Prompt for Paper 2 2nd Paper – Academic Analysis For your second paper due on (Final Draft) Sunday, March 15th, by noon Analyze Acemoglu’s and Robinson’s arguments up through Chapter 4 from the book Why Nations Fail. In this paper, you will be analyzing (that is, breaking apart, identifying, and, to some degree, evaluating) the parts of their argument. Identify the features of their overall and supporting arguments, using the vocabulary of A Rhetoric of Argument by Jeanne Fahnestock and Marie Secor as much as possible, and explain what these writers are doing when they make these arguments. What makes this different from a summary is the fact that you are identifying the authors’ rhetorical movements with formal vocabulary, and explaining why you believe their arguments are what you say they are. These arguments should be throughout your paper, not in a separate section. Use your summarizing abilities to explain the rhetoric of Acemoglu and Robinson, but do not stop there. Identify the appropriate names of certain aspects of the arguments, and then make your case (for or against, partially-for, partially-against). At the end of your paper, and taking up at least one page (more is fine) write your assessment their arguments so far in this book. Do you agree with them, or not? Explain why the authors are convincing or if they are not, in your estimation, based on what you have learned about argument. Again, use as much of the vocabulary and ideas presented in Chapters 1-3 of Rhteoric as you can. 6-8 pages, no outside research necessary (since you are analyzing and evaluating the arguments based on their adherence to rhetoric as explained in A Rhetoric of Argument, not against other sources). Double-spaced (no spaces between paragraphs), 12-point font, 1-inch margins. Include a Works Cited page (Nations and Rhetoric) Rough Draft due – at least 3 pages in length: Sunday March 8th, by noon MLA Format Include a Works Cited page Quote extensively – about 30% of the paper. Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Grade\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Introduction and Thesis Statement Excel-lent Mostly achieves Develop-ing Needs Improve-ment The introductory paragraph introduces at least some of the formal terms from A Rhetoric of Argument. The Thesis Statement is a summing up of the analysis of the parts of Acemoglu’s and Robinson’s arguments that the writer has chosen and perhaps contains some judgment about the overall quality thereof. Development The paper carefully analyzes, using formal rhetorical terms from Chapters 1 and 2 of A Rhetoric of Argument, several components of the arguments of Chapters 1-6 of Why Nations Fail. The writer has organized the body of the paper under topic sentences which generally announce the subjects contained in their body paragraphs. These topic sentences overall support the Thesis Statement. The analysis performed by the writer on sources is largely correct and accurately categorizes the authors’ arguments. The writer includes some commentary, either in criticism or support, of the arguments under analysis. Use of Sources and Conclusion The writer has quoted well – neither too little nor too much (30% approximately) -- from the two books required for this paper. It is clear in the paper that the writer understands both formal rhetorical categorization and the arguments Acemoglu and Robinson put forth. The writer has not quoted in the conclusion or included new information, and has written a thorough summing up of his or her paper. Assignment Fulfillment The paper is at least six full pages in length. The writer’s sentences are clear and easy to understand. The writer has two or fewer grammatical errors per page, and none of the grammatical errors impedes understanding. The writer’s diction is clear and sophisticated, with an awareness of audience and some evidence of the development of a personal rhetorical style. The writer has followed MLA format for design and quoting