

### SA 1.3

In life, there are a variety of ways to communicate messages, whether that may be from talking, writing, or drawing. Each of these three aspects are all unique to every individual, no individual talks, writes, and draws identically to others. Many of examples apply to writing, specifically in articles – where the writer is able to convey their messages through difficult forms of writing. The two different writing examples are the article “Mainstream English is Key”, from the Los Angeles Times and the “Landmark’s Political Cartoons”. These two types of writings are almost completely opposite, where one is very direct with the usage of facts and statistics, and the other intrigues the reader with interesting pictures that allows for the readers to interpret on their own. These two different types of writing still send the same message; however, the question is which one does it the most effectively?

For the article, “Mainstream English is Key” from the Los Angeles Times, it’s incredibly direct with the usage of the Queens English, one that’s very formal and in a way prestigious. They believe that it’s essential in correcting the student’s English in order to “survive” by stating, “Whatever the intent in Oakland, the goal there and in other districts must remain proficiency in standard English for all children. Anything less would stigmatize students, limit their ability to compete successfully in college or the workplace and do them a permanent disservice.” The phrases here attempt to show that they have good intentions of ensuring that the student’s future is one that’s filled with success. However, that does not mean that their approach and statement is correct. The article seemed to come in attacking and criticizing the use of Ebonics. Instantly, the approach of the news article fails at delivering an effective message by criticizing, which may rub people off the wrong way. Additionally, the ideas and insights provided in this article is one that are incredibly similar to a reading we previously read, “Tense Present” by David Wallace, both sharing the idea of learning standard English in order to survive and being able to change the corrupt system. Both delivered a piece that was somewhat aggressive which is ineffective in persuading an audience. By simply attacking others, it only makes them more defensive on their stance. The angle at which the piece came at rubbed people off the wrong way by simply isolating a race. Since they came out very blunt, it easier for people to get enraged, which makes it difficult for people to understand their point of view. This type of writing requires people to be open-minded or else it’ll end up offending. It requires open minded individuals to calmly understand the opposing point of view. If everybody can be calm and open minded, we can civilly address these issues without enraging people.

Comparing the article to “The Landmark’s Political Cartoon”, the cartoon uses visuals to portray the message. As the viewer looks at the picture, it consists of two visuals: one showing the bubonic plague below a corpse and another showing the plague killing the English book. With the visual, it allows people to interpret the pictures themselves. People can interpret the drawing as Ebonics killing the English language or Ebonics dominating the nation. Pictures are often times easier in allowing people digest controversial messages. It allows room for people to interpret it from both sides, rather than being direct and forcing a stance. Additionally, with

drawings, all race and classes are able to provide their two cents. Compared to the Queens English, it's difficult to incorporate other classes and ethnicities because it's exclusive to the white and wealthy. The majority is able to consume and digest the images and form their own opinions, which makes the writing substantially intriguing. The same cannot be said with the "Mainstream English is Key", where it's directed to those that are proficient at standard English making it difficult to read for the average citizen. However, the only downfall is that the pictures simply doesn't send out a consistent message to the community. These may be beneficial with controversial topics but not at being direct with one's demands. Nevertheless, this strategy is one that's effective in incorporating everyone and implying a specific message.

The two writings are completely opposite from one another as well as approach in conveying their message. The Los Angeles Times came in aggressive and direct, while The Landmark's Political Cartoon allowed room for creativity and self-interpretation. Both pieces are successful in specific circumstances: being direct when one wants something and beating around the bush to avoid enraging the bear. However, I do believe that being more direct is often times the better route. Although it's easy to get defensive and enraged, it's necessary in getting one's point across. It rids of misinterpretation and is often times necessary for change to occur in controversial topics. It's necessary to get people all on the same wavelength rather than having them interpreting and riding their own wave.