

## Essay II (Position Paper) Argument Worksheet

### ***Introduction***

Main claim (your position on the issue): state this as a complete sentence.

To which category does your claim belong?

(See *PA* chapter 5. Deciding which category your claim belongs to may help you to revise your claim to make it more clear and direct, and may help you to address other positions which make claims in the same category—your definitions may be different, or your claims of cause may be different, etc.)

- claim of fact (*PA* 149ff)
- claim of definition (*PA* 152ff)
- claim of cause (*PA* 154ff)
- claim of value (*PA* 158ff)
- claim of policy (*PA* 161ff)

### ***Countering Arguments for First Position***

First position on this issue: state the claim as a complete sentence.

Is this a claim of fact, definition, cause, value, or policy? (See *PA* chapter 5. Ideally, it should be in the same category as your claim.)

Provide supporting arguments used by those who hold the position.

For each of these arguments, what *warrant* connects the *support* to the claim? It may help to articulate the warrant as an if/then statement: *if* the support is correct, *then* the claim is correct. (see *PA* chapter 4, esp. pages 126-130)

Does the warrant require *backing* (support for the warrant)? Do your sources provide backing for the warrant, and if so, what backing do they provide? (see *PA* chapter 4, esp. page 130)

Are these logical arguments (sign, induction, cause, deduction, analogy, definition, statistics), arguments from authority (credibility/ethos), or emotional arguments (motivation, value)? (See *PA* ch. 6, esp. pages 184-200.)

Are any of these arguments fallacies (see *PA* ch. 7): logical fallacies (*PA* 220-224), fallacies that affect ethos (*PA* 224-225), or emotional fallacies (*PA* 225-226)?

What rebuttals can you make against these arguments? Can you identify a fallacy? Can you attack the *support*, the *warrant*, or both?

### ***Countering Arguments for Second Position***

Second position on this issue: state the claim as a complete sentence.

Is this a claim of fact, definition, cause, value, or policy? (See *PA* chapter 5. Ideally, it should be in the same category as your claim.)

Provide supporting arguments used by those who hold the position.

For each of these arguments, what *warrant* connects the *support* to the claim? It may help to articulate the warrant as an if/then statement: *if* the support is correct, *then* the claim is correct. (see *PA* chapter 4, esp. pages 126-130)

Does the warrant require *backing* (support for the warrant)? Do your sources provide backing for the warrant, and if so, what backing do they provide? (see *PA* chapter 4, esp. page 130)

Are these logical arguments (sign, induction, cause, deduction, analogy, definition, statistics), arguments from authority (credibility/ethos), or emotional arguments (motivation, value)? (See *PA* ch. 6, esp. pages 184-200.)

Are any of these arguments fallacies (see *PA* ch. 7): logical fallacies (*PA* 220-224), fallacies that affect ethos (*PA* 224-225), or emotional fallacies (*PA* 225-226)?

What rebuttals can you make against these arguments? Can you identify a fallacy? Can you attack the *support*, the *warrant*, or both?

### ***Countering Arguments for Third Position***

Third position on this issue: state the claim as a complete sentence.

Is this a claim of fact, definition, cause, value, or policy? (See *PA* chapter 5. Ideally, it should be in the same category as your claim.)

Provide supporting arguments used by those who hold the position.

For each of these arguments, what *warrant* connects the *support* to the claim? It may help to articulate the warrant as an if/then statement: *if* the support is correct, *then* the claim is correct. (see *PA* chapter 4, esp. pages 126-130)

Does the warrant require *backing* (support for the warrant)? Do your sources provide backing for the warrant, and if so, what backing do they provide? (see *PA* chapter 4, esp. page 130)

Are these logical arguments (sign, induction, cause, deduction, analogy, definition, statistics), arguments from authority (credibility/ethos), or emotional arguments (motivation, value)? (See *PA* ch. 6, esp. pages 184-200.)

Are any of these arguments fallacies (see *PA* ch. 7): logical fallacies (*PA* 220-224), fallacies that affect ethos (*PA* 224-225), or emotional fallacies (*PA* 225-226)?

What rebuttals can you make against these arguments? Can you identify a fallacy? Can you attack the *support*, the *warrant*, or both?

***Subclaim (can repeat for additional subclaims)***

State a reason your audience should agree with your main claim, as a complete sentence.

Is this a claim of fact, definition, cause, value, or policy? (See *PA* chapter 5.)

What support can you provide for your subclaim?

What is the *warrant* (if/then) that connects your subclaim to your main claim? (see *PA* chapter 4, esp. pages 126-130)

Does this warrant require *backing*, and if so, what backing can you provide? (see *PA* chapter 4, esp. page 130)

Are these logical arguments (sign, induction, cause, deduction, analogy, definition, statistics), arguments from authority (credibility/ethos), or emotional arguments (motivation, value)? (See *PA* ch. 6, esp. pages 184-200.)

Are any of these arguments fallacies (see *PA* ch. 7): logical fallacies (*PA* 220-224), fallacies that affect ethos (*PA* 224-225), or emotional fallacies (*PA* 225-226)? (If your argument is fallacious, correct the fallacy. If you believe your argument is valid, find the closest possible fallacy, and briefly explain why you believe your argument avoids that fallacy.)