

T H I R D E D I T I O N

**CRITICAL
THINKING
READING
AND
WRITING**

A Brief Guide to Argument

Sylvan Barnet • Hugo Bedau

**CRITICAL THINKING,
READING, AND
WRITING**

A Brief Guide to Argument

THIRD EDITION

SYLVAN BARNET

Professor of English, Tufts University

HUGO BEDAU

Professor of Philosophy, Tufts University

Bedford/St. Martin's BOSTON • NEW YORK

For Bedford/St. Martin's

Developmental Editor: Stephen A. Scipione

Production Editors: Karen S. Baart, Stasia Zomkowski

Production Supervisor: Scott Lavelle

Marketing Manager: Karen Melton

Editorial Assistant: Maura Shea

Production Assistants: Coleen O'Hanley, Helaine Denenberg

Copyeditor: Lisa Wehrle

Text Design: Sandra Rigney

Cover Design: Donna Lee Dennison

Composition: Pine Tree Composition, Inc.

Printing and Binding: Haddon Craftsmen, Inc.

President: Charles H. Christensen

Editorial Director: Joan E. Feinberg

Director of Editing, Design, and Production: Marcia Cohen

Managing Editor: Elizabeth M. Schaaf

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 98-85189

Copyright © 1999 by Bedford/St. Martin's

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, except as may be expressly permitted by the applicable copyright statutes or in writing by the Publisher.

Manufactured in the United States of America.

2 1 0
f e

For information, write: Bedford/St. Martin's, 75 Arlington Street, Boston, MA 02116
(617-426-7440)

ISBN: 0-312-17153-6

Acknowledgments

Derek Bok, "Protecting Freedom of Expression on the Campus" (editors' title) from "Protecting Freedom of Expression at Harvard" from *The Boston Globe* (May 25, 1991). Copyright © 1991 by Derek Bok. Reprinted with the permission of the author.

Robert Bork, "Addicted to Health" [editors' title] from *The National Review* (July 28, 1997). Copyright © 1997 by National Review, Inc. Reprinted with the permission of National Review, Inc., 215 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10016.

Judy Brady, "I Want a Wife" from *Ms.* (1971). Copyright © 1971 by Judy Brady. Reprinted with the permission of the author.

Lois M. Brenner, "Take the Pain Away" from *The New York Times* (February 21, 1996), "Letters to the Editor." Reprinted with the permission of the author.

Susan Brownmiller, "Let's Put Pornography Back in the Closet" from *Newsday* (1979). Copyright © 1979 by Susan Brownmiller. Reprinted with the permission of the author.

Acknowledgments and copyrights are continued at the back of the book on pages 452-453, which constitute an extension of the copyright page. It is a violation of the law to reproduce these selections by any means whatsoever without the written permission of the copyright holder.

Preface

This book is a text about critical thinking and argumentation—a book about getting ideas, using sources, evaluating kinds of evidence, and organizing material. It also includes about fifty readings, with a strong emphasis on contemporary arguments. In a moment we will be a little more specific about what sorts of readings we include, but first we want to mention our chief assumptions about the aims of a course that might use *Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument*.

Probably most students and instructors would agree that, *as critical readers*, students should be able to

- summarize accurately an argument they have read;
- locate the thesis of an argument;
- locate the assumptions, stated and unstated;
- analyze and evaluate the strength of the evidence and the soundness of the reasoning offered in support of the thesis;
- analyze, evaluate, and account for discrepancies among various readings on a topic (for example, explain why certain facts are used or not used, why two sources might interpret the same facts differently).

Probably, too, students and instructors would agree that, *as thoughtful writers*, students should be able to

- imagine an audience, and write effectively for it (by such means as using the appropriate tone and providing the appropriate amount of detail);
- present information in an orderly and coherent way;
- be aware of own assumptions;
- incorporate sources into their own writing, not simply by quoting extensively or by paraphrasing, but also by having digested materials so that they can present it in their own words;
- properly document all borrowings—not merely quotations and paraphrases but also borrowed ideas;
- do all these things in the course of developing a thoughtful argument of their own.

Parts One and Two Part One (Chapters 1–3) and Part Two (Chapters 4–6) taken together offer a short course in methods of thinking about arguments and in methods of writing arguments. By “thinking” we mean serious analytic thought, including analysis of one’s own assumptions (Chapter 1); by “writing” we mean the use of effective, respectable techniques, not gimmicks such as the notorious note a politician scribbled in the margin of the text of his speech: “Argument weak; shout here.” For a delightfully wry account of the use of gimmicks, we recommend that you consult “The Art of Controversy,” in *The Will to Live*, by the nineteenth-century German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer. Schopenhauer reminds his reader that a Greek or Latin quotation (however irrelevant) can be impressive to the uninformed, and that one can knock down almost any argument by loftily saying, “That’s all very well in theory, but it won’t do in practice.”

We offer lots of advice about setting forth an argument, but we do not offer instruction in one-upmanship. Rather, we discuss responsible ways of arguing persuasively. We know, however, that before one can write a persuasive argument one must clarify one’s own ideas—and that includes arguing with oneself—to find out what one really thinks about a problem. Therefore we devote Chapter 1 to critical thinking, Chapters 2 and 3 to critical reading, and Chapters 4, 5, and 6 to critical writing. These chapters are not all lecturing. Parts One and Two together contain thirty-five readings (three are by students) for analysis and discussion. Moreover, each of the three chapters in Part One contains a casebook, a group of closely related readings. For instance, the casebook in Chapter 1 consists of a newspaper editorial on divorce, followed by five letters that were written in response to the editorial.

All of the essays in the book are accompanied by questions. This is not surprising, given the emphasis we place on asking oneself questions to get ideas for writing. Among the chief questions that writers should ask, we suggest, are such matters as “What is *X*?” and “What is the value of *X*?” (pp. 3–9). By asking such questions—for instance (to look only at these two types of questions), “Is the fetus a person?” or “Is Arthur Miller a better playwright than Tennessee Williams?”—a writer probably will find ideas coming, at least after a few moments of head-scratching. The device of developing an argument by identifying issues is, of course, nothing new; indeed, it goes back to an ancient method of argument used by classical rhetoricians, who proceeded by identifying a *stasis* (an issue) and then asked questions about it: Did *X* do such-and-such? If so, was the action bad? If bad, how bad? (Finding an issue or *stasis*—a position where one stands—by asking questions is discussed in Chapter 5.)

In keeping with our emphasis on writing as well as reading, we raise issues not only of what can roughly be called the “content” of the essays but also of what can (equally roughly) be called the “style”—that is, the ways in which the arguments are set forth. Content and style, of course,

cannot finally be kept apart. As Cardinal Newman said, “Thought and meaning are inseparable from each other. . . . *Style is thinking out into language.*” In our questions we sometimes ask the student to evaluate the effectiveness of the opening paragraph, or to explain a shift in tone from one paragraph to the next, or to characterize the persona of the author as revealed in the whole essay. In short, the book is not designed as an introduction to some powerful ideas (though in fact it is that, too); it is designed as an aid to writing thoughtful, effective arguments on important political, social, scientific, ethical, and religious issues.

The essays reprinted in this book also illustrate different styles of argument that arise, at least in part, from the different disciplinary backgrounds of the various authors. Essays by journalists, lawyers, judges, social scientists, policy analysts, philosophers, critics, activists, and other writers—including undergraduates—will be found in these pages. The authors develop and present their views in arguments that have distinctive features reflecting their special training and concerns. The differences in argumentative styles found in these essays foreshadow the differences students will encounter in the readings assigned in many of their other courses. (Part Three, which offers a philosopher’s view, a logician’s view, a psychologist’s view, a lawyer’s view, and a literary critic’s view, also reveals differences in argumentative styles.)

Parts One and Two, then, are a preliminary (but we hope substantial) discussion of such topics as *identifying assumptions, getting ideas by means of invention strategies, using sources, evaluating kinds of evidence, and organizing material*, as well as an introduction to some ways of thinking.

Part Three “Further Views on Argument” consists of Chapters 7–11. The first of these, Chapter 7, “A Philosopher’s View: The Toulmin Model,” is a summary of the philosopher Stephen Toulmin’s method for analyzing arguments. This summary will assist those who wish to apply Toulmin’s methods to the readings in our book. The next chapter, “A Logician’s View,” offering a more rigorous analysis of deduction, induction, and fallacies than is usually found in composition courses, reexamines from a logician’s point of view material already treated briefly in Chapter 3. Chapter 9, with an essay by psychotherapist Carl R. Rogers, complements the discussion of audience, organization, and tone in Chapter 5. Chapter 10, “A Lawyer’s View: Steps toward Civic Literacy,” introduces students to some basic legal concepts, such as the distinction between civil and criminal cases, and then gives majority and minority decisions in three cases: searching students for drugs, burning the flag, protesting the draft. We accompany these decisions with questions that invite the student to participate in these exercises in democracy. The last chapter in Part Three, “A Literary Critic’s View: Arguing about Literature,” should help students to see what sorts of things literary critics argue about and *how* they argue. Students can apply what they learn not only to the literary readings that appear in the chapter (poems by Robert Frost and

Andrew Marvell, stories by Kate Chopin and Jean Rhys, and a casebook concerning the national anthem) but also to other literature they may encounter in the course.

WHAT'S NEW TO THE THIRD EDITION

In the first edition of this book we quoted Edmund Burke and John Stuart Mill. Burke said, "He that wrestles with us strengthens our nerves, and sharpens our skill. Our antagonist is our helper." Mill said, "He who knows only his own side of the cause knows little." We can regret the aggressive language in Burke and the sexist language in Burke and Mill, but these two quotations continue to reflect the view of argument that underlies this text. When one writes an argument, one is not setting out to trounce an opponent, and that is partly why such terms as *marshaling evidence*, *attacking an opponent*, and *defending a thesis* are misleading. True, in television talk shows we see people who have made up their minds and who are concerned only with pushing their own view and brushing aside all other views. But in writing an essay one is engaging in a serious effort to know what one's own ideas are and, having found them, to contribute to a multisided conversation. We learn by listening to others and also by listening to ourselves; we draft a response to something we have read, and in the very act of drafting we may find—if we think critically about the words we are putting down on paper—we are changing (perhaps slightly, perhaps radically) our own position. Even if we do not drastically change our view, the reader at the very least comes to understand why we hold the view we do.

In preparing the third edition we were greatly aided by suggestions from instructors who were using the second edition. In line with their recommendations, in Part One, "Critical Thinking and Reading," we have added checklists to each of the three chapters (checklists for critical thinking, for examining assumptions, for getting started, for examining statistical evidence, and for analyzing an argument), and we have also added casebooks (on divorce, free speech, and bilingual education) to each chapter.

We have also added checklists to Part Two, "Critical Writing," and in the chapter on the research paper we now include advice on using electronic sources. (A new appendix provides a list of World Wide Web sources for the current issues in this book.) We have somewhat heightened the reader's awareness of classical rhetoric by including discussion of topics such as *ethos*, *logos*, *pathos*, *stasis*, and, for that matter, *topos*.

In Part Three, we have increased the number of literary selections in "A Literary Critic's View," and in an effort to increase civic literacy, we have added "A Lawyer's View," with three legal cases (majority and minority opinions). We think that our prefatory material in "A Lawyer's View" concerning such matters as facts and the law and the balancing of interests will help students think not only about the legal cases included

in Chapter 10 and in other chapters but also about cases they read in the daily newspaper.

We close with a “Casebook on the State and the Individual,” with readings from Sophocles, Plato, and Martin Luther King, Jr.

Note: For instructors who require a text with a large number of essays, a longer edition of this book, *Current Issues and Enduring Questions*, Fifth Edition, is also available. The longer version contains Parts One, Two, and Three (Chapters 1–11) of the present book as well as its own anthology of nearly eighty additional readings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Finally, it is our pleasant duty to thank those who have strengthened the book by their advice: Lawrence Anderson, Louisiana State University–Shreveport; Evelyn D. Asch, DePaul University; Larry Beason, Eastern Washington University; Donavin Bennes, University of North Dakota; Earnest Cox, Texas Christian University; Ian Crawford, Berry College; Tracy A. Crouch, Stephen F. Austin State University; Ann Ellsworth, University of Washington; Elaine Elmo, Stanley Community College; Larry D. Engel, Rochester Community and Technical College; James M. Ewing, Fresno City College; Jill Fieldkamp, Wartburg College; Karl Fornes, University of Minnesota–Morris; Paula F. Furr, United States Military Academy; Lillis Gilmartin, Sierra Heights College; Eric H. Hobson, St. Louis College of Pharmacy; William T. Hope, Jefferson Technical College; Jane Janssen, Bellevue Community College; K. Kaleta, Rowan College; Cathy Kaye, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee; Janice Kollity, Riverside Community College; Mary R. Lamb, Texas Christian University; Mary Macaluso, New Mexico Highlands University; Barbara J. McGuire, University of Wisconsin; Jonathan Murrow, West Virginia University; Jeanne Purdy, University of Minnesota–Morris; Lindy J. Rawling, Moorpark College; Ed Reben, Dixie College; Sally Scholz, Purdue University; Christine M. Smith, Butler University; John E. Stowe, Fordham University; Charles Tita, Shaw University; Allen Wall, Chabot College; Eric A. Weil, Shaw University.

We would like especially to thank Janet E. Gardner of the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, who revised the research chapter to encompass the latest advice and information on using electronic sources and who prepared the new appendix of Web sites. A timely conversation with Phyllis West of El Camino Community College prompted us to include Sophocles’ classic play *Antigone* in the book; our thanks to her as well.

We are also indebted to the people at Bedford/St. Martin’s, especially Charles H. Christensen, Joan E. Feinberg, Steve Scipione, Elizabeth M. Schaaf, Karen Baart, Stasia Zomkowski, and Maura Shea, who offered many valuable (and invaluable) suggestions. Intelligent, informed, firm yet courteous, they really know how to think, and how to argue.

Contents

Preface

iii

Part One

CRITICAL THINKING AND READING	1
1 Critical Thinking	3
THINKING ABOUT DRIVER'S LICENSES AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE: IMAGINATION, ANALYSIS, EVALUATION	3
WRITING AS A WAY OF THINKING	5
A CHECKLIST FOR CRITICAL THINKING	8
EXAMINING ASSUMPTIONS	9
JOHN SILBER, Students Should Not Be above the Law	10
<i>A university president argues that student crimes should not receive specially favorable treatment.</i>	
JUDITH H. CHRISTIE, What about the Faculty?	14
<i>A reader responds to John Silber's essay.</i>	
A CHECKLIST FOR EXAMINING ASSUMPTIONS	14
A CASEBOOK ON EXAMINING ASSUMPTIONS: SHOULD DIVORCE BE MORE DIFFICULT?	15
THE NEW YORK TIMES, The Divorce Debate	16
MAGGIE GALLAGHER, Why Make Divorce Easy?	17
<i>Letters from</i> PATRICK G. D. RILEY, LOIS M. BRENNER, ALLISON LASSIEUR, AND REBECCA SAWYER-FAY	19
<i>A newspaper editorial favoring no-fault divorce elicits a variety of responses, from agreement, to disagreement, to proposals for modifying marriage and divorce laws.</i>	
Exercises	21
2 Critical Reading: Getting Started	22
ACTIVE READING	22

ix

Previewing, 22 Skimming: Finding the Thesis, 23 Reading
with a Pencil: Underlining, Highlighting, Annotating, 23 This,
Therefore That, 25 First, Second, and Third Thoughts, 25

SUMMARIZING 27

SUSAN JACOBY, *A First Amendment Junkie* 29
A feminist argues against those feminists who seek to ban pornography.

A CHECKLIST FOR GETTING STARTED 34

A CASEBOOK FOR CRITICAL READING: SHOULD SOME KINDS OF SPEECH BE CURTAILED? 35

SUSAN BROWNMILLER, *Let's Put Pornography Back in the Closet* 35

CHARLES R. LAWRENCE III, *On Racist Speech* 39

DEREK BOK, *Protecting Freedom of Expression on the Campus* 43

STEVEN MCDONALD, *The Laws of Cyberspace: What Colleges Need to Know* 46

A feminist writer, a law professor, a university president, and a lawyer weigh in on the necessity of protecting, regulating, or prohibiting certain kinds of expression.

3 Critical Reading: Getting Deeper into Arguments 50

PERSUASION, ARGUMENT, DISPUTE 50

REASON VERSUS RATIONALIZATION 51

SOME PROCEDURES IN ARGUMENT 52

Definition, 52 Assumptions, 57 Premises and Syllogisms, 58
Deduction, 58 Sound Arguments, 59 Induction, 62
Evidence, 64 Examples, 64 Authoritative Testimony, 68
Statistics, 70

A CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATING STATISTICAL EVIDENCE 72

SATIRE, IRONY, SARCASM 73

EMOTIONAL APPEALS 73

A CHECKLIST FOR ANALYZING AN ARGUMENT 76

ARGUMENTS FOR ANALYSIS 77

RONALD TAKAKI, *The Harmful Myth of Asian Superiority* 77
The image of Asian Americans as a "model minority" is not only harmful, but false, writes a professor of ethnic studies.

JAMES Q. WILSON, *Just Take Away Their Guns* 79
A professor explains why he prefers “stop and frisk” laws to get guns out of the hands of those most likely to use them for criminal purposes.

ELIZABETH M. WHELAN, *Perils of Prohibition* 83
The president of the American Council on Science and Health writes, “We choose to teach our children about safe sex, including the benefits of teen abstinence. Why, then, can’t we . . . teach them about safe drinking?”

ROBERT H. BORK, *Addicted to Health* 86
A former judge protests that society is overreacting in its prohibitions of smoking.

JUDY BRADY, *I Want a Wife* 91
A feminist sets forth her vision of marriage in America.

A CASEBOOK FOR ANALYSIS: DOES BILINGUAL EDUCATION MAKE SENSE? 94

DIANE RAVITCH, *First Teach Them English* 94
Letters from KENDALL A. KING, JEFFREY O. JONES, LISA M. GARCIA, MATHILDA HOLZMAN, AND JUDITH D. WALLACH 96
An Op-Ed piece proposing an “immersion program” alternative to bilingual education provokes a series of letters that agree with, rebut, seek to modify, and offer counterproposals to the claims of the writer, a former assistant secretary of education.

Part Two

CRITICAL WRITING 99

4 Writing an Analysis of an Argument 101

ANALYZING AN ARGUMENT 101

Examining the Author’s Thesis, 101 Examining the Author’s Purpose, 102 Examining the Author’s Methods, 102
 Examining the Author’s Persona, 103 Summary, 104

AN ARGUMENT, ITS ELEMENTS, AND A STUDENT’S ANALYSIS OF THE ARGUMENT 105

STANLEY S. SCOTT, *Smokers Get a Raw Deal* 106

TOM WU, *Is All Discrimination Unfair?* 110

AN ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT’S ANALYSIS 113

A CHECKLIST FOR AN ESSAY ANALYZING AN ARGUMENT 114

Exercise 115

ARGUMENTS FOR ANALYSIS 115

- RITA KRAMER, *Juvenile Justice Is Delinquent* 115
A neoconservative claims that the "present system actually encourages the young to continue their criminal behavior by showing them that they can get away with it."
- JEFF JACOBY, *Bring Back Flogging* 119
A journalist argues that, for many offenses, flogging would be an improvement over prison.
- KATHA POLLITT, *It Takes Two: A Modest Proposal for Holding Fathers Equally Accountable* 122
Among this writer's proposals are "curfews, no visitors, and compulsory group therapy sessions in which . . . unwed fathers . . . can learn to identify . . . patterns of irresponsibility."
- DAVID COLE, *Five Myths about Immigration* 125
A professor at Georgetown University argues that much of what we think we know about immigration is not true.
- JANET RADCLIFFE RICHARDS, *Thinking Straight and Dying Well* 129
A philosopher examines the morality of assisted suicide and euthanasia and explains why she thinks our laws ought to permit them.
- PETER SINGER, *Animal Liberation* 138
Should supporters of equality for women and minorities support equality for animals? Yes, says a philosopher, who explains why.
- JONATHAN SWIFT, *A Modest Proposal* 151
A satirist writes about poverty and overpopulation in eighteenth-century Ireland.

5 Developing an Argument of Your Own 160**PLANNING, DRAFTING, AND REVISING AN ARGUMENT 160**

Getting Ideas, 160 The Thesis, 166 Imagining an Audience, 167
 The Audience as Collaborator, 167 The Title, 170 The Opening Paragraphs, 171
 Organizing and Revising the Body of the Essay, 173
 The Ending, 176 The Uses of an Outline, 177 Tone and the Writer's Persona, 178
 "We," "One," or "I"? 181 Avoiding Sexist Language, 181

A PEER REVIEW CHECKLIST FOR A DRAFT OF AN ARGUMENT 182**PEER REVIEW, 182****A STUDENT'S ESSAY, FROM ROUGH NOTES TO FINAL VERSION 183**

- EMILY ANDREWS, *Why I Don't Spare "Spare Change"* 187
Exercise 190

6 Using Sources	191
WHY USE SOURCES?	191
CHOOSING A TOPIC	193
FINDING MATERIAL	194
INTERVIEWING PEERS AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES	194
USING THE LIBRARY	196
FINDING INFORMATION ONLINE	198
EVALUATING SOURCES	198
A CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATING SOURCES	199
TAKING NOTES	200
A WORD ABOUT PLAGIARISM	201
COMPILING AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	203
WRITING THE PAPER	205
Organizing Your Notes, 205	The First Draft, 205
	Later Drafts, 205
Choosing a Tentative Title, 206	The Final Draft, 207
QUOTING FROM SOURCES	207
The Use and Abuse of Quotations, 207	How to Quote, 208
DOCUMENTATION	209
A Note on Footnotes (and Endnotes), 210	MLA Format, 210
The List of Works Cited (MLA Format), 216	APA Format, 226
AN ANNOTATED STUDENT RESEARCH PAPER	230
A CHECKLIST FOR PAPERS USING SOURCES	231
THERESA WASHINGTON, Why Trials Should Not Be Televised	232

Part Three

FURTHER VIEWS ON ARGUMENT	249
7 A Philosopher's View: The Toulmin Model	251
THE CLAIM	251
GROUNDINGS	252
WARRANTS	253
BACKING	254
MODAL QUALIFIERS	254
REBUTTALS	256
A MODEL ANALYSIS USING THE TOULMIN METHOD	256
A CHECKLIST FOR USING THE TOULMIN METHOD	259

8 A Logician's View: Deduction, Induction, Fallacies 260**DEDUCTION 260****INDUCTION 271**

Observation and Inference, 271 Probability, 273 Mill's
Methods, 276 Confirmation, Mechanism, and Theory, 277

FALLACIES 278

Many Questions, 279 Ambiguity, 279 Death by a Thousand
Qualifications, 280 Oversimplification, 280 False Dichotomy, 281
Equivocation, 281 Composition, 282 Division, 283 Poisoning
the Well, 283 Ad Hominem, 283 The Genetic Fallacy, 283
Appeal to Authority, 284 The Slippery Slope, 285 Appeal to
Ignorance, 286 Begging the Question, 286 False Analogy, 287
Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc, 288 Protecting the Hypothesis, 288

**A CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATING AN ARGUMENT
FROM A LOGICAL POINT OF VIEW 289**

MAX SHULMAN, *Love Is a Fallacy* 290

A short story about the limits of logic: "Can you give me one logical reason why you should go steady with Petey Bellows?"

9 A Psychologist's View: Rogerian Argument 299

CARL R. ROGERS, *Communication: Its Blocking
and Its Facilitation* 301

A psychotherapist explains why we must see things from the other person's point of view.

A CHECKLIST FOR ANALYZING ROGERIAN ARGUMENT 307

10 A Lawyer's View: Steps toward Civic Literacy 308**CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES 309****TRIAL AND APPEAL 310****DECISION AND OPINION 310****MAJORITY, CONCURRING, AND DISSENTING
OPINIONS 311****FACTS AND LAW 312****BALANCING INTERESTS 313****A WORD OF CAUTION 314**

A CHECKLIST FOR ANALYZING LEGAL ARGUMENTS 315

**A CASEBOOK ON THE LAW AND SOCIETY: WHAT
RIGHTS DO THE FIRST AND FOURTH AMENDMENTS
PROTECT? 316**

WILLIAM J. BRENNAN, JR. AND WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, *Texas v. Johnson* 316

JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN AND HARRY A. BLACKMUN, *Cohen v. California* 326

BYRON R. WHITE AND JOHN PAUL STEVENS, *New Jersey v. T.L.O.* 332
May the flag be burned in political protest? Is the public display of a four-letter expletive a criminal offense? Does a school official's search of a student suspected of disobeying school regulations amount to unreasonable search and seizure? Supreme Court justices present their opinions and dissents in this series of cases concerning the First and Fourth Amendments.

11 A Literary Critic's View: Arguing about Literature 339

INTERPRETING 339

JUDGING (OR EVALUATING) 340

THEORIZING 344

A CHECKLIST FOR AN ARGUMENT ABOUT LITERATURE 344

EXAMPLES: TWO STUDENTS INTERPRET ROBERT FROST'S "MENDING WALL" 345

ROBERT FROST, *Mending Wall* 345

JONATHAN DEUTSCH, *The Deluded Speaker in Frost's "Mending Wall"* 347

FELICIA ALONSO, *The Debate in Robert Frost's "Mending Wall"* 351

EXERCISES: READING A POEM AND READING TWO STORIES 354

ANDREW MARVELL, *To His Coy Mistress* 355

JEAN RHYS, *I Used to Live Here Once* 358

KATE CHOPIN, *The Story of an Hour* 360

THINKING ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF LITERATURE 362

PLATO, *"The Greater Part of the Stories Current Today We Shall Have to Reject"* 365

A great philosopher argues for censorship as necessary to shape the minds of tomorrow's leaders.

THINKING ABOUT GOVERNMENT FUNDING FOR THE ARTS 370

A CASEBOOK ON LITERATURE AND SOCIETY: WHAT SHOULD BE OUR NATIONAL ANTHEM? 371

CALDWELL TITCOMB, <i>Star-Spangled Earache: What So Loudly We Wail</i>	371
HENDRIK HERTZBERG, <i>Star-Spangled Banter</i>	374
FRANCIS SCOTT KEY, <i>The Star-Spangled Banner</i>	377
SAMUEL FRANCIS SMITH, <i>America</i>	378
KATHARINE LEE BATES, <i>America the Beautiful</i>	378
JAMES WELDON JOHNSON, <i>Lift Ev'ry Voice and Sing</i>	380
<i>Are there good reasons for "The Star-Spangled Banner" not to be our national anthem—and if so, what songs might be the alternatives?</i>	

Part Four

A CASEBOOK ON THE STATE AND THE INDIVIDUAL	383
12 How Much Obedience to the State Does Conscience Demand?	385
SOPHOCLES, <i>Antigone</i> 385	
PLATO, <i>Crito</i> 416	
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., <i>Letter from Birmingham Jail</i>	430
<i>Three classic readings on a timeless question: A Greek tragedy in which a young woman defies the laws of the city to obey the laws of the gods; a dialogue in which the founder of Western philosophy reasons that being wrongfully convicted gives you no right to escape your punishment, even if the punishment is death; and a letter by an imprisoned American civil rights leader arguing that victims of unjust laws have the right to break those laws as long as they use nonviolent tactics.</i>	
Appendix:	
World Wide Web Sources for Current Issues	447
Index of Authors and Titles	455
Index of Terms	459

Part One

**CRITICAL THINKING
AND READING**
