Arrangement is important is that it guarantees arguers will make the most logically sound arguments. One thing that determines whether arguments are sound is whether they are assembled properly. Better arguments are those that make claims supported by evidence or data. Better speeches use a purposeful connective logic to create either breadth or depth in their argument. Better arguments anticipate possible objections, and take a realistic gaze at the issues that prohibit change from occurring.

Every introductory paragraph should have at least the following:

* An **Attention Getting Device** (or AGD). This is usually an anecdote or a startling fact.
* A **Thesis** (What you’re putting in to the essay that’s new).
* A **Purpose** (What your audience is getting out that’s interesting).
* A **Preview** Statement (The first, second, third progression of ideas in the essay).

Let’s say that we were arguing that a speech by Brian Kemp defending his voter suppression efforts could be illuminated using the theory of the second persona. The **thesis** can be a combination of the concept and the case. My **thesis** might be “*The second persona enables us to better understand Georgia Gubernatorial Candidate Brian Kemp’s speech in defense by illustrating how he appealed to the racial fears of his audience*.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

The **purpose** should describe the payoff of the essay, what the broader applicability is and why it’s useful. The **purpose** could be to illustrate how specific word choices can constitute the second persona of a popular viewing audience. By watching for the second persona of other state legislatures, we learn something about the local audience they are speaking to.

Now, the **preview**. There are two ways to organize your essay: the logically dependent way and the logically independent way. Either can work, but they will create different papers.

**Logical Dependency as Organization Strategy**

|  |
| --- |
| *What is logical dependency?* Logical dependency is a framework for organizing an essay based on the relationship between the thesis and its supporting claims throughout the essay. There are two ways that that this structure can be implemented: as *dependent*, meaning that the thesis compresses the claims in the essay, and the body expands upon its connective logic by carefully hooking sub-claims together, or as *independent,* meaning that the thesis is supported by separate and non-overlapping sub-claims. The advantage of the *dependent* structure is depth, while the advantage of the *independent* structure is breadth. Here are two facetious examples of logical dependency, using the thesis “Koalas are the most evil species on the planet”: *Logically Dependent*“Koalas are the most evil species on the planet”(1) Koalas assemble once a year to decide whether to wage war on Earth. (2) During this meeting, thousands of young koalas are eaten. (3) Massacres like this, according to the Geneva Conventions, are evil. Therefore: Koalas are evil. *Logically Independent*“Koalas are the most evil species on the planet”:Because (1) they were feared by the Ancient Greeks, Because (2) they practice the mystical dark arts, Because (3) they often plot to create nuclear weapons.Therefore: Koalas are evil. |
| *Logically* *Dependent* | *Logically**Independent* |
| Thesis: A=D1. A=B
2. B=C
3. C=D

Conclusion: A=D | Thesis: Major Claim1. Independent support for thesis 1
2. Independent support for thesis 2
3. Independent support for thesis 3

Conclusion: Major Claim |

Now, recall the three major criteria from the assignment description:

1. A specific definition of rhetoric (provided in the assignment description)
2. A concept that is paired with this definition
3. the ability to apply this concepts to an example

Returning to the assignment description, If we interpret the 1,2,3 as logically dependent instructions, the preview might read as follows:

* first, to define rhetoric as the study of speech or public address
* Second, to describe the second persona as a concept that deepens the idea of rhetoric as public address,
* And finally, to apply this concept as described to Brian Kemp’s speech,

Alternatively, we could define rhetoric and the second persona early in the paper and then expand on 3 as logically independent examples of the second persona, each receiving their own paragraph. If so, the preview could read as follows:

* first, the second persona of “outside agitators” in Kemp’s speech on October 12th.
* second, the second persona of “criminal illegals” in his campaign advertisements.[[2]](#footnote-2)
* and finally, the second persona of being avowedly “politically incorrect.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

In either case, the “first” statement should correspond with the topic sentence of the first section/paragraph, the “second” with the second, and the “and finally” with the third. Keep in mind that this is just one example, and there are a number of ways to construct the logically dependent/independent structure in a way that would satisfy the assignment.

**10 Quick Rules for Reviewing/Editing your Writing**

*Borrowed from the Twitter Account of Dr. Sarah Scullin (@ScullinSarah) on 8/2/19*

1. Go through every single sentence and make sure it relates to the previous sentence.
	1. How does it relate? Is it …
		1. Causal? (*the consequence of the act just describe was …* )
		2. Adversative? (*unlike these other thinkers, X argues …* )
		3. Sequential? (*third, we might consider responses to this argument…* )
		4. Additive? (*having considered Z’s effects upon Y, we might also consider …*)
	2. If you can’t connect the sentence to the previous sentence using one of the above four options, it’s either a restatement (OK) or it’s extraneous (Not OK). If it’s extraneous, cut it, or write your way to an answer.
2. Next, interrogate the style of every sentence. Combine and subordinate wherever possible and within reason. Use participles, absolutes, adjectives, and adverbs to replace nominalizations and extra verbs.
3. When you have created a massive sentence, especially at the end of making a point, follow with a short punch (or a simple sentence).
4. Find all of your stand-alone ‘this’s and replace with ‘this x’ where ‘x’ is the specific phenomenon you are discussing.
5. Add in some questions when you are in the weeds of arguing. Can be rhetorical or actual.
6. Avoid defensive or hedging language such as “I am not arguing that…” or “I do not intend to claim…”.
7. Does the essay have a clear *thesis* *statement* that is consistently referenced from the beginning to the end of the essay?
8. Does the essay have a clear and directly stated *purpose statement* which informs the reader of the “so what/who cares” legitimation for considering the major claim?
9. Does each paragraph have a *topic sentence,* or a claim that captures the development of ideas in that paragraph?
10. Does the essay have a clear thesis that links the main argument of the paper to the development of the body? Is it either …
	1. Independent? (non-overlapping sub-arguments that separately support the major claim)
	2. Dependent? (builds one argument on another until it arrives at the fully developed major claim)

1. This is true. Kemp used the phrase “outside agitators,” a civil-rights era euphemism for Black protestors, to describe the people who were protesting his voter roll purge of non-matching address signatures from 2016. <https://talkingpointsmemo.com/dc/brian-kemp-outside-agitators-voter-registration> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Also true. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Q1cfjh6VfE> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://www.thecut.com/2018/10/brian-kemp-georgia-governor-race-voter-suppression.html [↑](#footnote-ref-3)