The re-emergence of smoking in youth communities across the United States through e-cigarettes and the legalization of marijuana has rekindled the debate over usage of tobacco and nicotine products. Historically, Native Americans have been one of the most targeted ethnic groups regarding the sale of tobacco products, and the increased popularization of smoking in main stream media has heightened the risk for current Native American youth. Therefore, it is no surprise that the scholarly article upending the current understanding of Native American tobacco usage in the northwest United States is of interest (Tushingham et al. 2018). In his newspaper article, Erik Lacitis presents the main conclusion of the scholarly article, but he replaces archaeological methodologies and analysis with the historical context of colonialism and a description of contemporary efforts combatting youth smoking in the Nez Perce community (Lacitis 2018). Lacitis’ choice of subject sacrifices the middle-range theory involved in an archaeological article, but this shift in focus successfully directs the conclusions of the research study towards addressing the contemporary cultural issues of tobacco usage and reparations for colonialism. However, Lacitis’ attention-grabbing style partially detracts from the overall presentation as it attempts to attract more general audience at the expense of vacuous content.

The scholarly article underscores that its findings contain the first direct biomolecular record of tobacco use by Native Americans in the northwestern United States (Tushingham et al. 2018: 1). To provide historical and contemporary context for the study, the authors outline the known health problems of tobacco products and the large campaigns against their use and sale. Furthermore, the article details the tenuous relationship between Native Americans and tobacco products by noting the controversy that American tobacco companies continue to use Native American imagery to market their products (Tushingham et al. 2018:1). This controversy stems from the context of colonialism in the historical-based understanding of tobacco usage in the northwest United States. The introduction of domesticated tobacco products to Native Americans around 1790 by Euro-American traders combined with forced-relocation of native populations evolved into the wide-spread tobacco usage and nicotine addiction that remains prevalent in modern Native American communities (Tushingham et al. 2018:1). With the context for the study established, the authors provide justification for the difficulty in studying ancient tobacco usage such as the rarity of preserved pipes in the northwest United States, the usage of other plants for smoking, and the unlikely preservation of charred tobacco seeds (Tushingham et al. 2018:2). The article further details archaeological methods to extract, record, and date the pipes found at 5 different archaeological sites, and the authors delve into extensive detail on the chemical analyses used with the technique of Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatography Mass Spectroscopy (UPLCMS) (Tushingham et al. 2018:3). Before presenting their conclusions, the authors acknowledge potential conflicts of interest as they identify cultural experts from the Nez Perce community whose aid to the research is motivated by the study’s use to help combat youth smoking in their community (Tushingham et al. 2018:3). The evidence of tobacco residue in a pipe approximately 1300 years old supports the understanding that Native Americans utilized indigenous, less-potent tobacco varieties long before contact with Euro-Americans. (Tushingham et al. 2018:4). The chemical analysis also identified other plants understood to be smoked by indigenous people in the northwest United States, and one mixture thought to be a staple for smoking was kinnikinnick. The mixture primarily consists of bearberry, and kinnikinnick is known to have social, medicinal, and spiritual uses (Tushingham et al. 2018:3). Bearberries contains the chemical arbutin, so researchers expected to detect large traces of this compound. None of the pipes contained traces of arbutin suggesting that kinnikinnick was not smoked by Native Americans in the northwest United States. However, the authors express doubts about the strength of this inference due to low sample size and the notion that absence of evidence is not evidence for absence (Tushingham et al. 2018:4). Finally, the authors express hope that their research will help combat youth smoking in Native American communities.

The newspaper article explicitly states the scholarly article’s conclusion that an approximately 1200-year-old pipe with tobacco residue provides sufficient evidence to completely overturn the accepted historical-based understanding of tobacco usage by Native Americans in the northwest United States (Lacitis 2018). The article then identifies the motivation of the research by acknowledging the consultation of Nez Perce cultural experts who plan to use the study to help combat the prevalence of smoking in their community (Lacitis 2018). The article provides numerous statistics from reputable sources on public health such as the CDC to describe the disproportionately large and harmful effect of smoking on Native American communities in comparison to the general population (Lacitis 2018). Lacitis transitions into an explanation of the study’s support of the “Keep it Sacred” movement by pointing out the traditionally spiritual associations of tobacco in native American culture. Lacitis provides historical and colonial background for the introduction of domesticated tobacco from the well-known Lewis and Clark expeditions to underscore the increase in Nicotine content of domesticated tobacco in comparison to indigenous varieties (Lacitis 2018). The article uses superlatives to describe Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatography Mass Spectroscopy (UPLCMS) technology and addresses the controversy of Native American imagery used to market tobacco products (Lacitis 2018). Like the scholarly article, Lacitis concludes with the hope that the study aids in addressing the cultural and health issue of tobacco use in Native American communities.

The scholarly article provides extensive justification for its conclusions by detailing its methodologies and assumptions. At the cost of losing the critical analysis of the journal article, Lacitis instead focuses on the applicability of its conclusions to solving contemporary cultural and health issues. While it is reasonable to expect the omission of the exact chemistry procedures and accounting to preserve the archaeological record (Tushingham et al. 2018:3), the middle-range theory used in an archaeological study is of utmost importance to even a general audience as it most accurately portrays the soundness of evidence and scope of the inferences drawn. Lacitis omits this analysis when he directly states that a ~1200-year-old pipe with tobacco residue supports the understanding that Native Americans in the northwestern United States had access to indigenous tobacco varieties long before contact with Euro-American traders (Lacitis 2018). This conclusion is presented under the trope of a discovery completely revolutionizing archaeological thinking, thus providing an attention-grabbing headline within the brevity required of an online periodical. To further the brevity of the article, Lacitis also completely skips the discussion of the smoking of kinnikinnick. However, this omission is justified as the authors of the scholarly article expressed major concerns over drawing conclusions from the lack of evidence for smoking of kinnikinnick (Tushingham et al. 2018:4). Lacitis accurately portrays the conclusions of the article without the analysis, and these omissions conserve the general audience’s limited attention span. This enables Lacitis to use the remainder of the article to characterize the study as a progressive tool in remedying cultural and health issues in the Nez Perce and broader Native American community.

Lacitis elicits empathy from the audience by quoting numerous statistics from reputable sources describing the significant smoking-related mortality rate of Native American populations (Lacitis 2018). Lacitis then builds upon this established disadvantage with a quote from Lewis and Clark to emphasize the change in nicotine content from the indigenous tobacco varieties (0.16%) to the domesticated varieties (8.3%) introduced by Euro-American traders (Lacitis 2018). By using the colonial connotations of the Lewis and Clark expeditions, Lacitis characterizes the cultural change of tobacco usage in Native American communities as exploitative. More specifically, Lacitis uses the conclusion of the research study to argue that Euro-American *interference* caused the traditional spiritual use of milder indigenous tobacco varieties to devolve into commercial use of tobacco with a much higher, *addictive* nicotine content. This directly transitions into Lacitis’ support of the “Keep it Sacred” movement (Lacitis 2018), which contends that regular usage of commercial tobacco is in no way an element of tradition or spirituality. In line with the Nez Perce cultural experts (Lacitis 2018), Lacitis uses the conclusion of the research study to argue that the integration of commercial tobacco into native American culture is an exploitative remnant of colonialism that requires reparation, and that addressing this issue will help solve the broader issue of increased youth tobacco use and heightened smoking-mortality in Native American communities.

Though Lacitis accurately portrays the conclusions of the research study and successfully uses the evidence to address a larger cultural issue affecting Native Americans, his attention-grabbing style slightly detracts from the overall presentation. A prime example of this is Lacitis’ description of UPLCMS technology used to identify tobacco residue. Instead of identifying how the technology helps overcome the challenges in identifying tobacco residue to satisfy a skeptical scientific audience (Tushingham et al. 2018:2), Lacitis simply states that the technology was used on Mars (Lacitis 2018). This fact contributes nothing towards portraying the archaeological significance of the research findings, nor does it build the argument for addressing tobacco usage in the Nez Perce community. Despite this, Lacitis still includes it in the article to appeal to a more general audience who would be more attracted by how “cool” a technology is given its use in space. Furthermore, Lacitis often repeats his arguments with platitudes such as “It’s hard to resist a more powerful drug” (Lacitis 2018). Despite already constructing an argument connecting the evidence of the research article to the broader issue of smoking in indigenous communities, Lacitis still includes these repetitive statements to aid readers simply skimming through the article. Lacitis’ style and sentence choice compromise the click-revenue purpose of online periodical with the actual substance of his argument that builds upon the research study.

The re-popularization of smoking and tobacco products across the United states advances the relevancy of both the scholarly and newspaper article to general audiences. Lacitis effectively builds upon the evidence provided in the research study to forward the idea of smoking cessation in Native American communities. The construction of his argument does not misrepresent the results of the research study, but Lacitis’ sentence choice and style distract from his presentation. Overall, the article furthers progress towards the goal of the Nez Perce cultural experts who hope to amend the health of their community and the effects of colonialism on Native American culture.
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Outline

Intro:

* Re-emergence of tobacco in all youth communities (e-cigs, legalization of marijuana)
* Tenuous relationship between tobacco and native American communities historically
* One of the most-impacted communities by tobacco

**Thesis**: Newspaper accurately states main conclusions of scholarly article but replaces archaeological methodologies and analysis with historical account of colonialism and detailing efforts to combat smoking in the native American community. This is done to appeal to a more general audience whose main concern is the growth of tobacco usage among youth (even outside native American community) as well as reparations for colonialism.

P1 – Summary of Journal Article

* Discussion of modern tobacco & history
  + Domestication -> replacement (1790s) vs. previous model of introduction
  + Tenuous historical relationship with Nez Perce and native Americans in general
* Challenging to identify tobacco residue – why?
  + Pipes are rare in northwest, tobacco doesn’t preserve well burnt, other plants smoked
* Tech used (UPLCMS) - ultra-performance liquid chromatography mass spectroscopy
* Identify conflict of interest – Nez Perce cultural society encouraging study to help combat youth smoking in indigenous community (**Also in conclusion)**
* Scientific/Tech methods, archaeological materials (not expected to be in newspaper)
* Results:
  + Clearly tobacco used (surprisingly) long before contact w/white traders (~1300 years ago): 5 sites, 8/12 pipes w/tobacco, pipes covered time span of 2500 BC-1900
  + **Unclear** now on role of kinnikimmick (lack of evidence is not evidence that it wasn’t smoked), previously thought to be smoked quite a bit

P2 – Summary of Newspaper Article

* ~1300 years ago Nez perce used a less potenent, indigenous strain of tobacco
  + Evidenced by residue on pipe, upends previous historical record of *introduction by traders*, now considered to be *replacement* by stronger, domesticated variety
* Hope to combat smoking rates by authors and outside cultural sources
* **Statistics on how native Americans are affected by smoking (reputable sources)**
* **Organizations combatting smoking (“Keep it Sacred”)**
* Rapid historical transition from indigenous -> domesticate
* Gas chromatography, irrelevant comment about mars
* Lewis and Clark quote on indigenous tobacco vs. domesticate
* Tenuous relationship (1900s logo of tobacco companies was native Americans)
* Ends w/hope to combat smoking in native American community (main focus of article)

P3a – Critique of Newspaper vs. Journal – Accurate portrayal of research study

* Accurate portrayal WHY?
  + States that tobacco residue in pipe 1200 yrs ago -> evidence for tobacco use
  + Omits uncertain conclusion about kinnikimmick (O.K because research study unsure)
* Omits analysis/midle-range theory, WHY?
  + Limited attention span of audience
  + Gives space for constructing broader discussion about the role of tobacco in Native American culture USING evidence from the research article (BUILDS)

P3b – Critique of Newspaper vs. Journal – Topics/Focuses of newspaper article

* HUGE focus on how indigenous tobacco less potent/more ritually significant: WHY?
  + Another aspect of how colonialism (white fur traders) have wronged indigenous people – ties in with modern social climate & historical misrepresentation of Native Americans and tobacco (FIXING WRONGDOINGS OF PAST)
* **Highlights that results of study will be used to combat tobacco use – WHY?**
  + - Modern audience (even outside of native American community) concerned w/re-emergence of tobacco/smoking, especially among youth

P3c – Critique of Newspaper vs. Journal – Style or author/newspaper article to grab attention

* Irrelevant comment about chromatography (how is it relevant that it was used on Mars)
  + WHY? Makes technology seem “cool/contemporary” to audience
* Why not talk about tech relevance/archaeological challenges of measuring tobacco in residue? -> less skeptical audience that simply doesn’t care
* Outside source usage doesn’t add to discussion, more so just a “I consulted experts, so trust me”

Conclusion:

* Indigenous peoples being wronged by colonialism + re-emergence of tobacco use (especially among youth) make the conclusions of this paper attractive/relevant for general audience -> newspaper takes advantage of this and sprinkles in attention-grabbing style of a typical periodical
* Focus on initiatives on combatting tobacco use + historical account makes general audience see this as progress towards fixing **CONTEMPORARY** health issue that goes beyond the native American community

**OVERALL: the content of the newspaper article does a pretty good job of building upon the conclusions of the article to address a contemporary issue relevant to a general audience BUT, it does fall into the style tropes of an attention-grabbing headliner.**