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CLASS TEXTS
Morris, Tom. If Aristotle Ran General Motors. (Holt, 1997)

CIVICS, COMMERCE, AND COMMUNICATION
“That man is more of a political animal than bees or any other gregarious creatures is evident. Nature makes nothing in vain, and man is the only animal who has the gift of speech. And whereas mere voice is but an indication of pleasure or pain, and is therefore found in other animals, the power of speech is intended to set forth the expedient and inexpedient, and therefore likewise the just and the unjust.”

–Aristotle, The Politics

“The offering of a shilling, which to us appears to have so plain and simple a meaning, is in reality offering an argument to persuade one to do so and so as it is for his interest. Men in the marketplace always endeavor to persuade others to be of their opinion, even when the matter is of no consequence to them. And in this matter all of us practice oratory on each other thro the whole of our lives.”

–Adam Smith, Lectures on Jurisprudence

“The division of labor, which made possible the Industrial Revolution, has become a more subtle division of knowledge, which now characterizes and sustains modern business, political, and academic institutions. We make constant use of formulas, symbols, and rules whose meaning we do not understand and through the use of which we avail ourselves of the assistance of knowledge which individually we do not possess. Since no one possesses total knowledge, different disciplines and professions of knowledge must learn to understand and dialogue with each other. The future survival of our civilization, therefore, will depend on competence, integrity, and communication.”

–Friedrich Hayek, Individualism and Economic Order
PURPOSE

This advanced workplace writing course teaches ethics and argumentation to future professionals. Building on the basic skills taught in Argument (WRTG-20100), Writing for the Workplace (WRTG-21100), and Technical Writing (WRTG-21300), we will produce more complex documents: policy and mission statements, position papers, dossiers, legal research memos, briefs, and long reports. Bridging the public and private sectors, these assignments will teach you how to define issues, propose changes, judge actions, and promote values within your chosen field. Besides tackling case studies from within the framework of your own profession, you will debate students from other professions about controversies involving business, government, law, and medicine. Since this class dialogue takes place at the intersection of different professional discourses, our subject of inquiry will be the new knowledge economy.

When Peter Drucker first coined the term knowledge workers, he paid homage to Nobel economist Friedrich Hayek. According to Hayek, the division of labor, which made possible the Industrial Revolution, has become a subtler division of knowledge, which now characterizes and sustains modern business, political, and academic institutions. Echoing Adam Smith, Hayek called our knowledge-based civilization the GREAT SOCIETY: a social arrangement based on widespread and decentralized economic interdependence, abstract legal codes, and impersonal information rather than on local and concentrated family ties, concrete tribal customs, and personal dialogue. This shift has profound implications for young professionals entering the workforce.

Hayek’s division of knowledge has created a global economy based on billable expertise, compulsory upgrades, and chronic ulcers. Thanks to rampant specialization, no one possesses either total understanding or total autonomy in the marketplace. Instead, competing but interdependent disciplines and professions struggle to understand and communicate with each other. Belonging to different and highly specialized discourse communities, lawyers hate dissecting malpractice law for doctors, while doctors resent spoon-feeding test results to lawyers. This Tower of Babel might be funny, if the political and ethical consequences were not so grim.

Miscommunication and aggression have shredded both professional ethics and the social contract. But we cannot easily solve this problem because we are caught in a dilemma. Without the specialization of disciplines and professions, mass society and the global economy would collapse, and billions would perish. This new paradigm has given us the power to create a new civilization, one based on knowledge as something specialized and knowledge workers as specialists. This is what gives the professions their power and makes specialized jargon necessary and inevitable. But the new knowledge economy also raises basic questions—of values, vision, and beliefs, of all the things that hold society together and give life meaning. Can competing professions in a capitalist economy create the common ground necessary for a functioning democracy? How are clear thinking and good writing essential to this process?
These issues are hardly academic. Whether one sees the professions as a high point of human achievement, or, in George Bernard Shaw’s tart phrase, “a conspiracy against the laity,” they play a dominant role in our lives. During a personal crisis, we seek the expertise of accountants, doctors, lawyers, and therapists. We rely on architects and engineers to design and maintain public and private space. We seek information, knowledge, and occasionally wisdom from broadcasters, consultants, and journalists. But whatever their differences, all professions:

- Serve the interests of clients in particular and the welfare of society in general
- Create, defend, and argue from a unique body of knowledge, based on formal theoretical and ethical principles
- Practice a specialized set of skills, methods, and procedures competently and consistently
- Render judgments with integrity under conditions of both technical and ethical uncertainty
- Learn from experience, both individually and collectively, and evolve new knowledge from changing contexts of practice
- Develop and organize a community or network responsible for the oversight and monitoring of quality in both practice and professional education.

“To assume a professional identity is not only to join an occupation,” declared Dr. William M. Sullivan at a 2007 Carnegie Foundation symposium on the professions in America: “It is to take up a civic role. The core of professionalism is that by functioning as a lawyer, engineer, doctor, accountant, architect, teacher or nurse, an individual carries on a public undertaking and affirms public values. With this identity comes a certain public status and authority as is granted both by custom and the profession's social contract.

“But professionalism also means duties to the public. Chief of these duties is the demand that a professional work in such a way that the outcome of that work contributes to the public value for which the profession stands. The larger public seems to understand this intuitively. There is widespread expectation that professionals should be accountable beyond the measure of profit and loss because the professional ethic rests upon a fiduciary basis.”

Unfortunately, widespread incompetence and dishonesty have eroded public trust in the professions. Talk-show hosts demand the lynching of bankers and lawyers. Educators consider “creeping professionalism” the enemy of liberal learning on American campuses. Potent and often cruel market forces, unchecked by forces of equivalent power, make it increasingly difficult to define how professionals should behave to clients and the general public. What has happened to the concept of vocation or calling? Given radical economic and technological change, will the professions survive in their recognizable forms, evolve into radically different entities, or dissolve entirely? Are the methods that have been developed for educating professionals adequate to the current intellectual, practical, and ethical demands of these roles?
METHOD

To answer these questions, we will turn to the Greek philosopher Aristotle. As the West’s first economist, political scientist, and ethicist, and one of its earliest public relations consultants, Aristotle was passionately interested in human society and communication. He recognized that passions, not abstract principles, motivate human action; that excellence, not some insipid notion of goodness, inspires human goals; that persuasion, not sheer logic, instigates change. Unlike Plato, who believed the Good, the True, and the Beautiful are one, Aristotle insisted these values are multiple and competitive. For the sake of social balance and cohesion, they must be defined and justified through public debate and argument. As a thinker, he believed in a dynamic world of synergy. As a moralist, he steered a middle course between bean-counting and breast-beating.

Aristotle’s philosophy consists of three parts, each bearing on this writing course:

♦ RHETORIC (the art of persuasion): Aristotle was the first writer to define different audiences and appeals, to classify the different occasions of argument, to teach how to find the right topic, and to advise what styles were best suited to what subjects. But for Aristotle, rhetoric means more than converting others to our agenda. It means communication as character- and community-building. A good modern equivalent would be a corporate mission statement. As D.C. consultants Patricia Jones and Larry Kahaner note, “For Aristotle, positions should be manifestos. Corporate mission statements, therefore, should outline in specific terms what we aspire to be and how we intend to realize our corporate aims. No other document reveals more about a company’s values and ethics than mission statement. It is a map for the high road. So say it and live it!”

♦ ETHICS (the art of conduct): Words must lead to action in the real world, but how do we judge our conduct? Aware of shifting contexts and competing goods, Aristotle didn’t believe we could rely on fixed rules and principles. Instead, he maintained, we must cultivate arête, commonly translated as “virtue” but actually closer to “excellence,” our personal best. According to Aristotle, true virtue is passion and instinct tempered and
mediated by reason. Manuel Velasquez, professor of management and business ethics at the Harvard Business School explains: “What distinguishes humans from other creatures, Aristotle held, is the ability to reason, and so the distinguishing purpose of human beings is to exercise reason in all our activities. Moral virtues, then, are habits that enable us to live according to reason; that is, when we as professionals know and choose the reasonable ground between going too far and not going far enough in our actions, emotions, and desires.”

**POLITICS (the art of organization):** Gods and beasts can exist in solitude, said Aristotle, but human beings exercise their humanity only through association. This perspective provides a necessary antidote to the rabid individualism and frenzied competition that have poisoned American industry for the past 20 years. To quote Robert Solomon, professor of philosophy and business ethics at the University of Texas at Austin: “The Aristotelian approach to business ethics and communication and the leading question for business in the 21st century begins with the idea that the corporation is first and foremost a community.” From Aristotle, young writers in the professions can learn how to break down and analyze organizational systems, weave networks and forge consensus, mediate and moderate tensions and conflicts, and create and adhere to values benefiting both shareholders and stakeholders.

Aristotle’s trinity clearly dovetails, just as his three great treatises, *The Art of Rhetoric*, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, and *The Politics*, echo each other. All aspire to phronesis, practical wisdom, the capacity to order all parts of ourselves and all components of our actions, personal and professional, in a realistic and effective way. “The person of practical wisdom is like an archer,” Aristotle explained. “In speaking and acting, there are infinite ways to get things wrong; but to act and speak in the right way, at the right time, with the right emphasis, with the right regard to the right persons, and with an exact appreciation for all the relevant circumstances, is to hit the mark exactly, like an arrow thudding into a bull’s-eye.” For Aristotle, then, good action and good communication represent not so much a law obeyed as an action well executed. The best rhetoric, the best ethics, and the best policy, therefore, are the most on target.

If these concepts seem too complicated, relax. Ultimately, the Aristotelian approach to professional communication, ethics, and organization comes down to two simple ideas: 1) While professional life has its specific goals and distinctive practices, and different professionals have their particular concerns, loyalties, roles, and responsibilities, **no “professional world” exists apart from the people who work in these professions**—or the greater society in which they are citizens. 2) **The integrity of these professionals determines the integrity of their professions**, and vice versa.
OVERVIEW

To apply Aristotle’s principles to professional writing, we will rely on debate, case studies, and dossiers. Every class includes group discussion on a political, ethical, or rhetorical issue affecting your profession. These talks will cultivate the critical thinking necessary to complete class writing assignments. Although class lectures sometimes focus on the American auto industry, my own area of expertise, you are expected to investigate and report on research topics within your particular field, ideally on subjects reflecting your personal and professional interests.

Drawing on class discussion and case studies, this course is divided into four sections. Each section is dedicated to a particular form of rhetoric and organized around a matching Aristotelian concept.

1) “POSITIONS AND PRINCIPLES” covers definitive rhetoric, the basic concepts and terms of ethical persuasion. How do communicators in the professions identify issues, profile audiences, analyze specific rhetorical situations, and define the terms of debate? As we answer these questions, we will explore Aristotle’s nuanced understanding of TRUTH.

2) “WHEELS AND DEALS” turns to deliberative rhetoric, the form of persuasion concerned with future decisions. How do communicators in the professions propose change and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different strategies for their audience? Deliberative arguments can be internal, focused on a specific organization, or external, involving multiple outside audiences. Either way, a plan of action must seem fitting and elegant, hence our study of Aristotle’s concept of BEAUTY.

3) “LAWS AND LEDGERS” investigates forensic or judicial rhetoric, the form of persuasion concerned with past actions. When things go wrong, tragically wrong, how should communicators in the professions trace causes, form credible and compelling narratives, and rebut criticism? As we will see in our discussion of tort law, these tasks are never easy because too often saving face becomes more desirable than doing right, the letter of the law more important than genuine ethics. To avoid these pitfalls without tilting at windmills, we will consider Aristotle’s complicated ideas about GOODNESS.

4) “MISSIONS AND LOGOS” addresses ceremonial or demonstrative rhetoric, the form of persuasion concerned with present values. How do communicators in the professions promote ideas, inspire passion and commitment, and build community, both within their organizations and in the outside world? Fittingly, we will conclude the course with Aristotle’s beliefs about UNITY.
COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Junior standing. Any one of the following prerequisites: Argument (WRTG-20100), Writing for the Workplace (WRTG-21100), or Technical Writing (WRTG-21300); or Academic Writing I (WRTG-10600) and three courses at level 2 or above in the social sciences or the professions.

Clear professional goals and strong problem-solving skills are also desirable. Focus and direction will enhance class performance. So will an ability to apply knowledge from your own profession to case studies, and to share that knowledge with those from other professions.

ASSIGNMENTS

Your final grade is based on these oral and written assignments. The latter include circulars, letters, brochures, press releases, display ads, and radio and TV scripts (250 to 750 words each).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENT, PERCENTAGE, AND PURPOSE</th>
<th>GENRE AND DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Class Forums (20%)** | **Oratory**
Sharpen the communication and analytical skills necessary for good consulting. Roundtables, debates, and oral reports in each of the course’s four sections. From the perspective of your own profession, be prepared to dialogue and argue with students from other professions on controversies concerning the auto industry. |
| **Position Dossier (20%)** | **Definitive Rhetoric**
Establishes your professional voice and research goals and teaches the basics of policy making and legislation. Designed to identify your strengths and weaknesses as an individual writer, this assignment requires you to work alone. Define a concept or issue within your field in a group of 3 to 4 documents. Include a problem description, legislative history, or position paper (750 to 1,000 words) and a periodic, progress, or completion report (1,000 to 2,000 words). Some examples from the auto industry: Are SUV’s actually trucks? What exactly is whiplash? Is road rage a legitimate legal defense? Are emissions standards fair and scientifically accurate? |
| **Proposal Packet (20%)** | **Deliberative Rhetoric**
Cultivates collaboration and exercises problem-solving skills. Since you must examine your profession within a broad context, work with one or two partners from identical or related fields. Propose a change within your field in a portfolio of 3 to 4 documents. Include a petition, proposal, problem description, or legislative history (750 to 1,000 words) and a proposal report or feasibility study, or completion report (1,000 to 2,000 words). The proposed change can be operational (a new manufacturing process or employee fitness plan), communal (a scholarship or art bequest), or legal (tougher laws or new industry standards). Identify the problem, evaluate the alternatives, present the best solution, and implement it. |

TOTAL: 2,000 to 4,500 words.
**Ethics Probe (20%)**
Introduces legal thinking and writing, teaches investigative reportage, and sharpens crisis management skills. This assignment explores conflict and clashing values. For the best results, work with two to three partners, some of whom must come from competing or opposing fields.

**Forensic Rhetoric**
Document and report on a civil or criminal case within your field in a file of 4 to 5 documents. Include a trip or science report (1,000 to 2,000 words); a briefing memo, public testimony, or a public comment document (750 to 1,000 words); and a legal opinion letter, legal research memo, or court brief (1,000 to 2,000 words). From defective products, to financial fraud, to environmental and labor violations, there is no dearth of material. Play investigator, lawyer, and publicist. Describe and document the incident, trace and analyze its cause, defend or attack the industry, and determine reparations. Above all, create a compelling narrative.

**Group Mission Project (20%)**
Builds consensus and creates shared institutional values. Summarizing the course’s major themes, this large-group assignment requires you to work with four or five partners from multiple fields.

**Ceremonial Rhetoric**
Working with a multi-professional task force, promote a new vision or mission for an organization in the public or private sector. This joint collection of 5 to 6 documents should include:
1) SWOT analysis (750 to 1,000 words); 2) a mission statement (750 to 1,000 words); 3) a policy statement, a procedure, or a manual excerpt (1,000 to 2,000 words); 4) public comment document (750 to 1,000 words).

Your project can be as simple as revising a division’s current operational goals or a company’s existing mission statement, or as complicated as creating an environmental initiative, rethinking overseas labor practices, or pushing fuel-efficient or alternative-energy vehicles. Heed Aristotle’s warning: Don’t be abstract or naive. Real values are meant for living in the real world.

These portfolio assignments are focused enough to allow you to participate in our on-going debate on the knowledge economy, but open enough to allow you to write for and about your particular field. You are welcome, therefore, to produce discipline-specific documents not covered in class. Occupational therapists may submit SOAP notes, environmentalists EPIs and lab reports, MBAs business plans, legislators and lobbyists motions and bills. All portfolios should include a title page and a two-part cover memo (750 to 1,000 words). The first part discusses case purpose, audience analysis, rhetorical strategy, primary and secondary research, document design, and editorial choices. The second evaluates individual or group performance and comments on the writing process itself (brainstorming, outlining, drafting, and revision).
IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE

Like your supervisors and fellow employees, visible and invisible constituents, and private and public regulatory agencies, I expect only the best from you. Dealing with human lives and values, communication within the professions can neither afford nor tolerate fuzzy thinking, sloppy writing, or slipshod ethics. Hence these grading criteria:

♦ D work is substandard. Poor effort, empty thinking, weak writing. The assignment is underwritten, incomplete, or riddled with careless mechanical errors.

♦ C work is competent. Minimum effort, standard thinking, conventional writing. While the assignment is complete and glitch-less, it lacks originality, invention, and creativity.

♦ B work is good. Genuine effort, sound thinking, solid writing. The assignment takes risks, holds promises, but still needs improvement.

♦ A work is excellent. Enthusiastic effort, original thinking, distinguished writing. The assignment demonstrates expertise and style and balances creative and analytical thinking.

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

1) ATTEND CLASS: Poor attendance definitely will affect your final grade. Keep up with all readings and participate in all class activities and workshops. Should you miss class, contact a classmate for any missing assignments or lecture notes. Also, turn in work on time even if you cannot do so in person. Two absences are allowed without penalty, but each subsequent absence lowers your final average by half a letter grade. According to Department of Writing policy, six absences will result in dismissal from this course.

Please note the holidays listed in the Undergraduate Catalog’s academic calendar. In accordance with New York State law, students who miss class due to their religious beliefs shall be excused from class or examinations on that day. Such students must notify course instructors at least one week before any anticipated absence so that proper arrangements may be made to make up any missed work or examination without penalty.
2) **Embrace Practice:** Professional writing is *recursive*, a *process* more than a product, moving from brainstorming and outlining to drafting and revision and then cycling back. For each written assignment, peers will comment on your draft in class on days marked as “workshop.” Instructor feedback will be given prior to due date as well as on submitted drafts. This practice will sharpen your thinking and improve your writing. Indeed, you will learn that writing itself is a way of thinking.

3) **Meet Deadlines:** They are the bottom line in professional communication. *Late papers will not be accepted.* Revisions are due *one week* after receiving an evaluated first draft. No revisions for final dossier.

4) **Be Honest:** This isn’t a course in industrial espionage. A plagiarized paper will receive an F, and you will be asked to withdraw from the course.

5) **Seek Help When Necessary:** First, visit The Writing Center, Smiddy 107—a free resource facility where, at scheduled times throughout the week, you may consult with trained student and faculty tutors about your writing.

Second, in compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the American Disabilities Act, reasonable accommodations will be provided to students with documented disabilities on a case-by-case basis. Students must register with the Office of Academic Support Services (110 Towers Concourse) and provide appropriate documentation before any academic adjustment will be provided.

**WRITING INTENSIVE REQUIREMENT, ICC, AND THE E-PORTFOLIO**

The Committee for College-Wide Requirements (CCR) has designated this course as “Writing Intensive” (W) within the Integrative Core Curriculum (ICC). If you entered Ithaca College in 2013 or later, you are required to take at least one W course and to upload appropriate artifact(s) to your ePortfolio on Taskstream to demonstrate your achievement of the Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) listed below.

Writing Intensive courses build on your ability to use writing both as a process for *making meaning* within a *specific subject area*, as well as for participating in *ongoing conversations* within a *particular academic or professional community*. Upon completion of a Writing Intensive course, you will be able to:

1. Develop and articulate content knowledge and critical thinking in a specific academic discipline or related profession through frequent practice of informal and formal writing.

2. Demonstrate understanding of audience expectations, genres, and conventions appropriate to communicating in a specific academic discipline or related profession.
3. Compose one or more documents totaling at least 3,000 words through multiple stages of writing, including brainstorming, drafting, integrating sources, and revising comprehensively after receiving substantial, formative feedback on drafts.

Writing for the Professions meets these three objectives and can provide you with many appropriate artifacts for Taskstream, the ePortfolio and assessment system for the Integrative Core Curriculum (ICC). This system is easy to use. On the Taskstream homepage, you will view two Directed Response Folios (DRF) programs, an icon for ICC, and one for Academic Writing 10600. The ICC DRF will include a marker for you to upload artifacts for the Writing Intensive Requirement. I would be happy to make recommendations for your ePortfolio.

PROFESSING KNOWLEDGE is never merely academic. “The peculiar character of the problem of a rational economic order,” Friedrich Hayek states in “The Use of Knowledge in Society” (1945), “is determined precisely by the fact that the knowledge of the circumstances of which we must make use never exists in concentrated or integrated form but solely as the dispersed bits of incomplete and frequently contradictory knowledge which all the separate individuals possess. The economic problem of society is thus not merely a problem of how to allocate ‘given’ resources—if ‘given’ is taken to mean given to a single mind which deliberately solves the problem set by these ‘data.’ It is rather a problem of how to secure the best use of resources known to any of the members of society, for ends whose relative importance only these individuals know. Or, to put it briefly, it is a problem of the utilization of knowledge which is not given to anyone in its totality.

Jimmy Wales cites “The Use of Knowledge in Society,” which he read as an undergraduate, as “central” to his thinking about “how to manage Wikipedia.” Information, Hayek realized, is now decentralized. Because knowledge is unevenly dispersed among different members of society, decisions are best made by those with local knowledge rather than by a central authority. Such expertise, however, must be based on civic-minded integrity. Under Aristotle’s tutelage and with some help from your colleagues, you can cultivate the necessary ethos to become an ambassador for your profession in a tricky and dangerous world. For Aristotle, this is the acid test of rhetoric. “Proof of character,” he maintained, “is the ultimate and sovereign proof in argument.”
CALENDAR

FROM ATHENS TO WALL STREET: “IN SEARCH OF ARISTOTLE”

JAN 21: ORIENTATION

Writing for the professions and the agar

Handouts
♦ AAA, “Looming Crisis on Highway Funds, “Driving Costs,” and “Motorists’ Bill of Rights.”
♦ Harold Ford and Jim Hall, “Let’s Rebuild America.”

INTRODUCTORY WORKSHOP: “CONTEXTUALIZING YOUR PROFESSION”

1. State your profession and career goals.
2. Name the professions that collaborate, compete, and conflict with yours.
3. Identify your profession’s major regulatory and representative bodies and explain their respective missions, goals, and challenges.
4. Perform a trend analysis of your profession, using the PESTLE template:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>QUERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>What political factors or related legislation affect your profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>What economic conditions or trends challenge your profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological</td>
<td>What social issues and demographic shifts relate to your profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>What technological developments challenge your profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>What legal controversies, cases, and rulings apply to your profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>What environmental factors or problems have an impact on your profession?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JAN 23: RHETORICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXTS

Civics, rhetoric, and professional ethics

Morris, If Aristotle Ran General Motors
Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*

- Chapter One: “Professionalism and Problem Solving,” 1-23.

Smith, *Writing Public Policy*

- Chapter One: “Public Policy is Language Use,” 1-16.
- Conclusion: “Ethics for Policy Communication,” 199-203.

**JAN 28:**

**CHARACTER AND PASSION**

*Ethos, persona, and appeals*

Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*


*Handout*

- Carolyn Matalene, “Texts and Public Contexts.”

**POSITIONS AND PRINCIPLES: “DEFINING ISSUES”**

**JAN 30:**

**ISSUES AND CONSTITUENCIES**

*Audience and invention*

Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*

- Chapter Three: “Rhetorical Problem Solving,” 52-85.

Smith, *Writing Public Policy*

- Appendix A: “Writing Clearly,” 204-10.

*Handouts*

- Linda Flowers and John Ackerman, “Reading the Context.”
- Case Study 1: “Mountain Trails Horse Center.”

**FEB 04:**

**ORGANIZATION AND ARRANGEMENT**

*Designing arguments and documents for multiple audiences*

Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*

Smith, *Writing Public Policy*
- Appendix B: “Interpreting Data to Support Policy Argument” (*handout*)

*Handout*
- Carl Botan, “Lee Iacocca as Internal Issues Manager.”
- Alfred Pritchard Sloan, “Co-ordination by Committee.”

**FEB 06:** *Definitive Rhetoric*

*Defining issues and markets*

Morris, *If Aristotle Ran General Motors*

Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*
- Chapter Two: “Technical Problem Solving (Definition),” 24-49.

Smith, *Writing Public Policy*

*Handouts*
- Lester Faigley and Jack Selzer, “Definition Arguments and SUVs.”
- Paul Roberts, “Bad Sports.”
- Malcolm Gladwell, “Big and Bad.”
- Danny Hakim, “Block that Grill” and “The Price of Success.”

**FEB 11:** Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*
- Chapter Seven: “Solving Problems through Periodic (Progress) and Completion Reports,” 207-73.

Smith, *Writing Public Policy*
- Chapter Five: “Legislative History: Know the Record,” 81-102.

*Handouts*
- Tom O’Mara, “Legislative Update”
- Phil Kolin, “Writing Press Releases, Brochures, and Newsletters.”

**FEB 13:** Workshop 1.
**FEB 18:** Workshop 2.
WHEELS AND DEALS: “PROPOSING CHANGE”

FEB 20: POSITION DOSSIER DUE.

DELIBERATIVE RHETORIC
Evaluating policy and proposing change

Morris, *If Aristotle Ran General Motors*

Smith, *Writing Public Policy*

Handout
♦ Nicholas Lehman, “Conflicts of Interest.”
♦ Eric Gable and Richard Handler, “Colonial Williamsburg.”
♦ Chrysler, “Making the Mini-Van Safer.”

FEB 25: Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*
♦ From Chapter Eight: “Feasibility Studies,” 287-308.

Handouts
♦ Fareed Zakaria, “Imagine: 500 Miles Per Gallon.”
♦ Elizabeth Kolbert, “The Car of Tomorrow.”
♦ General Motors, “Who’s Driving the Hydrogen Economy?”

FEB 27: Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*

Handouts
♦ Lester Faigley and Jack Selzer, “Proposal Arguments and Title IX.”
♦ Donna Tropiano, “Don’t Blame Title IX.”
♦ John Cogan and Glenn Hubbard, “Bringing the Market to Health Care.”

MAR 03: WORKSHOP 1.
MAR 05: WORKSHOP 2.
MAR 10: SPRING BREAK.
MAR 12: NO CLASS.
**LAWS AND LEDGERS: “JUDGING ACTIONS”**

**MAR 24:** PROPOSAL PACKET DUE.

**FORENSIC RHETORIC**  
Arguing cases through causation, narration, and rebuttal

Morris, *If Aristotle Ran General Motors*  
♦ Part Three: “Goodness,” 115-72

*Handout*  
♦ Notice: “Firestone Class Action Lawsuit.”  
♦ Harper’s, “No Shoes, No Service” and “Tooth and Consequences”

**MAR 26:** THE CALCULUS OF TORT  
Cost-benefit analysis and liability

Putnam, *Pocket Guide to Legal Writing*  
♦ Chapter Seven: “Preparing to Write,” 149-70.

*Handouts*  
♦ Adam Davidson, “Working Stiffs.”  
♦ Elizabeth Kolbert, “The Calculator.”

**MAR 31:** FACTS AND FORENSICS  
Research, evidence, and causal arguments

Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing* (Primary Evidence)  
♦ From Chapter Eight: “Trip Reports,” 274-87; “Scientific Reports,” 308-23.

Smith, *Writing Public Policy* (Secondary Evidence)  

Putnam, *Pocket Guide to Legal Writing*  
♦ Chapter Five: “Legal Citation,” 89-134.  
Handout
♦ James Glanz and Eric Lipton, “Report Disputes on the WTC Collapse.”

APR 02: COURTROOM DRAMA
Crafting narrative and rebuttal arguments

Putnam, Pocket Guide to Legal Writing
♦ Chapter Eight: “Legal Correspondence,” 171-88; Appendix A, 251-56.
♦ Chapter Nine: “Legal Research Memo,” 189-224; Appendix B, 257-64.
♦ Chapter Ten: “Court Briefs,” 225-49; Appendix C, 265-76.

Handouts
♦ Philip Cooney, “Revisions to Government Documents.”
♦ Sam Kazman, “CAFE is Bad for Your Health.”
♦ Matthew Philips, “Can We Really Forgive and Forget?”

APR 07: WORKSHOP 1.
APR 09: WORKSHOP 2.
APR 14: WORKSHOP 3.

MISSIONS AND LOGOS: “PROMOTING VALUES”

APR 16: ETHICS PROBE DUE.

CEREMONIAL RHETORIC
Accentuating the positive, eliminating the negative in organizations

Morris, If Aristotle Ran General Motors
♦ Part Four: “Unity,” 173-211.

Handouts
♦ Reibstein and Washington, “Lee’s Last Stand.”
♦ Iacocca, “Remarks to the Ethnic Heritage Council of the Pacific Northwest.”
APR 21:  Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*

*Handouts*
♦ Chrysler, “Customer Bill of Rights.”
♦ Avis, Goodyear, and Honda, “Mission Statements and Commentaries.”
♦ Honda, “Earth Day, Every Day.”
♦ Quick MBA, “SWOT Analysis.”

APR 23:  Kennedy and Montgomery, *Technical and Professional Writing*
♦ Chapter Five: “Collaborative Writing and the Uses of Technology,” 122-49.

**WORKSHOP 1.**

APR 28:  **WORKSHOP 2.**

APR 30:  **WORKSHOP 3.**

**CHANGING LANES: “THE ROAD TO ARÊTE”**

MAY 05:  **MISSION PROJECT DUE.**
Course Evaluations.

MAY 07:  Morris, *If Aristotle Ran General Motors*

Smith, *Writing Public Policy*
♦ Conclusion: “Ethics for Policy Communicators,” 199-203.

*Handouts*
♦ Michael J. Sandel, “What Isn’t for Sale?”
♦ Department of Writing, “Professional Writing Courses.”

**EXAM ORAL PRESENTATIONS**
**WEEK** TBA (Smiddy 109)