

SAMPLE WIKI JOURNAL ENTRIES

The argument made in The New York Times' Editorial Board's article "The Supreme Court Keeps Tinkering With Death" is expertly succinct and well made because of its clear claim, appeals to pathos, and its strong conclusion. The article first provides a clear definition of what it means by tinkering with death, then goes on to make a claim that because the Supreme Court is refusing to stop the use of the death penalty, it is therefore tinkering with death. Next the article shares the most recent Supreme Court ruling about the death penalty. This ruling overturned the sentencing to death of a mentally handicapped man in Texas. The anecdote about the recent ruling is an emotional appeal. It demonstrates how the death penalty is being used in ways that violate the Eighth Amendment and should be considered cruel and unusual punishment. It also shows that the Supreme Court has demonstrated a history of ruling against the death penalty. Finally, the article concludes by questioning why the Supreme Court, unlike the rest of the developed world, has not done away with the death penalty altogether. The article does this all without getting bogged down in wordy explanations. It also provides just enough evidence to make its point, without drowning the reader in information.

If an article can clarify definitions, state a claim, make an appeal to logos, pathos, or ethos, and close their argument in a way that makes the reader further consider their claim, then the article has made its argument well. Often, in order to accomplish all of these tasks, an argument will rely on a plethora of verbiage and deep, wordy explanations. When an argument can be made as brief as possible, without losing any of its strength, then it the argument can be deemed succinct. Since the New York Times' article was brief, but still held its strength, and made clear definitions, claims, appeals, and a strong conclusion, it was both succinct and well made. These standards can be found in all other strong arguments. Additionally, when these standards are removed from an argument it becomes noticeably, objectively weaker. Therefore, these standards can be associated with a well-made and succinct argument.

NY Times Editorial Board. "The Supreme Court Keeps Tinkering With Death." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 29 Mar. 2017.

The article "Art of Accounting: How to make tax season smoother this year" by Edward Mendlowitz in *Accounting Today* could not have been more relevant to my current work situation. As we are struggling at work to finalize 1099-K tax forms for our merchants, it was very helpful to read an article with advice regarding planning for a smooth tax season.

Mendlowitz's writing style is very straightforward and easy to understand, which is extremely effective. He gets his point across with minimal fluff, which is great for people who are busy and don't have a lot of time to commit to catching up on news articles. His tone is relatable, and you can tell he clearly has experience in the subject matter he is writing about. Sentences such as "Tax season can be a great opportunity or disaster" (para 2) demonstrate that he clearly knows his audience and what they are currently going through. He follows with a clear breakdown of advice, making it easy for readers to absorb the main points he wants to get across.

This article was published at an extremely relevant time. Everyone in the accounting profession is currently feeling the stress of tax season and likely pondering ways they could have made this process smoother. With very helpful tips ranging from training to process control, this article is useful for brainstorming strategies for next year's season. I also appreciate that Mendlowitz

included a link for an additional checklist at the end of this article. This shows he clearly understands his audience and knows that it is a great strategy to cover the basics in a quick, easy to read article, as to not alienate any casual readers. This feels accessible to anyone in the chain of tax season command, and readers who want to dig deeper in the topic have the opportunity to engage in further reading.

This was a very enjoyable article and I personally feel that I learned enough to provide some suggestions to my team at work, as we are all feeling the stress of tax season this year and can certainly use these tips for future seasons. The article was effectively communicated and contained valuable insight from an expert in the field.

Argument tactics in politics:

After reading numerous articles and hearing several speeches by the new president of the United States, I have become aware of some tactics he uses in his arguments. Although the tactics are powerful, a lack of refinement in his arguments seems to be the connate failure at reaching a large portion of the population and perhaps the cause of the onset of much major political controversy of recent.

A diversity of beliefs keeps important complex issues in discussion enhancing freedom by allowing for democracy rather than an institution of one-sided beliefs. Therefore, a diversity of beliefs should be respected and appreciated. People hold their political and religious beliefs as reflections of themselves which is why an attack on these beliefs creates social discontent.

I believe our nation's president's arguments raise so much controversy because they address strongly personal issues (political beliefs being very personal) without consideration and respect for the opposing view. In an article from the New York Times discussing the president's criticisms of the judicial system former federal judge, Michael W. McConnell exclaims, "Mr. Trump is shredding longstanding norms of etiquette and interbranch comity." It is not that presidential disagreements with court rulings are unprecedented, it is the lack of tact and diplomacy in expressing those opposing views.

Though Mr. Trump's arguments win over many, a large portion of his constituency has become alienated to the extent that a great civil uneasiness has developed. An emotionally fueled division of minds has lead to public violence. For example, riots like the one at UC Berkeley where innocent people suffered. There have also been country wide spikes in hate crimes. I think standing up for what you believe is everyone's right and trying to persuade others can be done respectfully--which should be a priority for a president of the US to promote peace among citizens.

The president's arguments consist of pathos, false logos and very little ethos. Without utilizing ethos, those whom will be hardest to convince will be nearly impossible to reach. It will also lead to a negative judgment of character. The false logos, which relies on emotional appeal also deteriorates ethos.

His arguments sometimes appear to follow logical structure but often are not logically sound. For example in his declaration to run for the presidency, he argued that other candidates didn't even know the air conditioner didn't work. He then asks, how could you trust them to be able to fight ISIS? It seems logical to assume that if one can't fix an easy problem, then they can't fix a hard problem. But this is not sound reasoning. Perhaps they didn't care about the air conditioning because it was not important. Also, knowing about air conditioning does not make you knowledgeable about tactical defense and vis versa.

I believe fewer tactics, more tact, more integrity of speech will develop a common interest in a larger audience. Check facts and make more claims based on actual logic and ethos rather than emotional appeal and perhaps it will lessen the negative impact of controversial arguments. I fear the current tactics will not resonate well with foreign relations.

Cars with self driving features can be found on roads all across the country. According to tech news feeds, Google, and any fan of Elon Musk, they are the fleet of the future and the days of fully autonomous vehicles are almost upon us. Critics have attacked self driving cars from many angles including logic and ethics. In "The Cybersecurity Risk of Self-Driving Cars" Jason Kornwitz provides a detailed argument against their safety from a new angle, cybersecurity.

Jason's point is clearly made through a simple yet sufficient opening paragraph. By immediately following the introduction with a testimonial about the potential for vulnerabilities in modern self driving cars, Jason grabs the reader's attention and then offers them an appeal to ethos and logos. While introducing the testimonial he clearly states the positions of prestige held by professor Engin Kirda, the voice of the testimonial. After his appeal to ethos he seamlessly moves on to the appeal to logos.

Another strong tactic used in this article is the use of questioning. By posing an open ended question early in the article, Jason gets the reader to engage more in the reading. This engagement helps ensure the reader will pay more attention to the argument being presented. However, the particular question asked has an excellent, and less obvious, secondary function. Jason asks "What makes [self driving cars] so vulnerable?" In order to successfully make his argument, this question must be answered. By asking the readers this question, Jason appeals to the readers own knowledge. This question opens the reader up to start searching for reasons why self driving cars are vulnerable. The article then simply has to toss vulnerabilities to the reader who will gladly accept them as they search to answer the original question.

Throughout the rest of the article Jason continues the appeals to ethos and logos all while feeding the idea of self driving cars being vulnerable to cybersecurity threats. His frequent references to different figures of authority followed by their explanations of potential vulnerabilities provide a solid stream of credible facts which back his argument against the security of self driving cars.

Jason's expert use of questioning primes the reader to accept the facts of his argument. By combining this with a clear cut appeal to ethos and logos Jason has crafted a very strong argument against the cybersecurity of self driving cars.