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Questions

Swift

1. Swift’s satirical tone becomes apparent when he mentions that, “a child, just dropped from its dam, may be supported by her milk for a solar year…”. At this point, the reader can see that Swift’s use of words that have been used with animals indicates that he is not being serious in “A Modest Proposal.” In addition, we see that he specifically mentions a solar year and not just the common lunar year indicating that he is either a lunatic, or the piece is supposed to be satirical.
2. It is possible to see that the speaker of the story puts a lot of thought into the proposal; however, at points, the reader sees that the proposal is merely a satirical speech. At the end, the speaker mentions that he has no interest in pursuing such a task and that he would not even be able to provide towards the cause having children and a wife that are too old.
3. Like mentioned above, Swift uses this language as satire. This is where the reader first realizes that the writer is not being serious about what he is saying. The wording used, however, really makes the reader think about what type of world they live in, where people are treated as animals in some places. It is also meant to show that humans should be more considerate towards each other. When forced to think about other people as animals, the reader realizes that every human life has a purpose should be treated with respect.

Royko

1. Royko’s writing appears more factual and straightforward than the other written pieces we have read in the class. The other written pieces relied more on implication and analysis to extract the meaning.
2. In my opinion, I believe that guns should be banned for all purposes other than law enforcement and hunting. I am fine with gun ownership, but I do not believe in common citizens owning military grade assault rifles or guns of similar caliber. Having studied psychology and psychological disorders, I am aware of the potential damage that certain mentally ill individuals can cause to innocent civilians. In addition, I support the absolute ban on gun ownership to people who are diagnosed with a mental illness or exhibit behaviour deemed potentially harmful to others. On paper, this would be my ideal stance, but given that illegal gun trafficking and trade do exist, I can understand the counterarguments to the stance I take. However, I certainly believe that there should be tighter restrictions on guns and that stricter regulations should be carried out and closely enforced. People who were known to have some level of mental illness that was a potential threat have carried out many of the bigger shootings. Guns should be kept away from these people and stricter analysis of a person’s mental health should be applied before allowing them to own a weapon. This will not stop all shootings, but it can stop some of them.

DeBrabander

DeBrebander’s essay titled “The Freedom of an Armed Society” uses a number of literary devices not only to keep the reader interested throughout the article, but also to add effect to the point he is arguing. Three of devices used in the text are an anecdote, INSERT 2, and INSERT 3.

The first literary device, used almost instantly, is an anecdote. In the beginning, the reader comes across an anecdote about DeBrabander’s experience with his son following the Sandy Hook shooting. DeBrabander goes on to detail the situation upon turning up the radio’s volume in the car in which “[his] eldest son asked if he could be homeschooled.” The author’s use of an anecdote in the beginning of the essay is used to hook the reader and to keep them reading. The anecdote also explains why DeBrabander has chosen to write this article and links the introduction to the thesis statement: “That incident brought home to me what I have always suspected, but found difficult to articulate: an armed society — especially as we prosecute it at the moment in this country — is the opposite of a civil society.”

Another literary device DeBrabander uses is rhythm. In the paragraph illustrating the details of a town hall meeting regarding Obamacare, Debrabander speaking about guns, says, “they announce that the conversation is not completely unbounded, unfettered and free; there is or can be a limit to negotiation and debate — definitively.” With a mild application of alliteration, the author exaggerates the control the gun that the armed protestor bore over the entire town hall and how everyone’s freedoms were essentially taken away with the presence of this weapon. Analysis of the sentence reveals that the gun is presented as an evil “whip” that keeps control over the crowd.

Finally, irony is used as a basis and argument for the entire essay. DeBrabander stresses throughout several paragraphs, especially in the paragraph illustrating the town meeting with the armed protestor, that having more guns and more liberal gun laws does not actually entail freedom, but a hidden oppression amongst all individuals, even going as far as endangering the 1st Amendment right.