1. Why should one consider the audience when crafting persuasive messages and why should one consider the audience when considering the ethics of persuasion?
   1. If you don’t alter your message at all when you talk to others, you end up alienating one side of an argument. Your persuasive argument will hit a “brick wall” in the case of arguments. You can alter your message, wording, evidence used, and other things to help you gain some persuasive strength.
   2. It is important not to completely change your message. Or else you are lying. You need to understand how they view things to prevent misleading them. It is also important to understand their view of the situation and how you should talk in order to maintain an ethical standpoint. Being ethical ensures that you are both not harming others but also maintaining a positive image for the audience.
2. Describe the major ethical perspectives of persuasion in your own words.
   1. Religious Perspective: We need to avoid doing those things that deities, prophets, and wise men from religions such as Hinduism, Christianity/Islam, and Buddhism/Confucianism would declare we should avoid. Like lying, murder, slander, and other sins.
   2. Human Nature: Those acts or words that would denigrate, harm, or reduce the potential of a human are bad. Meaning murder, hate speech, and libel are unethical actions.
   3. Political: It is those acts that would go against a specific political stance that are unethical. Any action that does not promote this stance which is negative.
   4. Situational: It is important not to take a specific stance but to adapt to the task at hand. It is important to understand the audience and their expectations. It is important to understand their values and culture to establish a basis from which to alter your message and language.
   5. Legal: That which is unethical is that which is illegal.
   6. Dialogical: It is important to maintain an open channel of honesty and improvement of the speaking parties. This does not occur in monological speaking where dogmatism and domination occur. Thus, monological speaking is bad.
3. Give an example of a contemporary demagogue. Explain why the person is demagogue using strong evidence.
   1. Donald Trump is the easiest one to call out. He can wield leadership over massive numbers of people. He maintains influence through twitter and public speech. He also relies on scapegoating, blaming other countries or denying his failures at all. In some cases, he has blamed China for several U.S. issues. China has been in a lot of trouble lately for their privacy rights violation. He is very hypocritical; one example is his criticism of Obama for golfing while golfing even more than him. All these traits make for a demagogue and Trump exhibits them all.
4. Describe the five dimensions that Larson suggests for judging a person’s ethical character. Apply the dimensions to a recent example from politics.
   1. Citizen-Politician – How should we evaluate a person’s actions based on their responsibilities as a citizen versus politician. Should we hold politicians to a higher standard?
   2. Private-Public – How should we evaluate a person’s actions in manners that are personal to them? Should we judge them more harshly in public matters than private.
   3. Past-Present – Should we evaluate a person’s past actions just as harshly as their current actions. If I stole a pop-tart years ago should I be judged more leniently than If I just stole it?
   4. Once-pattern – Should repeated behavior be of more concern to us than behavior that occurs once? Should someone who speeds to get their ailing mother to the hospital be judged less harshly than a frequent speeder.
   5. Trivial-serious – Should my all actions be held to the same degree of scrutiny? Should minor actions such as stealing a pop-tart be considered less unethical than stealing a car?
   6. Let’s talk about the recent debate. Trump continuously acts petulantly, like he has in the past, should we judge him more harshly as a continued abuser of this behavior than Joe Biden’s single outburst during this debate (Once-Pattern)? As politicians, it is difficult to examine the Citizen-Politician aspect since they are continuously providing some front, however, how would we judge someone who acts like this as a regular citizen? Would we penalize or discredit a citizen vs. these politicians? Additionally, are these little outbursts and comments worth scrutinizing or are they something that is trivial? Just like with Citizen-Politician, it is hard to see how they act in their Private life, so we can’t judge them in that aspect. However, just like the Once-Pattern argument, the Past-Present is dissected through their previous actions and now. We know that Trump has acted like this in the Past and he is doing it now, while it doesn’t entirely pertain to the debate, how can we heavily criticize his actions but not Biden’s? It is worth noting that Biden probably has some skeleton’s he has attempted to bury without success.
   7. Here are my sources regarding Biden’s blunder: <https://www.pastemagazine.com/politics/joe-biden/the-10-worst-things-joe-biden-has-done-in-his-poli/#3-had-to-drop-out-of-the-1988-presidential-race-for-plagiarism>
   8. https://pjmedia.com/news-and-politics/matt-margolis/2020/07/23/the-top-7-racist-comments-made-by-joe-biden-over-the-years-n673531
5. What is the difference between lying and deception? Does this distinction matter? Why and in what contexts?
   1. Lying is telling a mistruth either through words or actions. Deception is using ambiguity to let a receiver come to a bad conclusion, through wording or actions. This distinction is important, because people make a lot of assumptions in regular conversations. If you let them make the wrong assumption, then you are simply deceiving. I could deceive by emphasizing the wrong words or I could lie by saying the wrong word. It should be important in legal matters because documents can be worded to confuse or mislead a reader and trap them in a legal binding.
6. How can you improve your ethical judgment and why should you?
   1. I can familiarize myself with methods of persuasive action and how to both intensify and downplay wording. I can also calmly continue to interpret the meaning of a persuaders message and the ethical background from which they come. It is important to improve ethical judgement to protect against people who would speak unethically in ways that I might not understand if I didn’t improve my ethical judgement skills. In the same way that you hone a blade to cut through fruit, vegetables, or wood and foliage, you would have to hone your judgement skills to cut through poor logic and unethical arguments.
   2. Additionally, I can utilize the framework available on page 67 of the book to try and analyze the argument presented to me.