Title of essay/article: Don’t attack the patriotism of our patriots Name: Alex Yeoh

Textual (Rhetorical) Analysis worksheet (BE DETAILED and **follow directions** carefully—type directly in this file)

1. What is the context of the article?

Dragging military people through the mud for political gain. Specifically, John Aravosis calling John McCain disloyal.

1. What seems to be the author’s purpose?

To stop people from dragging military servicemen and women for political gain.

1. In what type of publication did this appear? Describe it. Why is this important, specifically?

It was published in a newspaper called the Miami Herald. It is a publication based in Miami, Florida with readers mostly in southern Florida, the Caribbean, Latin America, and people on the internet. Because of the range of readers is so broad, the writing in the Miami Herald necessarily has to be broad.

1. Write a brief analysis of the author’s credentials and possible expertise or bias. If no information is available on the author online, try to take a guess based upon his or her knowledge and writing ability, which you might derive from the article.

Born in 1957, has been a writer for his entire life. He writes one of the most popular columns in America and is an acclaimed writer, even earning the 2004 Pulitzer Prize for commentary. He is a syndicated columnist writer.

1. Who seems to be the ***target audience***? Be specific.

Older, newspaper reading, republicans (his first example is John McCain, Bush was president)

1. List 6 sentences/quotations that you think show and support the author’s stance. Explain *how* for each in 1-2 sentences.

“he accused McCain of ''disloyalty'' because at one point, his captors tortured him into reading a propaganda statement.” a specific example of his point.

“he is a war hero, having survived over five years of beatings, solitary confinement and deprivation in a Vietnamese prison camp, even refusing an offer of early release because it meant leaving fellow prisoners behind.” specific proof of McCain’s heroism

“We would trust that 40 years later, no one would raise this as proof of ‘disloyalty.’” This was only brought up right when he was running for presidential candidate.

“Americablog.com” an effective way for the readers to not just take his word for this problem, but instead letting the readers take action and see for themselves.

“But that heroism was slimed (Kerry was never under fire, they claim) by people working for the re-election of a president who served in the Texas Air National Guard during the Vietnam war” a second example of his point (from the other party).

“Max Cleland can leave three limbs in Vietnam, yet have his patriotism questioned or a John Murtha can serve as a Marine for 37 years, yet be called a coward.” two more examples of his point.

1. Analyze the writer’s language. What is the writer’s tone? Why might he or she have chosen this tone? Is it effective? How is the writer trying to reach a specific audience through style and language choices and wording? Give 4 examples and clearly connect the answers to these questions to them in several sentences for each.

The tone of the writing is disappointment. It was chosen because the entire topic is a negative, but an angry tone would have simply made him seem like a ranting old man. It is effective. He aims to reach them through his examples by first bring them in with “I give you John McCain: traitor” then show them that it isn’t a single party issue.

“I submit that John Aravosis would read a statement denouncing his own mother if you beat him long enough. Most of us would.” He shows why doing this is wrong. Instead of just yelling at John Aravosis for doing this, he shows everyone that this could happen to anyone.

“it seems to me that something has gone haywire in a nation that forgets how to revere the service of military men and women,” He clearly states his stance on the topic. As I read it, the grammar doesn’t seem angry as it isn’t filled with exclamation marks and the syntax seems almost like a sentence that would end with a sigh.

“I make no case that military service exempts you from criticism, however vigorous and sharp. No, the case I make is for simple respect.” He states that he isn’t here to have a shouting match about how great military people are, but instead he is only here to argue for the respect of those military people.

“Where did reverence go? Was it voted off the island on Survivor? Did it fail its audition to be the next American Idol? Was it not sexy enough for America's Next Top Model, or ruthless enough for The Apprentice?” He ends the article on a particularly drab note. The idea that in this age of shallow reality TV shows and the like, we have lost respect for the people who have risked life and limb for our freedom.

1. Finally, how do the stance and language choices aid the author’s purpose relative to ***target audience***? Explain in detail, using three specific examples (lines, etc.) and showing the connection.

“he accused McCain of ''disloyalty'' because at one point, his captors tortured him into reading a propaganda statement.” He hooks his target audience by using a well-liked politician from their party and using him to show them that the action is bad.

“by people working for the re-election of a president who served in the Texas Air National Guard during the Vietnam war and a vice-president who dodged service altogether.” He indirectly talks about how a president from their party has also done is causing some to perhaps not only question this happening but also their party doing it.

“Max Cleland can leave three limbs in Vietnam, yet have his patriotism questioned or a John Murtha can serve as a Marine for 37 years, yet be called a coward.” He adds in two more examples to further strengthen his point.