As civilization progresses with new technology and innovation, our means of communicating is constantly being modified to accommodate the norm. Arguments remain key pieces of language which serve the purpose of providing clarity and reason to claims, those of which are supported with sanctioned evidence. Whether an individual is in a 16thcentury Salon with artists, scholars, and philosophers defending their claims, or is in a modern day campaign against biological patents, the basis of a clear argument remains constant.

Within the text of *Everything’s an Argument, written* by Andrea Lunsford, John Ruskiewicz, and Keith Walters, the reading is intended to strengthen arguments by focusing on a specific path of questioning. “Did something happen? What is the nature of the thing? What is the quality or cause by the thing? What actions should be taken?” (Lunsford 22).  The authors advise us to contemplate arguments in a clinical process in which we should first observe and gather data and only then can we formulate our claims. This is further exemplified as although the authors insert text about Pathos or emotional appeals, this form of argument which lacks concrete evidence or reasoning is overshadowed by a large majority of the text which advocates opportunity and strategy. “Flat taxes are fairer than progressive taxes because they treat all taxpayers the same way. Treating people equitably is the American way” (Lunsford 138). This statement highlights the use of warrants or underlying assumptions which may support your claim. Although the efficiency and fairness of a flat tax can be debated, the use of “Treating people equitably is the American way” prompts their audience to make the connection between fairness and the flat tax. In terms of realistic writing, no argument can be perfectly structured and be without weak elements. It is within the best interest of the writer to analyze any possible shortcomings and view his/her work from all perspectives in order to appeal to the reader’s sense of impartiality. This style is present within the article *Why Is Compromise Now a Dirty Word?,*Written by Deborah Tannen. Once she begins her initial claim denouncing partisan politics, “The death of compromise has become a threat to our nation” (Tannen 147), she not only states her reasoning and supports it with clear evidence and also provides a rebuttal to her claims. “Though the two-party system is oppositional by nature, there is plenty of evidence that a certain comity has been replaced by growing enmity” (Tannen 148). By injecting this rejoinder into her article, she proves her views are unbiased and can provide a stable atmosphere in which discussion is promoted.