

**Fish & Wildlife Service – National Conservation Training Center  
Critical Writing/Critical Thinking Follow-up Web Series  
Craft of Persuasion**

Speakers: Michelle Baker (MB)

Karene Motivans (KM)

[audio start]

**MB:** Very good. Well it's good to see everybody here, especially with the bad weather and the holiday last week. I'm really glad you could make it.

Karene mentioned that there are a couple of downloads that you'll be able to get after the webinar today. One of them is this set of reading examples that we'll be going through. A lot of these are from the Letter from Birmingham Jail, the Martin Luther King letter that was sent out to you as a weblink before today's session. I hope that you had the chance to read that. And I'll be talking in a little more detail about the context for that letter, because we'll be using that quite a bit today as sort of a touchstone for our discussion.

There are also a lot of examples here that I pulled from the Federal Register, the FWS website, as well as from our course notebook, and some of the student writings. So a lot of familiar work that maybe even some of you are responsible for creating that by and large are really good. Most of the examples that we're looking at today are positive examples of things that have been really well done.

So, The Craft Of Persuasion is today's topic. I want to talk first about persuasive writing and what that means. We're not talking about campaigning, about advertising, about the hard sell, or about anything unscrupulous or cheap when we talk about persuasion. What we are talking about is any kind of writing that attempts to convince the reader beyond the presentation of facts or data in a very bald sort of way.

So a chart or a graph is a very bald presentation of the facts. Any time we interpret that chart or data, we've begun persuading. So there's a really fine line. Basically any time we start to communicate, we've started to persuade people to our point of view.

Classically, though, there are three artistic ways of persuading our readers. And today we're going to go into a lot of detail on those three techniques. They're called the artistic proofs. They go all the way back to Aristotle, to the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, and in order, they are *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*. They're the three that we're going to talk about today.

This information is available in an outline that you will also be able to download after today's webinar. So you don't have to worry too much about jotting down all these notes. You can just relax and listen for right now.

So the three artistic proofs. The first of them is logos. As you might guess, that refers to logic. Anytime we conduct a logical analysis in our document, we're engaged in the artistic activity of logos, persuading our reader by getting them to follow along with our logical argument.

The second of those proofs is called ethos. That word now means ethics, but what it used to mean was the writer's credibility. Ethics is part of that, the writer's good character, but there are two other parts of that—good will, the writer's relationship with his audience; and good sense, which goes back to the logos, the writer's ability to put all the data together and make sense out of all of it. All three of those make the writer's ethos, or the writer's credibility.

The third artistic proof is pathos, and today that word has a lot of different meanings. None of them are as close to the original Greek meaning of pathos, which meant emotion. Today we find that word in things like sympathetic, or empathetic, but we also find it in negative words like pathological or pathetic, meaning people that are overly emotional or that rely only on their emotions. So as we'll talk about towards the end of today's webinar, we have a lot of conflicting emotions about the role that emotions play in our decision-making process. We have to be careful about the way that we reach out to our audiences emotions, but we shouldn't ignore the emotional process.

So pathos is that appeal to our readers' emotions. Again, the three artistic proofs—logos, ethos, and pathos.

Now, a couple of points to make about those before we move on. First, they all have to be present in the document. I will be referring today quite a bit to last month's webinar, the HEAT section, that HEAT-ing up your paragraphs, showing your logical analysis. It's not enough that you have all of the data. You actually have to piece the data together and show how it's relevant to your topic. That's what we mean that the artistic proofs have to be present in your document.

Credibility. Just because you're writing on behalf of the federal government, you cannot assume that your audience thinks you are credible. You have to be credible in the document. So the artistic proofs have to be present in absolutely everything we write.

Second, they are artistic. That means they're a matter of craft. They have to be practiced. They aren't right or wrong. Instead they can be used well or they can be used poorly. And they really need to be honed in order to be perfected, so this is not something that we wake up one morning and we're really good at evoking pathos in our audience. So artistic proofs—logos, ethos, and pathos. They have to be present in the document, and they have to be practiced to be perfected.

Throughout today's discussion, we're going to start with a really good example from service writing. And I've highlighted a few of the terms that are persuasive in the piece. Then we're going to go to the Martin Luther King document because his piece is extreme, and when we look at a more extreme example, we can see a little more clearly how the techniques are working. And then we're going to back to a service piece that's maybe a little bit medium. And we would see how we could

make it a little bit better. So that's how today's reading examples are going to work.

I'd like to give you just a little bit of context for the Martin Luther King letter that was the precursor to today's webinar. In April of 1963, Martin Luther King staged a series of demonstrations in Birmingham, Alabama. He was invited there as the President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to try to end some of the segregation practices that were illegal but were still happening on the ground, in the businesses in Birmingham. He attempted to stage non-violent protests in the city. They turned violent and he and his followers were arrested.

While he was in jail, a group of 8 white ministers published an open letter in a newspaper condemning King and his followers for their non-violent protests. Their basic argument was that over time the segregation issue would work itself out, and King and his followers should just be patient and let that happen. King responded by publishing his own letter. It really had two audiences. His stated audience was the 8 white ministers that had written to him. But because their letter was published in newspapers across the country, he had an implied audience as well, which were those very same newspaper readers.

So he had a very delicate rhetorical task, to persuade white America, who was seeing images of black violence in the South. And that's why it's such a great example of persuasion, and a really extreme example that will serve us well for today's discussion, especially since we know how that argument turned out. It got more and more extreme, but eventually that cause was won. And King, in part because of the rhetoric in this letter, did win that battle.

So let's jump in with logos. Example A that's on your screen right now is a good example of the use of logos in Service documents. This example is taken from the Earth Justice letter. It's in your course notebook in the IRAC section. Basically it lays out the reasons why the Service's selection of critical habitat was faulty in the opinion of this organization. There's a lot of data in this paragraph, but the words that I have highlighted are the bits of logic that are persuasive. *Rather than, and then I've taken out a lot of statutory language here, the Service used, and then there's data. By substituting ... the Service excluded lands, ... without first considering ... Further by starting ... the Service excluded ... without considering ... and without considering.*

The pieces that I've left out are what I call the bald facts, the tracts of land that are either included or excluded in the Service's baseline. But the bits that I've highlighted are the logical pieces that make this paragraph persuasive. It's thorough. It's coherent. It's comprehensive. And that makes it a bit of logical persuasion, very much like this very early paragraph in King's letter.

King lays out the four basic steps in a non-violent campaign, and then describes how he's gone through all the steps in Birmingham. His implied audience, the newspaper readers across the country, have only seen the spectacular pictures, the pictures of violence, the pictures of police beating down suspects, and fire hoses being turned on people who are rioting. The idea of non-violence is not

something that they've been exposed to. So early in his letter, he introduces the concept of non-violence and what that entails.

The first two sentences of this paragraph constitute a hypothesis, very much like what we talked about in the HEAT webinar from last months. *We have gone through* all these steps in Birmingham. *The first step is collection of the facts to determine whether injustice exists.* And in the rest of the paragraph, he goes through the facts, outlining the case that injustice does indeed exist in Birmingham. This is an important first step, because again, all that the people across America have been seeing is the aftermath of King's campaign, not necessarily what led up to that campaign.

The language that I have highlighted here is the language where King attempts to be neutral. *Gainsaying ... thoroughly segregated ... treatment in the courts ... unsolved bombings.* As difficult, as emotional as this situation is, King makes a valiant effort to remain rational and to outline the situation in a clear, logical way for his readers. That's what makes the argument persuasive instead of relying simply on language like *grossly unjust* or *racial injustice*.

What I'd like to do now is to revisit some of what we did in the course, some of what we did last month, again from a slightly different perspective, that of persuasion. Under the category of logos, we're going to look at the different kinds of argument we can make, beginning with example and analogy, then looking at authority and cause. Those are the kinds that we covered in class.

Today I'm going to add to that argument by definition and then we also looked at IRAC as a principle of organization. Today we're going to look at that as a kind of argument, which is argument by rule. So we're really going to look at 5 kinds of logos argument; example and analogy, authority, cause, IRAC, and definition. And again, these are on an outline that you'll receive on the end of today's webinar.

We're also going to go through the rules for each of these kinds of argument. All of these rules are outlined in your course notebook in great detail. They're outlined in summary on the outline that you'll get at the end of today's webinar, and we're going to look at them in the examples we'll talk about right now. The one exception to that is the argument by definition, which I'm going to give you fresh today, but there are only three rules for argument by definition.

In example C, we're going to start with argument by example and analogy. There are four rules. We have to show that our examples are sufficient and representative, that's one. We have to consider counter examples, that's two. We have to demonstrate how the one is like the other, that's three. And we have to explain how the differences are negligible. That's four. In King's example, he compares Hitler's Germany and Hungary's communist country to America's segregation.

Those two examples are not sufficient and representative by themselves. But in his whole argument, he uses lots of different examples, so he does meet that first

requirement. Adolph Hitler's Germany was legal, Hungary's freedom fighters were illegal, so he's including counter examples. He meets the second rule.

Third, demonstrating how one is like the other. This is tough, because Adolph Hitler was exterminating the Jews in Germany. It would be nearly impossible to argue that blacks are being exterminated in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in America, but you'll notice that King doesn't try to make that argument. Instead, he argues that blacks are being treated in a way that is anti-Christian. He's saying that he would have offered aid and comfort to his Jewish brothers. That in the communist country, principles dear to the Christian faith are being suppressed and that he would openly advocate disobeying that country's anti-religious laws. So he places the emphasis, not on the extermination of the Jews, but on their anti-Christian treatment, which is comparable to the situation in America, so he meets the third rule.

The fourth rule is to explain away the differences. The major differences between America in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century and Germany or Hungary is that those countries are fascist communistic dictatorships. We are a democratic capitalistic society. That's a major difference, and it's not negligible, but he doesn't try to explain it away. He's counting on that difference to make his argument even stronger. As a democratic, capitalistic country, not a fascist dictatorship, we should be behaving even better than Adolph Hitler's Germany or communist Hungary, so he meets all four requirements for an argument by example or analogy.

Example D. Example D comes from a biological opinion, which was written in the Northwest Region for a bridge-building project. It is an analysis of that project's affect on the spotted owl in that region. In this paragraph, the argument is being made that spotted owls prefer mixed landscapes with both older and newer vegetation types. In the second sentence, there's a comparison to the coastal range of California where spotted owls are found in mixed forests. And then in the last sentence, spotted owls don't generally appear to select for stands of intermediate or younger ages.

So this is an argument by example, but it lacks some of the features that we just saw. For example, rule number three, demonstrate how the two are alike. In what ways are the redwood forests along the coastal range of California similar to this landscape where the bridge is being built in Oregon? So the third rule, to demonstrate how the two are alike, that bit of logical analysis needs to be done in this paragraph to make the writing truly persuasive. If there are any differences between the habitats, those need to be explained away, and if there are no differences between the habitats, that needs to be stated in the paragraph.

This is simply one example of habitat that spotted owls prefer, so we need to explain why this example is sufficient and representative if the document does not provide other examples the way the King document does. This is a way this paragraph could be more persuasive.

Our next argument type, *logos* type, is argument by authority. Again, there are four rules for argument by authority. They're fairly simple. Cite the source. Qualify the expert. Eliminate bias. And verify independently. King skips all four of

those rules, breaks all four of them in this paragraph. His three authorities are St. Thomas Aquinas, Martin Buber, and Paul Tillich. He doesn't need to cite those authorities for two very good reasons having to do with his stated and implied audiences.

His stated audience, the 8 white ministers, should know who these three people are. His implied audiences will know only that they are impressive names that he's able to throw out there. Supposedly, at the time that King is writing this letter, he's in jail. Now we suspect that he put some finishing touches on this letter when he got out of jail. But the average public is going to be very impressed that he's going to be able to cite these from memory without any reference works while he's in a jail cell. So it works to his advantage to break the rules of authority and not cite them.

Paragraph F comes from a decision not to make a critical habitat designation for the Mariana fruit bat, the Guam Micronesia kingfisher, and the Mariana crow. What you'll notice from the bolded segments are that these authorities are grouped into categories, and they're arranged by their objectivity, their reliability, and their scope. So at the beginning of the list, you have their peer-reviewed scientific publications, and at the end of the list, you have pers. comm. For the less reliable information at the end of the list, there are details about the specific information that was used, so that information is what we call qualified.

A careful reader is going to review the document to see where this specific data was used, and they will try to poke holes wherever they can if they're skeptical. It might be wise to include what's called a gap analysis, stating where are these data flawed, where are these data incomplete, and why are these data still considered the best available even if they are flawed and incomplete. But in general, this is an excellent way to state and qualify your sources.

The third type of persuasive logoi is argument by cause. In an argument by cause, we need to demonstrate the causal relationship, which can either be a causal chain or a causal scenario. We want to eliminate other possible causes and especially explain why causes are not correlations. King does this when he explains why he is in Birmingham. He's not a citizen of Birmingham. He lives, I believe, in Mobile, Alabama. But he says early on in the letter that he is a part of all of the south, a part of a network of mutuality, whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly, thereby identifying what we would call a causal scenario.

In example H, there is a far more detailed causal chain that we described in class as a procedure. In this example, a section 7 consultation and its outcome are described. Again, this is persuasive because it's clear and comprehensive. There are two mechanisms that could lead to regulatory requirements, and they are as follows. In the bolded sections, you can see quite clearly what that chain would be. It's like a nice little flow chart explaining what would happen if further section 7 consultations would need to continue.

The fourth type of logical persuasion is an argument by rule. We described this in class as an IRAC argument. In terms of persuasion, that's a little bit simplified. In persuasion or in philosophy, we have slightly more sophisticated models that we

use to describe argument by rule. You may have heard some of these. They're called things like syllogisms and enthymemes. But unless you're studying philosophy, you don't really need to know what those are or how they work. There are two good examples of them here from the King letter in reading example J and then from the Service in reading example K.

From the King letter, he poses a question that some of the ministers have posed, that King and his followers have behaved in ways that precipitate violence. So he asks a number of questions in order to negate that possibility. This is a typical philosophical movement. You might think this is a philosophical move that you wouldn't see very often in the Service, but actually it is, and I'd like to turn your attention to example K. Example K is what we call in philosophy an enthymeme. And if you look at the bolded sentences here, you can see exactly where we're headed. The

*The little Mariana fruit bat, Guam broadbill, and bridled white-eye are believed extinct on Guam ...because these species are believed extinct on Guam, we propose that designation of critical habitat is not prudent because such designation would be of no benefit to these species.* This is an IRAC argument where the issue and the rule are missing. The issue is that a petition has been submitted to designate critical habitat for these three species.

The rule is too obvious to mention—we don't designate critical habitat for species that are already extinct, or it is of no benefit to designate critical habitat for species that are already extinct. This kind of example that's used in philosophy classes all the time. It's called an enthymeme, and it's the exact same type of philosophical construct that King is using to make his argument in paragraph J here.

The final type of logos, which is exhibited in Example L is persuasion by definition. This is the kind of argument that the Service has to make on a regular basis when we define take, endangered, or injurious. All of those are definitions, and we have regulations that define those terms and the situations under which those occur. King is defining a much more abstract concept, the concept of just and unjust laws.

King's strength is his ability to define those in very concrete ways. *An unjust law is a code that a numerical or power majority group compels a minority group to obey but does not make binding on itself. ...A just law is a code that a majority compels a minority to follow and that it is willing to follow itself.* That is a very clear, concrete explanation of a very abstract concept.

In a Service example, it looks a little something like this. Again, this is from the designation of critical habitat for these extinct species, and in the center of this paragraph, which has been broken up kind of awkwardly here. *A long-accepted view developed from ecological research is that the existence of more than one population increases the long-term likelihood of species' persistence.* The paragraph itself makes alternating reference to species and populations. The center sentence that's bolded here provides a very clear rule or definition for how a species can continue to persist. It would be much more clear if there also a quick definition of species and populations, perhaps right here in the topic sentence.

So as a summary, the first type of artistic proof, logos, is to show your logical analysis inside of your document. The principles that we covered in class and in the HEAT webinar from last month are all feeding into the persuasive power of logos. The rules for argument by example and analogy, authority, cause, IRAC, and definition are good guidelines to make sure you're writing persuasively and including your logos in your document.

Now, the second part of the artistic proofs is ethos. Ethos consists of three parts, but essentially it's your credibility as a writer. In example N, we have the mission statement of the USFWS as pulled from a press release. This mission provides our basis as an organization, what we do within the Federal Government. It would be handy, and I know most of you already have this, saved on your computer. It's something you can and should be copying and pasting into a lot of your documents. But we'll also look at some ways to extend the use of your mission in creating your ethos.

Example O is another example of creating ethos in writing. For those of you who were in the ESA section of the CW/CT class, this comes from a petition to list a Hawaiian bird called the Akikiki, and in one section of the petition, the petitioners identify themselves and describe what their interest is in the conservation of this species. So this organization, the ABC, describes who they are and why they want to see the Akikiki preserved. This is an example of building your ethos in the document.

King provides a beautiful example in the very first paragraph of his argument. He reminds his audience that although he is in prison, he presents himself as a working minister, someone who has a desk, and secretaries, someone who might be confined, but not someone who is a prisoner. Someone who is in a city jail, not a penitentiary or who is a prisoner. This opening paragraph, particularly the reference to secretaries, is a nice piece of ethos, because it presents him as a professional businessman on the par with any business person who would be reading his correspondence.

Very few of us even today have secretaries who are working on our behalf, and there's a sly bit of power struggle that's happening in this opening bit of rhetoric for King.

Ethos is the writer's credibility. Part of that is in the logos that we just referred to. Making sound arguments demonstrates that the writer has good sense, and that's the first part of ethos, but ethos also consists in having good character, doing our best at all times to carry out our mission, which is why it's important to reference our mission in correspondence and other documents to point out we are doing our best to conserve our nations' resources and to protect our habitat and critical resources. But finally, ethos includes good will. Good will is our relationship to our audience. So everything we talked about in class that has to do with that relationship builds into your ethos.

I'd like us to compare for just a minute the kind of audience relationship that we seen in examples Q and R. Example Q, which was written in response to the first skill check, the letter to USARK dealing with the python problem, establishes a

context for the letter, and it responds to USARK's letter, but it doesn't have that nebulous feeling of "good will" that can be very hard to define. Part of that is because all three sentences begin with the word I. *I am writing to you ... I would like to begin ... I sincerely hope.* So no matter what the writer says, the emphasis is still on the FWS or the writer of the letter instead of on the audience.

Other ways to go about that would be to say something like, *your recent letter indicates a willingness to preserve the rich heritage of the ENP that we also treasure.* Or, *our agency was pleased to receive your letter indicating a shared concern over the python problem.* Those would be ways to get around that I-focus at the beginning of each of these sentences.

Also the second sentence in example Q says, *I would like to begin by thanking you.* That's what we call meta-discourse. That is talking about talking. We could simply say, thank you for your continued interest, and it would sound much more sincere.

The difference between these two is what we call artificial, which is the way Q reads, and organic, which is the way some of these alternatives should sound. Paragraph R is a much more organic and really a masterful ethos argument. The fact that we're not in agreement with USARK is stated at the opening of the paragraph, but it's minimized in two different ways. Number one, it's stated in the negative, *we may not be in agreement.* Second, it's inside of a dependent clauses. *While we may not be in agreement.* And you'll remember, we talked about the difference between dependent and independent clauses in class.

The core of the sentence is *we believe*, which is a very hopeful, positive phrase. That language we believe is repeated several times in this paragraph, which you'll see in just a moment. Also, the word *enhance*, and the word *partnership*, this is very positive emotional language, which creates a feeling of good will between us and USARK. The phrase *both separately and together* gives USARK the feeling that this is a true partnership. We're not trying to dominate their organization. We're just trying to work together with them.

In the next few sentences *you are aware, we need to ensure, we believe.* We establish our authority, but it's non-threatening. And we clearly lay out our position using those logos techniques that we talked about, rooted in our mission, which is our good character. And then that bolded section, *at the same time*, this is our common ground. Public education is a vital goal that we both share, and that's where we close. The concepts that we can both agree on.

The more contentious issue of funding our own research is placed in a dependent clause, *while we continue*, and then the emphasis is placed on *public information and education efforts*, the very last words in the paragraph. So example R is a great example of good will, good character, and good sense all coming together in a persuasive ethos argument.

Finally under the category of ethos, we have paragraph S, which is on the topic of creating cooperative readers. Paragraph S is taken from a letter that we wrote to a section 7 consultant indicating that they may have taken the bald eagle in excess

of permits. We have the necessary information, the raw data is definitely present, but it's hard to create goodwill with an organization that we're chastising. The very least we can do is to create cooperative readers, and the language of this paragraph doesn't go very far to do that. What we can do instead is to take the paragraph modules and the sentence structure modules and make the language here more clear, and that will help to create good will, even if the essential message of the letter is still pretty negative.

So for example, the topic of this paragraph is buried in the first and last sentences of the paragraph. A better topic sentence would be something like, *Despite efforts to reduce coal bed natural gas wells, several Bureau projects exceeded the disturbance activities outlined during section 7 consultations.* The details, which are plentiful in this paragraph, should be provided in sentences with clear transitions, characters as subjects, actions as verbs, appropriate emphasis, close subject-verb pairs.

One example would be right here where we talk about the modifications. *Specifically, the Bureau modified several projects after site-specific section 7 consultations were completed. During the 5 reporting periods, these included ...* That would be much more clear and easy to read, and that would help our readers.

So in summary, ethos is a combination of good will, good character, and good sense. Good sense is closely tied to logos. Good character is created by referencing our mission as the Service and upholding our commitment to the best available science and to conservation. Good will is created through our relationship to our audience, creating a context, writing clearly, and creating cooperative readers.

Karene, if we have just a minute left, I would like just to introduce the concept of pathos by showing that video that I sent to you.

**KM:** Okay sure. Do you want me to just start it?

**MB:** Please.

**KM:** Can everyone see it?

[Yes.]

William Shatner and Leonard Nimoy did not always get along while playing Captain Kirk and Mr. Spock in the 1960's TV series Star Trek. This is Steven Shohan with Hollywood Story.

Producer Gene Roddenberry was continuously lobbied by Shatner to make Kirk equal to the Vulcan as a problem-solver, which resulted in extra dialogue for the cast. Nimoy responded by stealing scenes with his reactions. He would lift an eyebrow, give his superior officer a quizzical look and offer one-word replies such as "fascinating."

At one point, the two actors cornered Roddenberry and demanded to know which one of them was the star. Frustrated by their pettiness, the producer instructed the show's writers to make Kirk and Spock buddies, which helped ease the tension.

Shatner and Nemoy enjoyed a long, fruitful relationship and made lots of extra cash by pairing as a team. For more great stories, go to [www.HollywoodStories.com](http://www.HollywoodStories.com).

**MB:** Thanks Karene.

**KM:** Sure.

**MB:** I know that's kind of silly, but I think a lot of us feel like, and especially when we're writing, that we don't know whether we're writing to Spock or Kirk. And we want to be writing to the Spock character, because we think he's the one who's making the decisions, right?

He's logical and rational, and he stays cool and calm. But the reality is that Kirk is the one who's driving the ship. And he's impetuous and impulsive and passionate. And he decides where the ship lands, and he decides when to engage in battle.

I think that America is really conflicted over the role that decisions play in decision-making. And for more information about that, there's a book by Malcolm Gladwell called *Blink*, and he suggests that we make decisions a lot faster than we think we do. He calls it rapid cognition, and he very carefully does not call it intuition or associate it with the emotions, but his book has been widely criticized for that reason. A lot of psychologists have said that what's describing is not a rational process but an emotive process, and that we should try instead of to rationalize our emotions to understand the role that emotions play.

So this has been an area of a lot of dispute. Example T in your reading is a very famous piece of writing, not from King's letter, but from Tolstoy's novel *Anna Karenina*. And in it her husband has just discovered that his wife has been committing adultery, and this is the response that he writes to her. I would encourage you to read it to yourself out loud and feel just how cold it is. Because in the novel, this is the very reason that she committed the adultery in the first place, and it's also the reason that the novel ends as tragically as it does, because he continues to play that Spock character and he doesn't show any emotion. He prides himself on that. But unfortunately, that's not what she's looking for in a mate.

So to skip ahead rather quickly, towards the end of your reading examples, I have a few pieces that I've drawn from the Akikiki petition in which there could be some language that would be considered emotional describing the ways in which the Akikiki are vulnerable on their island. For example, in paragraph X, the Akikiki are a very small bird, and as an island, Kauai is particularly vulnerable to hurricanes, and the trees on it are particularly vulnerable to being uprooted because of the soil conditions. So there's a good bit of language in this paragraph that is descriptive and that a reader would really resonate with.

In paragraph Y, I'm sorry, no. Let me move backward. In paragraph W, there's an argument being made that malaria has not been found to be a problem in the Akikiki, but the conclusion is that any Akikiki with malaria are probably already dead, and that's a really powerful conclusion that could be amplified, and the danger of malaria could be perhaps drawn out a little more powerfully than what it is in this paragraph.

So I would caution you to be careful in your use of pathos, but be aware of what a powerful tool it is. In class, we talked about the power of storytelling, of setting up a narrative whenever possible, and we also talked about descriptive language. Those are the two best ways to evoke pathos in your reader. And I would encourage you to use those when appropriate to the best of your abilities.