” is too broad a question. While your thesis question will be along the lines of "Could Chester Burnette have been persuaded to do something different?" it's most useful if it's more specific (e.g, "Could Chester Burnette have been persuaded not to invade Squirrelville until he had allies?" or "Could Chester Burnette have been persuaded not to invade Squirrelville?")
* Introductions are most interesting if they set up a contradiction, puzzle, or paradox. If, for instance, something about a text surprised or puzzled you, it would probably surprise or puzzle your classmates. So, try to describe that puzzle.
* When I encourage students to write a thesis question, they have a tendency to formulate a false dilemma—“Was Chester using antimetabole in order to persuade dogs to attack squirrels, or was he an ineffective rhetor?” “Is this speech epideictic, or do bunnies eat steak?” It’s quite possible that the answer is, “Neither.” Anytime your thesis question has an “or” in it, make sure you don’t have a false dilemma.
* Because you are *so* trained to put your thesis in your introduction, students have a tendency to answer the question before they pose it.

On January 3, 1996, Chester Burnette gave his famous speech “Little Dogs are Evil.” Hubert Sumlin, whose tendency to befriend little dogs was notorious among Chesterians, was sitting on the platform with Chester, listening to Chester say things like, “Anyone who likes little dogs is providing aid and comfort to squirrels.” Obviously, Chester was trying to provoke Hubert. He explicitly and implicitly called him a traitor. After that speech, nothing could stop Hubert from persuading the dogs to invade Squirrelville. Could someone talk Hubert out of invading Squirrelville?

That last question was answered before it was posed.

**ADVICE FROM STUDENTS WHO TOOK A CLASS WITH ME PREVIOUSLY**

“Do the microthemes. Go to office hours. Take it seriously. Read, re-read, and re-re-read Burke, because he is worth it.” “It will teach you a subject, which English teachers have failed to teach during most of your academic career: practical, effective writing. It will refine your writing skills to a new level, and you’ll be thankful for it. In short, this is a must-take class for anyone serious about writing.” **“Be ready to work—to relearn how to write and, in a way, forget everything else you have been taught. It’s a tough course, but you come out a much better writer.”** “DO IT!! But know it’s hard work. Start early. Do your microthemes. Go to office hours.” “The class is not the easiest but it never seemed to matter because I was constantly trying harder and wanting to improve more each time." “Overall, what I learned in this class is of great value.” “Trish cares about her students more than any other professor I’ve encountered. If you’re willing to care about your own work in return, you will improve as a writer.” “You have to jump in. The water is deep, (and in the beginning it’s dark), but Trish will be there for you the whole time. BE PREPARED TO WRITE. (But that’s why you’re here, isn’t it?) But don’t be afraid; Trish is always available and extremely supportive in developing your writing ‘sketches’ into finished work.” **“Every teacher says, “my class is really hard.” Trish isn’t lying.”** “DO NOT TAKE 2 TRM CLASSES BACK-TO-BACK ON THE SAME DAY. I just wouldn’t recommend this class scheduling to anyone who isn’t prepared for an insane workload. One class would have been a lot better, and I think I could have put in better quality work.” “Having a paper due every other Monday was challenging for sure. But working under those time constraints was beneficial.” “If you’re pursuing academia, take this class. Be prepared for this class to be your biggest workload priority. If you’re pursuing another priority, wait to take this class.” **“When entering the class keep in mind everything you read and hear in class will be used throughout the whole semester.”** “This was by far one of the hardest classes I’ve taken at UT, but by far the most useful/worthwhile.” “B.S. just won’t cut it.” “Go to class! Most of what I learned from lectures I’ll have with me for the rest of my life.” “If you’re not expending every ounce of mental energy you have on your papers, you’re not trying hard enough.” “Commit to the class. You’ll get a ton out of it, if you’re willing to put in the effort.” “This is a hard course, but one of the most rewarding classes at UT.” “Take it!!! It’s more work than your average class, but so rewarding.” “Take it seriously. This class is difficult but so beneficial.” “Definitely do not take 3 other rhetoric classes and this one; it’s bad news for your sanity. Eventually, you will run out of time to write.” **“Trish is one of the best profs you’ll have because she knows her stuff! This is not a blow-off class. Be prepared to spend 10+hrs on a full paper to get an A. What you’ll learn in here will change your life. Seriously.”** “Come to class; the lectures are interesting and really helpful to explain things that may be confusing. Be prepared to commit a lot of time to this course. It can be stressful at times, but it is definitely worth it in the end.” “Learn to love the library.” “Be careful with your other courses. This class has a heavy workload so don’t have too many other classes with heavy or extensive workloads. Otherwise, you’re probably going to lose a lot of sleep.” “Go to class. It’s interesting and informative.” “This course is a course where the content is more important than the grade.”“Take her classes—all of them.” “Take notes, because the random nuggets of information she drops are just as interesting as the course material, and you want to remember it to impress your friends.” “Write down Trish quotes—they’re often golden.” “Take this class! Don’t let the 1000 page syllabus intimidate you into dropping it. Trish is a great instructor!” **“Microthemes are like working out, they are a temporary hassle but once you’re done you feel a lot better… and if you don’t do them, you just worry about not doing them all the time.”** “Do the microthemes—you will be more stressed if you don’t than if you take the time to jot something down.” “Do the microthemes even if you can’t finish the readings; read enough to answer the microtheme prompt. It will make your papers so much easier.” "Do the microthemes. For the love of God, do them!" “Read, or at least skim, all the readings. Even if you can’t get a microtheme out.” “Don’t skip microthemes! You will regret it later! They help so much.” “Do every single microtheme.” “Take the microthemes seriously and the papers will be easier.”“Do the reading, even if you just skip to the conclusion.” “**Although some of the microtheme reading can be long, don’t be fearful. Just read what you can, look for the example of the concept, take notes on something you think is weird/don’t understand in the text.”** “Start organizing microthemes as they are written!” “Do not begin your paper the night before. It takes a lot research to write a good paper.” “Be sure to research the various points of view for each paper topic. If mid-paper you change your mind on what the thesis is, change the paper. You’ll actually save time & the paper will be a lot easier to write.” “RESEARCH for every paper & NEVER procrastinate.” “Give these writing techniques she talks about (example-- introduction techniques) a chance. It may be hard at first, but you will benefit from them and become better writers with much better papers.” “Start thinking of your paper topics really far in advance, because sometimes your first idea is useless if you cannot find a text to support it.” “Be prepared to change your writing habits and style. Be prepared to change your views on what you know.” **“No matter how much you want to procrastinate, you have to force yourself to work on the paper at least one week before it is due. You won’t be satisfied with your end result if you don’t.”** “Spend the time reading the material. Spend the time researching. Spend the time writing. Spend the time going to see Trish. Time! Time! Time!” “I can't emphasize how early you need to get started on a paper. I spent all of college waiting till the last minute to do papers, and pulling As on them. Unless you are superhuman, this won't work.” “Do not procrastinate, if possible. Adequate research is the difference between a bad and horrible paper.” “Research, Research, Research for your papers!!!” “Be prepared to do a lot of research.” “Learn the value of setting up your paper in the introduction well. As soon as you learn this your grades will go up instantly.” “Use, use, abuse even the Writing Center.” “Be sure to present all the arguments fairly in your paper. Don’t misrepresent the arguments or your paper will suffer.” **“Don't get discouraged easily! It takes a couple of papers to get the hang of it, especially if you're recently out of high school. Go see Trish and go to the UWC!”** “She posts your writing assignments on the board and has the class give constructive criticism. It is sort of scary, but really helpful.” “Do lots of invention.” “Don’t worry about no grades: everyone gets them. Focus more on improvement and what Trish mentions in her paper comments. USE. THE. PAPER. COMMENTS. Changing one thing can be a 20 point gain.” “Start papers earlier than you usually would—they require research and effort, but in the end, it’s really rewarding to see how your writing has improved.” “Trish expects a lot out of her students, but at the same time is very fair. Talk to her if you need help. Also, get to know some of the other students, if not all. This might be the most beneficial thing because you can really help each other do better on assignments. It also makes the class more enjoyable, and you get more out of it.” **“Use your peers. Constructive criticism is a necessary aspect of writing in college and life in general. We are all in the same struggle and most of us don’t mind lending an ear and an eye to help a fellow soldier, as long as you return the favor.”** “Let go of what you think you know about the writing, and be open to the idea of reforming your writing process.” “I would advise students to really work on their first draft. I’ve found that it’s a lot easier to revise a paper if you have a really strong fist draft. I would also advise coming to office hours after writing a first draft.” “Don't be afraid to throw out a first sub that got a bad grade. If you find it hard to make changes on that one, it might be easier to start over on your second submission.” **“If Trish doesn't like your thesis, don't give up--just get more evidence.”** “Pick your topics early, like within the first three weeks of class, it helps a lot to have your ideas brewing while you read course material, also discuss things with Trish—it helps.” “You have to start writing the paper at least a week in advance.” “Don’t even try to write your paper the night before.” “You need time to produce good papers. Start early.” “Write a little bit every day.” “Don't be afraid to express opinions different than Trish's. She grades papers, not beliefs.” **“Don’t pretend these are regular papers. These will be the hardest undergrad papers you write.”** “Do NOT procrastinate in this class! And, write your papers with a group of RHE students, so you can look up from your laptop and ask, ‘does this make sense?’” “Definitely start your papers early and don’t procrastinate. Trust me. And do the readings; they’re really interesting and can be applied to other Rhetoric classes.” “The best thing you can do in this class is just dive in on the paper prompts—even if you don’t know what you’re doing at first. Eventually, you’ll learn to swim.” “Take advantage of the revision opportunity—that is when you learn the most. Expect to completely rewrite your first paper once, maybe twice—the time you put in will pay off.” “Do not leave a paper until last minute to write! Start your research a week in advance and do a little bit everyday.” **“Go to office hours! She will just give you advice, sources, new topics. It is amazing!”** “Go to Trish’s office hours to learn how to improve your paper. Trish really cares and wants your writing to improve and in this class, it will.” "Go to her office hours and understand exactly what she means by her comments on your papers." "Go to class and pay attention." “Invest time to go to office hours, even if you feel you don’t need to.” “SEE TRISH! It doesn’t matter if you completely know & understand the topic & know your thesis or not. Trish really just wants to help and wants you to know & understand what you’re doing.” “Seriously, don’t put stuff off. Take advantage of all the office hours you can. Office hours are extremely valuable.” **“Always, always talk to Trish if you’re having any trouble at all. She will help you in more ways than you can imagine. Trish is a great writing professor because she’s experimented a lot of different ways to write a paper. She knows what you’re going through.”** “Go to office hours and all will be revealed, or not. But, you’ll always end up better off.” “Definitely go to office hours!! It helps reduce anxiety. This is honestly the most useful advice I can offer.” “Ask Trish for help finding sources/resources for your paper.” “Seek advice. There are so many ways to proceed on these papers that you need to speak with Trish to narrow your focus to write a good paper.” “Go to office hours; that’s where everyone else gets all their questions answers and paper advice. Don’t write papers the night before.” “**What you take from this class depends on what you’re willing to put into it. Maximum effort = maximum return.”** “You’ll learn a lot of rhetorical terms and read many crazy arguments, but that’s not what this class *teaches* you. Trish teaches you to be a critical thinker, and you’ll use that skill everywhere and always.”

**From the Center for the Core Curriculum (**[**http://www.utexas.edu/ugs/ccc/teaching-resources/syllabus**](http://www.utexas.edu/ugs/ccc/teaching-resources/syllabus)**)**

## Ethics and Leadership

This course carries the Ethics and Leadership flag. Ethics and Leadership courses are designed to equip you with skills that are necessary for making ethical decisions in your adult and professional life. You should therefore expect a substantial portion of your grade to come from assignments involving ethical issues and the process of applying ethical reasoning to real-life situations.