

Isaac Campbell

Professor Andrew Hincapie

ENG 1022-16A

### In-Class Writing Sessions (Selected)

These writings, assigned by Professor Andrew Hincapie in his English Composition II class, take place every day during lectures. They are short-term with loose formatting requirements, and not revised or proofread before the end of class. Academic voice is not strictly enforced, either (elements such as contractions and non-third-person pronouns are present). The subject that each piece is written on is usually presented during the lecture.

Each selected paper begins with its own header in MLA format. Page numbers are omitted.

Isaac Campbell

Professor Andrew Hincapie

ENG 1022-16A

8 September 2025

### In-Class Writing Session: Live Arguments

In the segment, the first speaker is collected, using a strategically built argument for his points. He claims that there is no hard evidence on the Watergate scandal; that the government would be crippled without a leader; and that Nixon knows nothing about the issue. However, the second speaker argues sarcastically, going ad hominem in his approach. While countering the first speaker by asserting that there is indeed evidence from many different bureaus, he calls some officers “rusty nails” and even his opponent “Chicken Little.” He also affirms that the government will manage just fine without a president, and that having criminals in office is not good for the country, keeping his sarcastic flair with both points.

Argument-wise, the first speaker has a better structure, and his calm delivery adds to his credibility. He clearly states his positions on Watergate at the time. However, the second speaker discredits the first speaker’s points about the supposed lack of evidence in a combative, mocking manner. I feel as if this insulting approach stays on topic enough to be an effective way to discredit his opponent. Even though some remarks slip past the argument and target the person, the insults that do find their argument serve a dual purpose in adding to the second speaker’s credibility.

In the second segment, the first speaker asserts that women will give up their personal pursuits to support their husbands, and describes her plight to win her case in the courts. She ends off with a single insult towards the second speaker, calling him a “miserable failure.” He

counters her by opening with “Michelle, you miserable [...],” and decorating his argument with many more insults throughout, only briefly addressing any evidence.

In this case, I feel that the first speaker was more effective, simply due to her professional approach and usage of only a single personal attack at the end of her turn. The second speaker went overboard with his insults, seeking defamation and a more militant “win” in lieu of presenting any more evidence than contracts in his turn. Particularly in the present day, he also comes off as sexist due to his approach, and therefore loses credibility.

Isaac Campbell

Professor Andrew Hincapie

ENG 1022-16A

10 September 2025

In-Class Writing Session: Student Loan Debt

With the present problem of students not being able to pay for college education on their own, and having to sabotage themselves with extreme loan debts, I feel like there is one part of the solution much more effective than others. The wealthiest, lowest in number but highest-paid Americans should be taxed more than they currently are. The richest people on the leaderboard, such as Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk, and Bill Gates, have net worths in the hundred billions. However, the vast majority of regular, working-class people in the same country are often struggling to get by, only being able to afford food and housing, and fighting to raise their children. Business leaders very much deserve their success for working hard in the beginning, but anyone can live on e.g. five million dollars in their savings account; why should they get any more income when the hard workers that sustain their success are struggling to survive off theirs?

Isaac Campbell

Professor Andrew Hincapie

ENG 1022-16A

15 September 2025

### In-Class Writing Session: Logical Fallacies

In the clip with Ernie and his banana, he claims that holding it in his ear will keep the alligators away. Bert argues that there are no alligators on Sesame Street, but Ernie argues this is evidence that the banana in his ear is working as intended. This is a false cause; the banana does not cause the alligators' absence, despite them occurring at the same time.

In the Monty Python scene, the villagers accuse a lady of being a witch. While three villagers at the front consult the knight, they settle on a series of hasty generalizations; wood burns, and witches burn too, so witches must be made of wood. If a duck floats in water, and wood floats in water too, then, if she floats in water like a duck, then she must be made of wood, and therefore a witch. The rest of the villagers, upon this conclusion, join the three without questioning this logic; this is bandwagoning.

Isaac Campbell

Professor Andrew Hincapie

ENG 1022-16A

17 September 2025

In-Class Writing Session: Laura Fraser and Vegetarianism

Laura Fraser's "Why I stopped being a vegetarian" explains her reasons for the titular action. Near the start of her essay, she describes the reasons she'd provide, such as nutritional, environmental, and moral reasons. This works on its own, but she accents these explanations with a striking level of sarcastic humor and personal opinion. While funny for some, this is confusing, and can even be misleading in an expository context. Her article treads the line between being expository and argumentative as a result of her jokes.

Later on, Fraser discusses her real reasons that she'd come to find out for becoming vegetarian. She quite bluntly states that one reason was because "[she] was not a lesbian." This is a *total* curveball, and a hasty generalization for lesbian people: that they do not choose to be vegetarian. She saves face and clarifies her position and background in the next body paragraph, but this kind of organization is confusing, and would be problematic in an academic context. This argument and others later also inch into the realm of bad faith regardless of their intentions.

Largely in the same manner, Fraser continues to go on different tangents related to the problem, such as on environmental or moral aspects, and explains her personal experiences and thoughts for each one. However, she doesn't quite make the effort to *connect* all these ideas into one point. The lack of structure causes her essay to fall into being non-sequitur.

Overall, Fraser's base reasons for quitting are merited, but the way she presents and explains them in detail are very non-academic. Her essay is very much an entertainment piece.

Isaac Campbell

Professor Andrew Hincapie

ENG 1022-16A

29 September 2025

### In-Class Writing Sessions: Censorship

One positive of censorship is protecting developing children from experiencing obscene, traumatizing, or otherwise mature subject matter. If someone is shown violence or sexual content too early in their lives, it'll negatively impact them through trauma and possible conditioning. Some basic censorship naturally serves to protect from this.

One negative of censorship is the suppression of ideas that may be from a minority or otherwise dissenting in their communities. For example, if a certain group is being oppressed, it is certainly more difficult for them to speak up in their defense if their words (or content) are censored from the public.

Isaac Campbell

Professor Andrew Hincapie

ENG 1022-16A

6 October 2025

### In-Class Writing Sessions: Pandering

An artist naturally has agency over their own work. However, I feel like they also have the responsibility to deliver their ideas as-is from the start, and also to be faithful to those ideas. Retconning, to me, is a display of artistic irresponsibility; if you have to retcon something in your own work, then you probably didn't really refine or think about what you wrote very much before publishing it.

As for whether the audience should have a say, it depends on the kind of retconning; if a change is made to something purely technical, like for graphical reasons or to fix technical mistakes or artifacts, then the artist definitely has the right to fix it, as it only adds quality to their original vision. However, if a change is made to characterization or their story, I think the audience has the right to be upset; their memory of the existing story and their expectations based on it would be betrayed in this case. I feel like the writer should at least ask the audience what they think before they make any changes to the lore.



Isaac Campbell

Professor Andrew Hincapie

ENG 1022-16A

8 October 2025

### In-Class Writing Sessions: Political Cartoons

For the first cartoon, I immediately notice the words written on the film: “I am a crook.” Richard Nixon is hanging between these films, attempting to splice a “not” in between them. The significance to this is the Watergate events during his administration, and the cartoon represents him trying to prove himself as innocent despite what everyone else was saying.

For the second cartoon, I immediately notice “Adolf the Wolf” and the underlined “Foreign Children.” The significance here is the notion that the United States’s policy of isolationism during World War II was basically holding that, since the war and its deaths weren’t on domestic soil, they didn’t matter.

For the third cartoon, I immediately notice the two politicians on the left - the donkey and the elephant. There is also a packet labeled “government shutdown” held by Uncle Sam. The significance of this cartoon is that it implies that the attitude towards the current government shutdown is largely of the two parties blaming each other for it.

For the fourth cartoon, I immediately notice the “Dump Trump” pin on Bad Bunny. The significance of this is that it pits Bad Bunny’s decision to star in the Super Bowl as a stand against Donald Trump and his current policies.