

	10	8	6	4	2
Argument and Analysis	Clear, easily identifiable logical flow to the argument, which is well-reasoned and well-supported. Weaknesses in argument are addressed.	Argument is generally clear, generally logical, broadly well-reasoned, and mostly well-supported. Some weaknesses in argument are addressed.	Argument is sometimes clear, logical, well-reasoned, and sometimes supported. Flaws in the logical flow evident. Few weaknesses in argument are addressed.	Argument is confused, or lacking clear reasoning, strong logic, or regular support. Logical flow difficult to discern. Weaknesses in argument abundant and significant.	Essay so poorly argued that no organizing logic evident. No relevant evidence offered to support the argument.
Citations and Evidence	Citations conform to the APA Style Manual, with no errors. Relevant evidence is used extensively and accurately.	Citations generally conform to the APA Style Manual, with one or two errors. Relevant evidence is used regularly and mostly accurately.	Citations somewhat conform to the APA Style Manual, with three or more errors. Relevant evidence is sometimes used, or is generally accurate.	Citations are present, but do not conform to the APA Style Manual. Evidence is often irrelevant, misunderstood, or inaccurate.	Citations are inconsistent, partial, or absent. Little or no accurate or relevant evidence is employed.
	5	4	3	2	1
Thesis	The thesis is clear, specific, original and well placed.	The thesis is generally strong, but lacks one of clarity, specificity, originality, or placement.	The thesis is apparent, but lacks two of clarity, specificity, originality, or placement.	The thesis is lacking or deficient in three aspects of clarity, specificity, originality, or placement.	Thesis is absent or unintelligible.
Structure and Mechanics	Structure clearly consistent with introduction and thesis. Few if any errors of grammar, word choice, punctuation, sentence structure, or spelling.	Structure generally consistent with introduction and thesis. Occasional unclear transitions or unfocused paragraphs. Occasional errors of grammar, word choice, punctuation, sentence structure, or spelling.	Structure often inconsistent with introduction and thesis. Transitions are abrupt or unfinished. Paragraphs often lack focus. Some errors of grammar, word choice, punctuation, sentence structure, or spelling.	Structure is quite confused. There is little apparent relationship with the thesis. Transitions rarely coherent. Paragraphs poorly structured. Frequent and persistent errors of grammar, word choice, punctuation, sentence structure, or spelling. Frequent fragments or run-on sentences.	No coherent structure discernible in essay or in paragraphs. Mechanical problems dominate essay and impair comprehensibility.

Comments: The paper draws on a lot of evidence. It offers good points on the use of espionage in conflict. The discussion of propaganda, while not drawn from a classical thinker precisely, was a welcome addition, but it was not sufficiently developed or integrated into analysis of Rock's plan. As the propaganda discussion suggests, there is good and broad reading here.

However, the writing needed additional revision, if only to pare away some of the run-on sentences that plague the paper. Ideas are often presented without a clear structure to order them (as in the discussion of mercenaries).

The sources are used pretty well (although the interviews with Rock needed closer reading). There are good arguments evident; now polish the way in which they are presented.

Grade: 22.5/30