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Rhetorical Analysis

Comparative Rhetorical Analysis for two articles about Humanitarian Intervention

The two articles “The Case for Humanitarian Intervention” by Mia Farrow and “The Case Against Humanitarian Intervention” by John Bolton discusses the humanitarian intervention in the opposite sides. Farrow supports the humanitarian intervention and explores the development of it to claim the importance of who take actions for it，while Bolton is against it and analyses eight diverse arguments to support his view. The audience of the two articles is the person who want to do the research about humanitarian intervention and have some doubt of it, because the two articles show the definition, background and historical examples of humanitarian intervention, which is help the reader to research it deeply, and they have some academic vocabulary about history and social science. Although the two articles both use some specific rhetorical strategies to convince readers effectively, I feel that Bolton make me believe the negative effect of humanitarian intervention is greater than its benefits by logical examples, emotional effect and credible information source.

Farrow’s article is more vivid and coherent, but compared to Bolton’s article, it lack a force to persuade readers. It expresses the progress of humanitarian intervention by the flow of history, which makes the article more coherent and guides the readers to track the story. However, it does not reflect its main points of each part clearly; readers may be confused with what is the argument of the article. Then the author evokes an emotional response to persuade readers effectively. In the beginning of the article, the author gives the definition of humanitarian intervention by the moral part and shows heartrending historical events, which makes reader cause sympathy emotion to create a basic support for the article. In addition, Farrow uses some data and examples to make the article more logically. For example, he states, “500,000 people were killed in the span of three months while the UN and its member states did next to nothing.” by large data of “500,000 people” to show the big kill in the short time “the span of three months”. It convinces readers to believe the necessary of humanitarian intervention by the cruel history. Then after the department act for humanitarian intervention, another statistic appears-“Despite much talk, little has been done to halt the killing, and the concept of R2P, so lauded in the halls of the General Assembly, has yet to be applied to save the over 200,000 people who have so far been killed in Sudan.” Compared to the front “500,000 people were killed”, there were “over 200,000 people were saved”. The couples of data express the necessary of signing R2P by the obvious improvement.

When we comes to Bolton’s article, it persuade readers much more effectively than Farrow’s article. Firstly, it explores eight arguments against humanitarian intervention by a clear structure. Each argument is in a single paragraph with clear topic sentence and specific expression, so that readers can find the main point more directly. It is really help reader to understand and come into the article. The author also manipulates readers’ feeling to strengthen the belief of the article successfully. In the beginning, the author confirms connects of humanitarian intervention and moral rather than expresses point of view about against humanitarian intervention directly, which is to guide readers agree with the article first and then make them doubt why the author want to against humanitarian intervention. Then readers will read the following context because of the doubt rather than give up reading when seeing the idea. Compared to evoke emotion in Farrow’s article, the controversy article attracts to readers more. Then Bolton persuades readers more effective by some trustworthy instances, which everyone knows. For examples, Bolton also uses the example of R2P to prove his point of view. He points out “R2P has already been cited as a reason to invade Iraq” and give the factual example of “the US stop Iran from processing enriched uranium”. This example is much newer than that Farrow used. Therefore, the example is more credible and persuasive to persuade readers.

In summary, despite the fact that they both use the emotion and logic rhetorical strategies to persuade readers effectively, Bolton is more convincing obviously. Bolton structures his article and lists the principal arguments clearly, while Farrow is more like describe a story about humanitarian intervention vividly without a definite argument to support his point of view. When coming to emotion, Farrow prefers to inflame the evoke emotion, but Bolton prefers to raise the interest and doubt of readers. The second one may be more attractive. Finally, they give the different example to the same object—R2P. Absolutely, Bolton’s instances have more time-effectiveness than Farrow’s. After the comparison of these three parts, Bolton’s article is more convincing.