

Structural Critique of the Argument Structure:

Claim: This is a poorly articulated argument...

Reasoning: ...because the argument is not even apparent in the essay.

Warrant: In order to persuade us, a writer would typically need to articulate both the main argument and its logical reasoning up front where we can find it for ourselves and judge its correctness.

Ideological Response to the Argument Position

Claim: Lawmakers should have a better understanding of the female body...

Reasoning: ... because that knowledge will help them make better decisions about how to legislate.

Warrant: In the U.S. alone, women outnumber men 2-1 and so less knowledge about the female body will clearly impact any legislation that is designed to govern them.

(Warrant/Definition): In America, a lawmaker is someone who is clearly tasked with understanding his or her constituencies in order to make more effective laws for them.

Qualifier: Lawmakers are tasked with deciding the fates of women's bodies from a legislative perspective whereas other people in the community are not expected to have the same responsibility.

Structural Critique of the Argument Structure:

Claim: The argument is well built in this piece ...

Reasoning: ... because the writer states her claim and then goes on to support it with multiple quotes that illustrate her point by demonstrating the very ignorance of the people she's talking about.

Warrant: The abundance of instances that are illustrated by the quotes shows us that this kind of ignorance is not an isolated occurrence

Ideological Response to the Argument Position

Claim: Lawmakers need to have a better understanding on the subject of sex education...

Reasoning: ... because recent stories suggest they lack basic knowledge of a woman's body.

Warrant: If lawmakers are going to regulate women's bodies they need to have a good understanding of them

(Warrant/Definition): By sex education we mean being fluent in feminine reproductive biology.

Qualifier: Male lawmakers