

Brooks, David. "The Great Affluence Fallacy." *The New York Times*, August 9, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/09/opinion/the-great-affluence-fallacy.html?mcubz=3>, A. 18 August 2017.

Speaker: The voice of David Brooks, is one of a conservative perspective, a man who has knowledge of past and present, and feels both compelled and obligated to form and express an opinion. Nevertheless, the man's conservative bias is expressed most assuredly in statements often aimed at "millennials": "as we've gotten better richer, we've used wealth to buy space: bigger homes... yards, separate bedrooms, private cars, autonomous lifestyles" (9).

Occasion: Brooks employs an interesting technique to his message of "affluence"; by presenting a historical example of "supposedly" better-off colonists continuously defecting to a less affluent, more communal/tribal Native American lifestyle. A parallel is drawn from this historical example to one of a "millennial" standpoint, a modern rejection of absolute autonomy and a acceptance of modern communality.

Audience: The audience Brooks has in mind, is the very same one he continuously references in the article. Millennials, the greatest generation for shifting values of autonomy vs community.

Purpose: Taking occasion and audience into account, it becomes clear that the author has a favourable view towards community and is generally positive to the idea for millennials.

Statement: The author's comparison of white colonials fleeing the "commercial" colonies for the "communal and tribal" societies of the Indians, helps illustrate the innate desire for community we face, timelessly (1). Brooks then ties this into our modern American consumer culture, and with a generation that is at a crossroads on its individuality and its community, connecting two issues, both old and new.

Tone: Brooks' tone towards affluence is dry in taste, a mere statement and not an impassioned position being held. As if he is intrigued but not surprised in the direction this generation has taken.

Crane-Murdoch, Sierra “Standing Rock: A New Moment for Native-American Rights.” *The New Yorker*, October 12, 2016,  
<http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/standing-rock-a-new-moment-for-native-american-rights>, A. 20 August 2017

Speaker: Sierra Crane-Murdoch, is an investigative journalist, writing for respected magazines, such as the Atlantic and the New Yorker. Her background is that of an educated woman, formerly from Berkeley, and distinctly hands on with the situation at hand. Her writing suggests an understanding of the people at Standing Rock and bias towards the Native Americans of the protest.

Occasion: The time and place of the article takes place last year, during the much publicized Standing Rock anti-Pipeline protests, that brought together many Native American tribes to the area in solidarity. The author, being located at the scene, illustrates for us the reasoning and rationale for the protest and what it means in context to earlier incidents, such as the 1973 Wounded Knee standoff (1).

Audience: Murdoch serves as a window into the protesters daily lives, helping enlighten those of us who aren't in the camps experiencing it all. Therefore, her audience is the public who don't understand the reasoning and who don't understand what the life of the protest is like; of what being a Native American entails.

Purpose: Murdoch wrote this piece in order to give context, give a window into how and why these protests are occurring, and contrasting the protests to earlier historical examples to show how different the situations are.

Subject: The content the author writes waxes and wanes between modern day context, the day-to-day life of the camps and of the historical examples of injustice faced by Natives in the US. The idea of the recurring oppression of Native Americans is prevalent throughout the article.

Tone: The author writes in a very muted tone, presenting the protest much like a journal or a memoir, allowing the facts to speak for themselves. While the author clearly portrays only one PoV in the conflict, it is presented objectively, allowing the reader to draw conclusions based on the what the author wrote.

“Of slots and sloth.” *The Economist*, January 15th, 2015,

<https://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21639547-how-cash-casinos-makes-native-americans-poorer-slots-and-sloth>, A. 20 August 2017

Speaker: While the Economist failed to list an author of the article, the Economist itself has garnered quite the reputation. While the magazine denies having a left-right spectrum bias, it often holds more conservative biases, given its love for free market, classical liberalism and all that that entails.

Occasion: The articles was written in the context of Native run casinos seemingly failing to cut poverty in the USA, despite years of legality. This particular article details one specific example of a reservation’s casino that doesn’t help the poverty issue.

Audience: The audience the Economist appears to be addressing is a standard reader, who may be under preconceived notions that handouts and casinos help the residents of the Reservation. The particular audience of the Economist tend to be fond of the free market however, so this piece in particular could be written for a more ignorant individual, possibly not of the Economist’s usual audience.

Purpose: The author is writing this clearly to show that “[the] payments can be destructive because the more generous they become, the more people fall into the trap of not working”, in order to inform the reader that these handouts are inefficient and bad (6). They provide a counter-example instead, of a tribe that “has eliminated poverty entirely”, rather than flat checks to all its members, instead diversifies the tribes economy through other ventures (8).

Subject: The authors flatly states that the current method casinos utilize for redistributing wealth, has led to rising unemployment and “sloth”, and rather the money should be used in a different way. And he further states that the reason it hasn’t is due to how unpopular such a move is, resulting in backlash for the general population from the Reservations.

Tone: Unfortunately, the tone writer has on the topic is snarky, effectively hurting the message of the article. Statements like: “He says he doesn’t hear that argument used often against rich non-Natives with trust funds. Perhaps he has never seen the film ‘Arthur’,” only hurt the argument at hand with uncalled for jokes, in an otherwise serious article.

Reagan, Bob. "Why Dallas should think twice before tearing down Confederate statues." *The Dallas Morning News*, July 21 2017, [www.dallasnews.com/opinion/commentary/2017/07/21/dallas-think-twice-tearing-confederate-statues](http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/commentary/2017/07/21/dallas-think-twice-tearing-confederate-statues), A. 19 August 2017.

Speaker: Bob Reagan is a male, lawyer, former police officer and professor, residing currently in Dallas, city well known for wealth, and a crossroads for the Deep South of the East, and a Traditional image of the West, of Texas. From his location, his position in society and even his gender, Reagan's position on the issue of Confederate statues is understandable and somewhat expected, yet his potential bias is muted in favor of a more ethos, humanizing approach to the issue at hand.

Occasion: This piece is fairly recent as of this date, being less than a month old, and interestingly enough, somewhat prophetic for the day. The current mindset of the United States, as of August 19, is that the maintenance of Confederate monuments is unnecessary or even somewhat offensive, a position that Reagan preemptively contradicts. In a strange way, Reagan has made a case for an issue that is occurring in the present, that he wrote of in the past.

Audience: Reagan's statement is to an audience of Dallas, of those who approve of the monuments, and those who are undecided. It is clear that he is motioning for the undecided, asking them to simply understand why these statues need not be removed, an education for those who would otherwise question the existence of these monuments.

Purpose: Reagan's message of preservation is fraught with pathos and logos, a blending of the two, as he attempts to sway the reader. Statements such as "it is unjust to vilify those in the Civil War who fought, or even their military leaders", and "the Confederate soldiers, and even many of those who led the secessionist movement, did not fight to establish slavery; they were defending their homeland against a perceived invasion...", clearly seek to provide perspective on the Confederates, and as to why they fought, contradicting sentiments brought forth by others on the continued existence of Confederate Monuments/Statues (7,9).

Statement: The author also puts forward the example of Napoleon in the Louvre, drawing parallels between the French Emperor and the Confederate figures of old. Overall, he makes a

distinct focus as to why the Confederates fought, the impact they have made, and as to why they should be maintained in the public eye as monuments.

Tone: The tone of the writer in this piece is almost apologetic, and factual; clearly showing that his writing more of plea than anything else. By his tone of choice, the author remains mild and friendly to the audience, allowing us to slow down and fully absorb his statements and arguments.

Riley, Naomi Schaefer. "To solve alcoholism, Native Americans must look inside reservations." *Arizona Republic*, USA Today, May 18, 2017, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2017/05/18/south-dakota-indian-liquor-alcoholism-column/101484586/>, A. 20 August 2017.

Speaker: Naomi Schaefer Riley is a Harvard educated woman, with a long history of writing articles of lifestyle and political narrative. Her writing has distinct conservative flair, present in her writing on this article, and previous articles; showing an anti-PC lens on her views.

Occasion: This particular article is of fairly recent origin, detailing an issue that has affected Native Americans for generations and that continues to cripple Native American groups to this day: alcoholism. The author writes this in light of "Nebraska officials voted to revoke the licenses of four liquor stores", which the author states is a hollow action (1).

Audience: The audience of the article appear to be the uniformed, non-Native American public, who may see the issue of alcoholism as a problem that Native reservations have inherited, rather than maintain. The author also discreetly nudges Native Americans themselves, by stating that "many Indian leaders believe that people inside of these communities are perpetuating the problem", suggesting to any Indian readers, that the issue of alcoholism is a problem that must be tackled by them, the Natives.

Purpose: The author writes this article in order to both inform the general public of the "true" cause and reason of continual alcoholism in the reservation, and to subtly prod Natives into taking their own fate into their hands.

Subject: The actual content that the author presents details "the scourge of drugs and alcohol on reservations", and the various methods used by reservations to combat the "scourge" (2). But also shows that powers within the tribes, often refuse methods that truly work, such as "a program called 24/7", in "which people who are out on bail after an arrest and people on probation must check in with local law enforcement twice a day to take a breathalyzer test"; the program proved successful, but forces within the reservation prevented its implementation (9).

Tone: The author writes in an almost rebellious fashion, with a tone that makes her sound as if she is breaking down a great barrier. The effect, is an article that has blatant ethos but also comes off as somewhat pretentious, especially considering her non-Native, affluent background.

Rosenberg, Alyssa. "Trump says we can't replace Confederate monuments. He's wrong." *The Washington Post*, August 17, 2017, [www.washingtonpost.com/news/act-four/wp/2017/08/17/take-down-confederate-monuments-honor-real-american-heroes-in-their-place/?utm\\_term=.248a146f41a7](http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/act-four/wp/2017/08/17/take-down-confederate-monuments-honor-real-american-heroes-in-their-place/?utm_term=.248a146f41a7), A. 19 August 2017

Speaker: Alyssa Rosenberg's written response does much to tell us about herself, as she is adamantly anti-Trump. Of course, this is not an unusual position to hold up in the modern America, as is her position on the Confederacy and Confederate monuments; the woman grew up in Boston, the heart of New England and an old member of the Union, and received an education at Yale, a northern Ivy League school.

Occasion: The article is written directly in response to Trump's statement concerning Charlottesville and the greater controversy surrounding Confederate monuments, a recent event fresh in the minds of the American public. In fact, the very event that contextualizes Rosenberg's article merely occurred last week (as of this writing), and continues to be an ongoing debate/issue.

Audience: Unlike Bob Reagan's piece, concerning the preservation of monuments, Rosenberg's audience is clearly not a single city or population within said city; rather her audience is of a more national level, a general opinion to be read and acknowledged by the American people. And potentially Donald Trump himself, as a direct response to his statement on the removal of Confederate statues.

Purpose: The author wrote this in order to provide a response to the statements by the President, backed with ethos and pathos, in order to justify and to call for the removal/destruction of Confederate monuments. The author wants those who read their article to understand that tearing down "traitor's" statues, is not the moral issue as portrayed by the President (2).

Subject: The subject of the article of course being, the current status of Confederate statues in the United States. The idea presented by the author is the endorsement of the removal of said Confederate monuments.

Tone: The writer speaks with a passionate tone, as evidenced by statements such as “their racist and anti-Semitic ideas about the state of the country”, showing that the author feels strongly at hand about the issue and the opposition (2). The tone, as a result, adds subtle pathos, through such a personal and passionate voice, hereby giving credibility to the article.

## Works Cited

- Brooks, David. "The Great Affluence Fallacy." *The New York Times*, August 9, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/09/opinion/the-great-affluence-fallacy.html?mcubz=3>, A. 18 August 2017.
- Crane-Murdoch, Sierra "Standing Rock: A New Moment for Native-American Rights." *The New Yorker*, October 12, 2016, <http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/standing-rock-a-new-moment-for-native-american-rights>, A. 20 August 2017
- "Of slots and sloth." *The Economist*, January 15th, 2015, <https://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21639547-how-cash-casinos-makes-native-americans-poorer-slots-and-sloth>, A. 20 August 2017
- Reagan, Bob. "Why Dallas should think twice before tearing down Confederate statues." *The Dallas Morning News*, July 21 2017, [www.dallasnews.com/opinion/commentary/2017/07/21/dallas-think-twice-tearing-confederate-statues](http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/commentary/2017/07/21/dallas-think-twice-tearing-confederate-statues), A. 19 August 2017.
- Riley, Naomi Schaefer. "To solve alcoholism, Native Americans must look inside reservations." *Arizona Republic*, USA Today, May 18, 2017, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2017/05/18/south-dakota-indian-liquor-alcoholism-column/101484586/>, A. 20 August 2017.
- Rosenberg, Alyssa. "Trump says we can't replace Confederate monuments. He's wrong." *The Washington Post*, August 17, 2017, [www.washingtonpost.com/news/act-four/wp/2017/08/17/take-down-confederate-monumen](http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/act-four/wp/2017/08/17/take-down-confederate-monumen)

[ts-honor-real-american-heroes-in-their-place/?utm\\_term=.248a146f41a7](https://www.fox.com/story/fox-honor-real-american-heroes-in-their-place/?utm_term=.248a146f41a7), A. 19 August  
2017