Here is a sample paragraph from a student paper, showing how unneeded words can be cut to save space, without changing the meaning.

McKinney, however, doesn’t make assumptions about American people suddenly just one day changing. She uses multiple studies to prove that there are still disparities affecting our country and that action needs to be taken. McKinney assumes that America has only one way to go in closing the racial divide and that is with public policy. Her use of the word “only” isn’t very reasonable because, of course, public policy is not the only answer. Public policy is definitely important and may bring about the most change but it’s not the only way to go. McKinney uses the specific assumption that no public policy initiatives have been taken in Chicago to close the gap between Black and White qualities of life. McKinney’s use of specific places and populations in her assumptions is more realistic than Obama’s assumptions about change and therefore the foundation for her argument is sturdier.

This is a change of approximately 30%. In a paper of 1,500 words this would add up to about 459 words—almost 2 pages that could be filled with new points, illustrations and explanations.

Here are two more examples.

One argument, though, that may be used to defend “Democracy Imperiled” is that the author of said article at least made an attempt to show both parties were at fault for the current voting situation. In “Block the Vote,” time and again the authors only cited incidents where the GOP was at fault for voter suppression and never once made any reference to Democrats doing the same. Because Fund makes an attempt to be unbiased it is easier to trust him, and therefore his article is more persuasive. Fund not only states that he believes both sides are guilty, though. He states specific events where Republicans have committed voter fraud. The authors of “Block the Vote” may have
fancy ways of presenting their evidence, but nothing beats getting information from a source that is willing to provide both sides of the story.

[142 words]

One argument, though, that may be used to defend “Democracy Imperiled” is that the author of said article at least made an attempt to show both parties were at fault for the current voting situation. In “Block the Vote,” time and again the authors only cited incidents where the GOP was at fault for voter suppression and never made any reference to Democrats doing the same. Because Fund makes an attempt to be unbiased it is easier to trust him, and therefore his article is more persuasive. Fund does not only state that he believes both sides are guilty, though. He states specific events where Republicans have committed voter fraud. The authors of “Block the Vote” may have fancy ways of presenting their evidence, but nothing beats getting information from a source that is willing to provide both sides of the story.

[107 words—35 words saved, or 24%]

Although this argument for “Democracy Imperiled” may be a valid one, the reader needs to keep one thing in mind while considering it. Yes, Fund attempted to be unbiased. But did he succeed? When reading “Democracy Imperiled” Fund states in one paragraph that he doesn’t always vote Republican, and that Democrats aren’t always responsible. In the next paragraph or so he provides evidence of both sides being guilty of voter fraud. Even in those few paragraphs where he mentions Republicans, though, there are accusations against Democrats. And after he is finished defending himself as an unbiased writer, he continues to bash one political party and one party alone. So, yes, Fund does attempt to be unbiased. But when he fails at doing so, it makes the article “Democracy Imperiled” much less persuasive than the clearly biased “Block the Vote.”

[139 words]

Although this argument for “Democracy Imperiled” may be a valid one, the reader needs to keep one thing in mind while considering it. Yes, Fund attempted to be unbiased. But did he succeed? When reading “Democracy Imperiled” Fund states in one paragraph that he doesn’t always vote Republican, and that Democrats aren’t always responsible. In the next paragraph or so he provides evidence of both sides being guilty of voter fraud. Even in those few paragraphs where he mentions Republicans, though, there are accusations against Democrats. And after he is finished defending himself as an unbiased writer, he continues to bash one political party and one party alone. So, yes, Fund does attempt to be unbiased. But when he fails at doing so, it makes the article “Democracy Imperiled” much less persuasive than the clearly biased “Block the Vote.”

[107 words—32 saved, or 23%]