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**ERWC Overview:**

For the second semester of English 12, students will be engaging in multiple units of the ERWC. For each unit, students will produce a writing assignment that may be completed in class or out of class, submitted online, receive peer review, and then choose one final paper to revise, strengthen and submit at the end of the semester.

All first draft submissions will be scored by peers, and those scores will help direct students to determine what skills they should focus on mastering.

**Essay Requirements:**

* Must use evidence from the ERWC sources/articles in your response
* Must use a thoughtful paragraph structure with clear topic sentences to form a well-connected argument
* Must use a strong thesis that establishes a logical argument
* Must use integrated quotations and balance solid evidence with thorough commentary
* Must focus on analysis of the way in which the authors argue their opinions, including how the authors use rhetorical devices ethos, pathos and logos

**ASSIGNMENT 1II: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS ESSAY**

**Prompt: The Rhetoric of the Op-Ed Page**  
When discussing animals and animal rights, it easy to get caught up in the emotional attachments we have to beliefs and traditions regarding animals. Some come from long-held traditions of hunting and fishing, where killing animals for food or sport is acceptable, and even an homage to natures beauty. Others vehemently disagree at the idea of even using animal based products like honey or leather. In discussing an argument that can feel so personal, most enter the discussion with a strong, established bias.

In the article “A Change of Heart About Animals”, by Jeremy Rikfin, the author uses a blend of rhetorical devices to make his argument that, “…many of our fellow creatures are more like us than we had ever imagined.” Rifkin’s submission to the L.A.Times Op-Ed page raises questions about our treatment of animals, and uses research based arguments to encourage his audience to change attitudes and to “expand and deepen our empathy” for animals. The two letters to the editor in response, by Bob Stevens and Lois Frazer, exemplify two arguments based on two different ideologies on how we might treat animals.

How do Rifkin, Stevens and Frazer use rhetorical devices to convince us to agree with their views? Who is the most convincing in their argument, and who uses rhetoric that is flawed or misguided? Which argument regarding the rights and treatment of animals should win, and why? Use evidence from the article and the two letters to analyze the arguments of these writers.
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