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Billions of people populate this planet, and each person is constantly struggling to be their own
person. With each person comes a plethora of traits that define who they are. And, when these traits come
together, they form an identity. Experiences, relationships, personalities, quirks, emotions, and fears are all
examples of traits. These traits are what we hold on to so dearly in order to separate ourselves from the next
person. These identities are so important to us that a lot of our lives involve creating and sustaining them.
Without them, we are not much of anything. In the two short stories, “The Vanishing American” and “The
Girl with the Hungry Eyes,” the authors use supernatural elements in order to convey to the reader the
importance of identity. In “The Vanishing American” the main character’s life is so monotonous and full of
recurring elements, that he finds that he is in fact losing his all important identity in a very drastic way, leading
to him changing his view on others and looking down upon his own life. The narrator in “The Girl with the
Hungry Eyes” finds himself in the grasp of a living entity that feeds off his identity in order to compensate
for its lack thereof. The world is full of metaphorical invisibility and vampires of all kinds, and we must
overcome—as the narrators in the short stories do—these aspects of society as the characters in these short
stories do in order to sustain our identities.

While some people fear tangible things—whether it be animals or disease—some of us fear the loss
of who we are. Our identities are what make us, and to lack an identity would mean to blend in with the rest
of the world, disappearing in a sea of monotony. One way in which we could lose our identities is by allowing
our lives to become redundant: repeating the same routine day to day, year to year. For Minchell in “The
Vanishing American,” this fear becomes a reality when his lack of identity causes him to become literally
invisible. This supernatural concept of becoming invisible is extremely fitting to this character’s situation.
While some may see it as a desirable condition—to be able to go about your business unnoticed—it quickly
becomes a curse for Minchell because it is not a wish or desire that caused him to become so. How he has been living his life up to this point that has forced him to become unnoticeable to those around him. Evidence of this fact is in the events leading up to his discovering his invisibility. Instead of being instantly aware that no one can see him he figures it out gradually. At first look this may seem to be due to his gradually becoming invisible. The reality is that the monotony of his life had made him unnoticeable naturally: the invisibility was more of a side effect. The first sign of his invisibility is, upon leaving his workplace, Minchell addresses the woman in charge of the elevator and instead of a response the “girl [says] nothing” (296). This could easily be mistaken for simply a rude ignoring Minchell for her own reasons. But while he confirms her moving the elevator it is apparent that this could have easily been a coincidence. The girl even mentions “‘damn kids’” (296) suggesting that it was this that caused her to announce and go about moving the elevator. Then when addressing his own boss, who had been so “for over ten years” (297) he is ignored. Once again, this shows that Minchell was already invisible at this point: the monotonous of his own life led to him believing that the boss was just ignoring him as always. It is not till he arrives home that his being invisible becomes apparent. At this point there is no excuse for the events, when he enters and addresses his family he gets no recognition and response. And despite already greeting his wife she says: ““Young man, just you wait until your father gets here”” (300) as if she was unaware he had already arrived. The reason it is now bluntly apparent to Minchell that something was definitely aloof is because he has no more excuses. The excuses beforehand, however, were borne from the fact that his life is monotonous enough that this behavior towards him is expected. Whether his awareness of this fact is conscious or not is unclear. But he had already blended into the majority and lost his identity so drastically that he need not be invisible for these things to already be happening to him.

But this is the case as he soon discovers. And, it becomes quite apparent that there is more behind the relation between his turning invisible and his identity than it seems. When he becomes invisible, it is not only to those around him: Minchell becomes invisible to himself as well. At one point in the story—after speculating his situation to a large extent—he finally looks into a mirror and discovers “[it] reflected nothing” (300). Being unable to see his own image shows that it is not just those around him that have been failing to
see his significance: he has lost the ability to see himself as an individual as well. One of the signs of his inability to see himself (both metaphorically and literally) is when he realizes he is not aware that it is his birthday. Age is one of the most important factors that make up our identity. It dictates what we are capable of doing, as well as what we are allowed to do, especially in American society (which the “Vanishing American” is clearly focusing upon). As we age, new experiences become available to us: from potty training to drinking alcohol. Because of this our birthdays—the occasion on which our age increases—become a big part of our lives and therefore our identities. Not only this but it is also the day we set apart from all others and claim as “our day” in which we feel the focus should be on ourselves. This however is clearly not the case with Minchell, as he continues to do his redundant job of “totaling” (295) sums of money that he is adding up. This is clearly not something one would wish to be doing on the birthday, but still Minchell carries out his usual day, in no way recognizing his own identity through this special day as he should. The author points out Minchell’s forgetting his birthday as a way to signify that his monotonous life has become so much so that even a birthday has lost all individual meaning to him. Rather as seeing it as a reason to break away from his life of monotony, it seems to only get him to thinking how “he might have another seventeen or eighteen years left. And then death” (297). Minchell becomes aware of his life being meaningless and feels that “seventeen or eighteen” (297) years is a short time. This indicates that the monotony of his life has taken away from his identity and therefore the meaning of his life, and therefore made years seem less important and shorter. Without identity age means nothing to Minchell but a countdown of his own death. The number of years he decides is left before his death comes is also significant. It seems as if the narrator feels that around the time he is expected to retire is the same time his life will end. This is most likely because his job is a major factor in his lack of identity through monotony, and without it he would have to create some type of new identity. This is something he seems sure is impossible at this point in the story and death would be more likely. While most would remember their birthdays and use it as it should be, a cause for celebration and a time to recognize your identity, Minchell is incapable of doing either because he has lost his identity and become just as invisible to himself as he is at this point to others.
When discovering that he has become invisible—and lost any individual identity—Minchell begins to go on the defensive. Once Minchell realizes that the monotony of his life is what led him losing this identity and fading away he starts to see the importance of his identity and how serious his lacking one is. As a result Minchell begins to do something very human: he starts to blame everyone else for his predicament. Although it is his life choices that have led him to this point, he begins to address his wife and son as possible reasons that his life has become monotonous. He goes off a rant about how “he couldn’t let Madge and Jimmy Starve” (302). While his job was redundant and meaningless, he justifies staying in this position because there was no other option: doing so was for the good of his wife and child. He blames Madge for ruining his plans. He wanted “to teach,” but apparently meeting Madge resulted in his “not planning any more” and giving up “all the dreams” (301). But all of this speculation of his wife calls a lot into question. Why did his meeting his wife have to stop him from teaching? No further details on the matter are given, leaving room to speculate that Madge did not necessarily have a direct hand in stopping this particular plan. And seeing just how much of Minchell’s life is lacking distinct identity shows that it is more his fault that he is not teaching than anyone else’s. If it was truly a “dream” of his, than he could have found a way to go about achieving it and gaining this identity himself. Then he turns his thoughts upon his son who “never read books” and that he “would never understand” (301). His son Jimmy is not someone Minchell can relate to, but there is something beyond the negative comments he has to say about Jimmy. While Minchell is “forty-seven” (296), his boy is young and has his whole life in front of him. Not only this but his son, while somewhat stereotypical of a young boy, has some character and therefore identity. His son has plenty of time to continue developing his identity but Minchell has anything but and lacks this opportunity. Seeing his son “[eat] filth and [pick] his nose and [watch] television” makes Minchell feel as if his son is wasting this volition: not creating an identity as he had failed to do. Then the son too would grow like his father had into a life that lacks individuality and is full of monotony. If he had not allowed himself to lose his own identity he would not have become defensive as he had and begin thinking negatively and critically of his loved ones.

Once Minchell realizes he has become invisible to those around him, and more importantly to himself, the true issue arises: he must find a way to regain his identity. It is one thing to become aware of a
lack of identity, but to get it back is another story. Minchell has already recognized that keeping his job is necessary to support his family, so breaking the monotony by quitting is impossible. His feeble attempt at getting the attention of others shows poor result. He had been “vanishing gradually for a long time” (302) and to regain his identity and in turn his visibility would take an act far out of his character. Minchell would need to do something to separate himself from others and clarify his individuality to not only those around him, but to himself as well. Our identities start developing as soon as we are born, through both nature and nurture. It is the traits we develop at this point that act as the blueprints for our identities as adults. As such what we use as models for our identities and traits as children incorporate themselves even when we are too old to appreciate them. In Minchell’s case this module for identity is “King Richard.” (303) To ride this lion is his lifelong dream, but while Minchell has always recognized that the lion is important to him he never truly realized why until the end of the story. Not only is it a statue, representing something solid and concrete and so easily admirable, it is what the statue is of that holds importance. The lion—a creature that is independent in its own environment—represents such a powerful identity and significance that Minchell cannot help but aspire to. The lion does as it pleases; something that Minchell lacks the ability to do as he does only what is needed of him every day despite his distaste for it. He constantly must “put on his horrible suit…. [bring] his paycheck home and [turn] it over to Madge…[and] [listen] to her vicious unending complaints.” (302) He describes all this lack of contentment with his life, and if he were like the lion he would be able to rid himself of it all and follow any dream he pleases. The fact that it is a king is also something to consider. A king is above all others: a leader who everyone admires and notices. Minchell works a job in which even his own boss fails to recognize his existence, and being invisible is not being noticed by anyone. To ride such a creature with all of this meaning behind it would be just what Minchell needs. And when he does fulfill his childhood dream, he instantly regains his identity and becomes visible once more. And almost as if to recognize what he has done and that he now—as the lion does—has identity, Minchell only “when he was good and ready… got down off the lion.” (305).

While the author and the supernatural elements he uses in “Vanishing American” speaks to the reader about a man who has already lost his identity attempting to regain it, “Girl with the Hungry Eyes” is
about a man with a lot of identity who must prevent it from being taken. The narrator has a colorful past, a job, and aspirations. All of these are components and therefore evidence of his personality. It is through his experiences with the girl that he realizes just how important this identity is and that he must protect it. The supernatural element in this story is the concept of a “vampire” who feeds on the needs and wants of men. While it is not necessarily true in all cases, women—especially those used in advertisements—can have a distinct effect on men. While girls themselves seem to be able to take a lot out of men, this idea is furthered in by advertisers. In order to attract a male consumer, beautiful woman are placed next to a particular product. When men see these beautiful women they start to have delusions that purchasing or using the product will get this closer to this woman who otherwise is far out of their reach. This effect is extremely important when it comes to the identity of these men. Some of them have wives, or are above such ploys. And yet with this unique power some woman have over men, they metaphorically give up their identities to get closer to those “hungry eyes” (Title 223) of theirs. While it is the advertisers that take advantage of this event, it is the girls who have this initial power and in “The Girl with the Hungry Eyes” one Girl in particular uses this phenomenon to draw in men and instead of metaphorically removing the men’s identities, literally feeds on them.

Upon meeting “The Girl,” the narrator claims to be initially skeptic. Her arriving in, “A cheap, shiny black dress. Black pumps. No stockings” (225) gives him an immediate impression that she is either not serious about being his model, or unfit for the job. If this is in fact the case, and the narrator truly can see this Girl as just an inexperienced woman who knows nothing about modeling, than perhaps it is this that leads to The Girl choosing him as his vessel into the world of advertising. Because as the story plays out it becomes apparent that this was always her aim. Once up on the billboards the world may see her and her hungry eyes and fall into her spell. Any other man who instantly thought her to be irresistible would most likely have becomes a quick snack for this woman who fed upon identities. But with the narrator being strong enough to hold onto his identity from the start, he most likely becomes that much more appealing to The Girl. When he sees The Girl’s eyes, he describes them as “The hungriest eyes in the world.” This is most likely the point where the narrator begins to recognize her true identity, but is unaware of it at the time. Unfortunately, as
time goes by and the narrator is continuously exposed to these hypnotic eyes, does begin to be taken in by her and lose this awareness. Identities are what The Girl seems to crave and the narrator becomes quite appetizing when he reveals his past to her. Much of what makes us comes from our past, so by telling her “everything [he] knew about [himself]” (235) he is actually showing her just how much of an identity he has. She seems to “Never [pay] the slightest attention to what [he] said” (235) but by the end of the story it becomes clear that it is actually the opposite. After reiterating all of the aspects of his life he had previously revealed to her, meaning she had been listening to every word, she specifically says “I want your’ wanting me. I want your life” (238). His wanting her is the true sign that he has released his identity for her to consume.

He originally was so protective over his identity that he saw through her physical lure. But once he revealed himself to her he had raised the veil over his identity. Fortunately by now the narrator has deduced that she is behind various murders that have been occurring. When he sees that a man she was with turns out to be “[looking up at [him] from the front page of the paper… [and] as in the other maybe-murders, the cause of death [of the man he had seen with the girl] was uncertain.”(237). This leads to him realizing that The Girl was after his identity and would kill him like she had with the other men. The narrator escapes because “[he] realized what he was up against while there was still time for [him] to tear himself away.” (238) It is his identity, the very thing that she was after, that saved the narrator from her. It allowed him to see the vampire she truly was and prevent himself from being taken in: as the other men whose identities were already lost had. Without such a strong identity the narrator would have lost his life, and while this situation may be somewhat unlikely in real life, it is a universal truth that a strong identity makes us less vulnerable to the manipulations of others.

Identity is what protected the narrator from being taken in by The Girl, but it is how this vampire went about stealing the other men’s identities that is also important. Once establishing that “[the advertisers] want [her]” (231) she begins setting ground rules for both the narrator and everyone else. The narrator could never find anything about her for she had given no information, and made it clear that any attempts to discover this information for himself would result in the narrator losing her. Also, he was the only one who had any physical or verbal contact with her throughout the story, because any violation of this would also
result in her no longer working for him. What this clear-cut ambiguity did was turn this girl into a living frame. While identities are what she fed upon, it is also what she lacked. This allowed for anyone seeing her to imagine her as they would like with no restriction. Unlike the men and the narrator in the story, this did not have a negative effect on her. In fact this made it so when she was on these advertisements and seen by men, they would instill their own identities upon her and turn her into whatever they wanted her to be in their minds. If a man had a desire for woman who were lustful or kinky, then they would instantly see her as this. With no actual traits or past to define The Girl there is nothing interrupting or stopping this process. Once this is accomplished, the hunger begins. The narrator at one point observes the idea that she inspires “The innermost hungers of millions of men” and how this would result in a “Hunger she might feel in answer to their hunger” (232-233). As would anyone, the men would develop more and more of a need for this girl that so easily fits into their deepest desires. And once they have given up on their identities and begun focusing only on getting this untouchable girl, she goes in to take their identities away, and as a result kills them.

Our Identities make us, they define us, and in some ways they protect us. Our past, present, and future come together to form these identities and to lose any of them would mean to lose this identity. Without our identities we become susceptible to becoming victim to horrors of the world like those in “The Vanishing American” and “The Girl with the Hungry Eyes”. If we do not separate ourselves from those around us we will blend in and become unnoticeable to others, losing ourselves in the process as Minchell does. Even if it is us that allow this to happen, we usually blame everything and everyone else for our position and as a result never do anything about it. Unless we recover by committing an act to define ourselves and regain our identity, we will continue in this monotony and lose everything that makes our lives important and only see life as a countdown to death. There are those in this world who take advantage of how easily our identities can be manipulated into making us go in a certain way, and as our identities become less and less existent we begin to conform to whatever the media wants us to. It is the power of woman and their ambiguity that is used to do this, and our identities are the only things that give us the power to look past the glamour and makeup and see the ploys for what they really are, not giving in to the frames the girls set themselves up to be as the narrator in “The Girl with the Hungry Eyes” does. But it is difficult to make
people see how identity plays a role in all of these things, and sometimes to convey a message reality must be stretched somewhat to accommodate. But is the idea of becoming so invisible or a woman who feeds off the needs of men like blood for a vampire such a stretch? Is it not possible to become so devoid of a personality and identity that others lose the ability to see you and begin to ignore your existence altogether as if you are invisible? And are there not woman out there who in fact get off on the needs they instill in men because they have just the right kind of eyes or image that bring about hunger and want in any man that looks into them? These supernatural elements do exist; you just need to open your eyes and your mind enough to see them.
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“North Korea has been suspected of paralyzing U.S and South Korean government websites […] 13 dead bodies and pieces of a missing plane have been found on the shore of Tanzania” (Yahoo News). It is expected that news stations would focus their attention on these world changing stories, but that is not the case. For the past week and a half, the world has put aside these problems and has focused on one man’s death. On June 25, 2009 the world stood still as it was announced that the “King of Pop,” Michael Jackson, had died. The community mourned this one man’s death and ignored the rest of the problems that were happening. In this paper, I will describe why the world puts celebrities on a higher pedestal. Using works by Howard Zinn, Barbara Ehrenreich, Peter Singer, and a blog at Adaringadventure.com, I will analyze how our views of celebrities alter our views on the rest of the world in order to show that both society and the media places celebrities lives and deaths ahead of other equally important stories. Through this analysis, I will offer a few solutions, such as re-teaching our youth the values to look for in a role model, to end the obsessive fascination with celebrities.

A blog titled, “I Don’t Care about Michael Jackson,” on adaringadventure.com, explains how the world is putting Jackson’s death first. The author, who is unknown, says they feel sorry for Jackson’s family and for Jackson himself, because he had a “tortured soul.” But, the author brings up the point that other things are happening in the world. He says that the death of a homeless man is just as important as the death of Michael Jackson. He also says that thousands of people die each day, yet that information is not posted on “Twitter.com.” The author’s main problem is that people are taking Jackson’s death and putting it ahead of every other death because he had wealth and fame. The author is stating that the world should not mourn Jackson and ignore others deaths.
The author’s solution is to look at every death as a loss of a human life. The author of the blog mentions that on the website “Twitter.com,” he posted a quote that basically said he cares more for a homeless man down the street, than he does for Jackson. He then goes on to correct himself and says that both situations are equally important. His “idea” is to view death as a loss, to view everyone, from a child, to a homeless man, to a celebrity’s death as equal. He asks why people can tweet about Michael Jackson’s death but not tweet about all the mothers who lose their children every day. He wants to know why the two situations wouldn’t be of the same importance. Peter Singer, the author of “The Singer Solution to World Poverty,” has a similar argument. Singer argues that Americans pass judgment on certain unjust ethical acts, such as criticizing a person who sells a child to organ collectors to purchase luxuries, but acts hypocritical by not helping children that are dying from preventable diseases (WP 801). Is it right to put more worry and thought into one person’s death than another’s? No one’s life is more meaningful or more important than another’s. American citizens are literally allowing Michael Jackson to take over their lives. They spend half of their time trying to find out new details about his death and funeral, and ignore their previous beliefs and are oblivious to the fact that on the other side of the world, people are suffering more pain. It is the same situation Singer brings up. Why is Jackson’s life and death more important than a child who has been killed by an explosion in Iraq? To quote Singer, what’s the “ethical distinction” (WP 801) between mourning the “King of Pop” who may have committed a dark crime, and ignoring the rest of the thousands of deaths that occur in our world every day? There is none. If a person feels more for Jackson’s death, and not the deaths of passengers on a plane crash, there is a serious problem. Those people put all their energy into mourning a celebrity that they forget about the rest of the world, and one day, if this continues, the rest of the world is going to forget about them.

The author of “I Don’t Care about Michael Jackson” solution is a little vague. Their idea of a solution is for all people to be looked at as equals. He believes we should “tweet” about any one’s death, celebrity or not. I agree with the blogger’s idea, but there has to be a stronger solution. We need to rethink how we look at celebrities. We need to realize that even though they are out in the spot light, and they can sing and dance, does not mean they are that different from us. They are human beings who have troubles,
and in Jackson’s case, those troubles can lead them to a very dark place. The media should give the public all the information. It should not just be focusing on the death of one pop star, while soldiers are sacrificing their lives in Iraq, and while people are being killed in the Genocide in Darfur. Howard Zinn, author of “Stories Hollywood Never Tells” goes into more detail about how the media gives the public what they want to hear. Most news stations do not tell the public the whole story, or the truth of a story. Zinn says there is a structure in Hollywood where money and profit are absolutely the first consideration (WP 873). The media is only concerned with stories that will get them viewers and make them money. Michael Jackson was a celebrity whose life was like a circus and the viewers, instead of caring about men and women, who are fighting and dying in a pointless war, are worried about where Jackson is going to be buried.

My first solution to this problem of celebrity fascination is to deal with the media. We need to fight to have media that gives us stories of importance. The blog “I don’t care about Michael Jackson” brings up the late television actress, Farrah Fawcett, who died the same day as Jackson. In the article, the author says that it was sad that the actress had died but not because she was an actress, but because she was a human being. The media is constantly throwing Jackson’s death at us, and the public is eating it up. Barbara Ehrenreich, author of “Family Values,” analyzes the type of people in the world. She says that the world is made of “phonies” and “decent” people (WP 673). The “phonies” were “thick in the vicinity of power” (WP 673). She referred to people who follow the “phonies” as “dummies” (WP 673). They feed into all the attention of Jackson’s death because everyone else in the world is. They claim that the reason that they are following the story of Jackson’s death is because Jackson actually was a positive influence in their lives. Because he donated money to countless children charities, and made songs like, “We are the world,” Jackson influenced them and helped make them the person they are today. In reality, the people who say this did not know the real Jackson. They knew what they saw in the media. They knew his music. However, before all the media attention on Jackson’s death, most people did not even know he donated millions of dollars to charities. It goes back to what Ehrenreich was saying. The phonies follow people who have power, and because of Jackson’s wealth and fame, the public says he was their hero and influence in life.
Another possible solution I have to this problem is to educate young children on what kind of person they should look at as role models. Instead of looking up to doctors and teachers, who work to make a difference in their community, children idolize celebrities because of their wealth and fame. They dream that they can be these glamorous stars and consider these stars to be extraordinary human beings. Teaching children about whom to look up to early, allows them to understand that celebrities should not be put on a higher status pedestal just because they are in the spotlight. Role models should be people who go out into the world, and sacrifice their time, in order to help others who are less fortunate. In her writing piece, Ehrenreich analyzes the values of America. She brings up the people who influence her most, her family. When speaking of her family, she says, “in short, they fit the stereotype of “real” Americans; and their values, no matter how unpopular among today’s opinion-shapers, are part of America’s traditions, too. To my mind, of course, the finest part” (Ehrenreich 672). Ehrenreich got her values from the people around her, her immediate family. They were not famous; they did not have excessive money. They were real people, who made a difference in Ehrenreich’s life. These are the qualities of a true hero. That is the type of person that the future of our world should look to for guidance, not the latest celebrity on the cover of Seventeen Magazine.

One aspect that really upsets me in this story of Jackson’s death is that no one is mentioning the former accusations in Jackson’s past. A year, even a month before Jackson’s death, most people believed he was a child molester. Anything connected to Jackson made people think of his dark, hidden, secrets. But, now that he is dead, and the world is mourning their fallen pop star, it seems as if everyone has forgotten about his murky past. His fans and supporters may argue that Jackson was never found guilty, that there was never enough proof that he committed those heinous acts. Yes, Jackson settled both cases out of court, but after the cases, Jackson became the bad guy. People strongly believed that he was a sick, perverted, man with deep mental problems due to his tough child hood. As soon as he died, every one forgot. At Jackson’s memorial service, Reverend Al Sharpton said we should not focus on the negative in Jackson’s career. Why should we forget? Why, because he passed away, should we pretend that those accusations never occurred? We should not. When we speak about Jackson and his life, we should speak about everything, the good and bad.
There are millions and millions of people who live on this earth. Everyday, our numbers drop as people pass away. It is sad that Michael Jackson’s life ended so suddenly. I do feel sorry for the pain that the Jackson family is dealing with now. Jackson must have been a great influence and loving member of the family. We should celebrate Jackson’s career but we should not mourn his death as if someone we loved died. Just because he is a celebrity is not a valid reason to put him on a pedestal high above every one else. We are equal, we live and we die on this earth, so we should all be treated the same. Like Jackson’s younger sister, Janet Jackson, said at the BET Awards, “To you, Michael is an icon. To us, Michael is family.” The world has paid its respects to Jackson’s memory but it is time for us to move on, and let the king rest in peace.
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“The Girl With The Hungry Eyes” by Fritz Leiber and “The Vanishing American” by Charles Beaumont infuse aspects of the supernatural in their stories, and yet, the two convey issues the average American might experience; “The Girl With The Hungry Eyes” refers to the utilization of women’s sensuality in advertisements, and “The Vanishing American refers to the way most people take others for granted. Both stories also serve as commentaries about American culture, sharing similar views, with different causes and results. Each story takes a form of exploitation and spins it to demonstrate the author's view of America. “The Girl With The Hungry Eyes” shows both sides of exploitation: the narrator and other men use “the Girl,” but ultimately she is the one to use others around her. “The Vanishing American” points to how the character, Mr. Minchell, is taken for granted by everyone around him, alluding to the average American employee’s feelings of being used and under appreciated. They focus on the same issue, but in very different ways. “The Girl With The Hungry Eyes” shows how stereotypical gender roles assigned American culture can lead to exploitation, and “The Vanishing American” shows how although others are capable of exploiting a person, that same person can be partly responsible for being exploited.

When a person's weakness are known, it makes it easier for that person to be exploited. American society views men as the providers—the ones who are supposed to be in control—and women as weaker and dependent upon men. If a man were to allow a woman to be in control or have to depend on her, he’d be seen as less masculine or unworthy of respect. The first time Dave sees her walk into his building, he takes note of the Girl’s “cheap, shiny black dress” (225) and “those skinny arms of hers” (226). He picks at her appearance, drawing the conclusion that her flaws allude to her being weak and easily used. Originally, he doesn't try to exploit her; rather his issue with her is about control. The difference between exploiting
someone and controlling someone is that exploitation somehow benefits the person who does the exploiting, while control is about having power over someone. Depicting her as weak makes it easier for him to feel like he's in power, like he has command of her. It's as if he's doing her the biggest favor in the world by taking her pictures, and only if she produces a usable photo would he consider representing her. He's so cocky in his dominance over her that he includes her photo in his portfolio on an impulse, instantly regretting it when Papa Munsch discovers it. Only when Papa Munsch and other clients he sees want to use her pictures does the desire to control her develop into the desire to manipulate her, to take advantage of her for his own benefit. In a very opportunistic fashion, he sees her as his ticket to escaping poverty: “I was pretty near broke. I was behind on my rent. Hell, I didn't even have enough money to get a girl. . . . For the first time in months, I had money enough to get drunk, buy new clothes, take taxicabs” (225-33).

When Dave seeks the Girl out to take more pictures of her, that control issue appears again, as he tells her “[he]'s going to give her a chance” (230) to break into the modeling business, refusing to let on as to how much he actually needs her. Identifying the Girl's weaknesses allows him to control her in this scenario, but Dave knows that if she were to know about his weaknesses, the girl could end up being the one in control, something he simply cannot allow. His insecurities about the quality of his own work, and the fact that he needs her to make his living are things the girl could easily exploit. Dave and the other men look to use her, to control her as a way of validating themselves as men, suggesting that men in real life do the same as well. This is why it's so common to hear about men being the perpetrators in domestic violence case, as ways to display dominance over women. Moreover, it's why it's so rare to hear about a man being the victim in the situation, mostly because men who are the victims never speak up in fear of opposing this “American principle.”

Dave isn't the only man in the story to fall under the Girl's spell. The other men in the story are drawn to the girl, in part, because of her powers as vampire, but also because they look to use her to fulfill their desires. The relationship seems symbiotic, much like that of a shark and a parasite, in which, both parties benefit in some way. As the narrator describes it, the girl's eyes have “a hunger that's all sex and something more than sex” (226). Sex—as well as thirst, hunger, and sleep—is one of the basic human drives that is
controlled by the brain, and although it is wanted by most, it isn't enough to sustain a person. The “something more” the Girl is able to give is desire. All people want to be desired, to be seen as worthy enough to be wanted, and for those other men, the girl is their way of satisfying that urge. Though she feeds off of their happiness, off of “everything that's made [them] happy and everything that's hurt [them] bad” (238), they're getting something out of the deal too. The men are feeding off of her just as she does off of them (although with the girl, it turns out to be a much greater extent). They impose all of their desires and wants upon her, using her as a way to create a fantasy figure who exists for the sole purpose of meeting their needs.

There's also quite a double standard in regards to how the characters in “The Girl With The Hungry Eyes” exploit each other. The men in the story are able to control the girl as they are, as humans. It's expected of men by society to be the ones in control, but not of women. When the roles are reversed, when the girl becomes the one who uses the men, she can only do so because of her supernatural powers. She probably wouldn't be able to do exploit them on her own, as the men were able to do to her. The message it implies is that whenever a woman has power, or whenever a man doesn't, there's something wrong with the picture, and there has to be some explanation as to why it happens. It also brings up the fact that women are (the majority of the time) the ones who are exploited for their sexuality, not men. In advertisements (like the ones in “The Girl With The Hungry Eyes”), women are used to sell products, regardless of who the product is geared toward. This suggest that because mostly women are used in advertisements, that they are easier/meant to be taken advantage of, as men aren't used in advertisements to nearly the same extent as women are, nor for the same purpose.

Though at first, “the Girl” from the story is made out to be the one who's being taken advantage of in the beginning—being described as “uncertain . . . of just the general situation”—by the narrator, she eventually reverses the roles. When he first meets her, the photographer does mention the effect she has, “the faintest dizzy feeling like something was being drawn out of [him]” (226), but dismisses any connection it has with her. The power is able to grow once she realizes that he (the narrator) needs her, because his clients want her, desire her to be used in their ads. At this point, the tables turn, as even the narrator notes the
change in control, feeling like he was “being shoved away gently. . . . [He] was afraid the Girl was going to hold [him] up. She really had [him] over a barrel” (232-33). Her enticing air causes men (the photographer included) to become obsessed with her, inexplicably drawn to her. Even Papa Munsch—a widower of two years—becomes so engrossed with her, that it drives him to desperately seek her out, only to end up being an example of the extent her control had. The power she wields is so great that she is able to set her own terms and conditions as to how she works, and no one so much as bats an eye at her. Although Dave first dissociates the dizzy feeling with the girl, he too falls under the girl's spell, and becomes so enamored with her that he follows her against her wishes. He makes a connection between the girl and six murders that occur soon after she makes the scene, yet the influence she has over him makes him disregard that connection, and instead, opts to take her out anyway. The irony in the story is that while the men tried to exploit the girl, under the impression that she was weak and they were expected to do so, they actually end up empowering her with their own desires, putting her in control at the story's end.

Conversely, in “The Vanishing American,” only the victim's side of exploitation is told. Mr. Minchell embodies the average American employee who wilts under the routine of his job and life at home and is unappreciated and forgotten. His story represents the general view American society has about people with positions like his, ones that are considered “small” or “trivial.” People generally see others like Mr. Minchell as put there to do their jobs, nothing more. They can provide the service others seek, but beyond that, they are no longer needed. Mr. Minchell works at a job that does not require interaction with others and performs the same tasks every day, going home to a wife he resents and a child “he would never understand”. He is alienated from everyone in his life: To everyone he works with, he's just another nameless face, someone who's just a placeholder. The way Minchell vanishes is a gradual process, and for his coworkers to be completely oblivious of the fact that he's not there anymore speaks a lot about the lack of attention people pay to him.

It's not just Minchell that's taken advantage of; other people like the elevator girl, and the cashier at the drugs store, people with positions that—even in real life—are ignored as well. When Minchell enters the elevator (unaware that he's invisible), he encounters the elevator operator, who becomes disgruntled when
she thinks no one's waiting for the elevator. On the ride down, Minchell notes her “surly look,” (296) which suggests that she's frustrated. Her job is one that would also be considered trivial by most and is probably thankless. Just as Minchell feels ignored and taken advantage of, alluding to disliking his job when he mentions “the adding machine he hated so,” this elevator girl likely feels the same way, and he doesn't even realize it. It can be said that he's taking advantage of the elevator operator just as others have done to him. The cashier at the drugstore is another example of a person in Minchell's position. A man—who coincidently cuts in front of Minchell in line—says to the cashier, “Gimme a coupla nickels, will ya Jack?” and “scurried off” (298) as soon as he gets what he wants. Minchell notes the cashier's scowl afterwards, like he's unhappy about the cursory way the customer dealt with him. Again, his is a job that can easily be seen as unrewarding and goes unnoticed by many. It's reasonable to believe the cashier feels as dejected as Minchell and the elevator girl, and there are likely many more who feel the same way, unrealized, which says a lot about how America exploits people in such “unimportant” roles.

Just as Mr. Minchell doesn't realize that the elevator operator and the cashier are being used like him, he also doesn't realize that his wife probably feels the same way. There is a lack of her perspective throughout the story, and the reader can only infer how she feel through the bits and pieces Minchell mentions about her. Minchell embodies the ideal of what America believes a man should be: A worker/provider, a husband, and a father. Therefore, his presence in the household is almost nonexistent (which is why he was invisible to Madge and Jimmy as well). The household is Madge's domain, fitting perfectly into what America believes a woman's role should be: a homemaker. She cooks, she cleans, she does all the household chores, and takes care of Jimmy, which is probably her daily routine. Her monotonous life makes her “tired and lined and heavy” (300), so it's rational to assume that she feels as under appreciated as Minchell does, yet he fails to acknowledge this. He is not the only one who is taken for granted, and is somewhat at fault for doing the same to others.

While being taken for granted was a factor that caused Mr. Minchell to fade away, the character is partly responsible for his own vanishing as well. He allows it to happen because he makes no effort to change his life, make progress in any way. Change in life allows a person to grow and develop his or her personality,
and when no advancements are made, everything stays the same. His coworkers, and even people on the street never really took notice to him, because there was no personal interaction on his part with any of them. His isolation caused him to leave no impression on those people, they were easily able to forget him.

Furthermore, when he has the chance to interact with others, he doesn't seize the opportunity, like when he was alone in the elevator with the operator. At this point, he doesn't realize that he's invisible, but makes very little effort to interact with her. In fact, he states how “being alone with only one other person in an elevator had always made him nervous” (296). This proves that he's been an reclusive person for a while now and communicating with others is something he avoids doing. He demonstrates this even further while he's in the drugstore: “He went into the drugstore. . . . trying to to feel intimidated.” He dislikes confrontation, and feels overwhelmed when he feels like he has to face someone, which explains why he also shies away from his boss as he's leaving work feeling “a sharp increase in his heartbeat” (297) the minute he sees him. Minchell lets his fear of interacting with others overpower him, mentioning hasn't spoken directly to his boss—nothing more than a “good morning”—in over ten years. His lack of assertiveness can be said to be as much responsible for his disappearance as much as others around him ignoring him.

“The Girl With The Hungry Eyes” by Fritz Leiber and “The Vanishing Man” by Charles Beaumont both convey different approaches to exploitation. “The Girl With The Hungry Eyes” reveals both sides of exploitation, for in the story, men are portrayed as the stronger sex, being able to take control of women, and exploit them according to their own needs. Part of the Girl's lure is based on men's desires, therefore, the men in the story shape her to meet their needs, which is another example of how they try to control her. The Girl, however, ends up reversing the roles of power and exploits men in the end. “The Vanishing American” shows how exploitation can exist, in part, because of others, in addition to oneself. It's worth pointing out that Minchell begins to fade because people ignore him, and he doesn't make an effort to interact with them, yet because he's vanishing, it makes it that much harder for people to acknowledge him. It's a sort of a self fulfilling prophecy. Both authors' use of exploitation in their respective stories shows their views on America in general: Leiber referring to America's expectations regarding gender and power, and how it relates to
exploitation, and Beaumont referring to how although America does take others who are considered unimportant for grant, sometimes the individual enables others to take advantage of him or her.
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When we see a photo we most of the times criticize the people in it, what they wearing or how they look, but we don’t really know what the photo means to the people in it. In my case, this picture means a lot for me because my mother is in it. I just have this photo where I am with her and I feel that it is my treasure. After my mother died I was forced to live with other people and to adapt to a new life style. I moved in with my mother’s parents. Life was hard for me while I lived with them but I learned a lot from it. Now that I’m older I realize that I was not the only one who did not have my parents next to me. Physical abuse was the reason of my mother’s decision to illegally immigrate to the United States. I believe that immigration is one of the biggest reasons of family separation.

I didn’t know this photo existed until I went back to Guatemala three years ago. I went to my grandmother’s house to visit her and I brought with me my two favorite cousins. We were looking at a pile of old photos from my family when I found this photo. It looked old and I could not recognize the people on the background, I barely could recognize myself and my mother. Maybe the photo was like that because my grandparents did not take care of it as I would. They are pretty old and they do not take care about certain things as they used to when they were younger.

When I saw this photo many memories came to my mind and it was then when I remembered all the things my mother suffered. I felt my heart full of anger because I was too little at that time, when my mother
was beaten by her cousin. A couple weeks before my second birthday my mother received a visit, it was her cousin. (Her cousin was married with my father’s brother. They were not happy. They fought a lot and always when they had a fight my uncle used to go to talk with my mother so she could give him advice, but when they were happy again my uncle told his wife bad things about my mother. He used to tell his wife that my mother told him that he should leave her because she was a bad woman). She got into my house with a knife in her hand. My babysitter which was my ten years old cousin took me to the kitchen and we both hid in there. By the window I remember seeing my mother on the ground (where my birthday cake table is in the photo) with her cousin on top of her. Her cousin was holding the knife pointing to her face. I also remember my uncle sitting next to the green plants my mother used to water every morning. He had his back against a green column which was next to the plants. He was just watching how his wife was trying to kill my mother. I wonder if he in his mind was wishing that his wife would win or maybe he was too concentrating watching my mother’s underwear to think about that.

After the long fight my mother was the winner. She pushed her cousin away with all her strength and she finally could stand up. C. J. Newton says in one of his articles “Around the world at least one woman in every three has been beaten, coerced into sex, or otherwise abused in her lifetime. Most often the abuser is a member of her own family” (C.J. Newton). This is scary news for all the women like me. This statistic means that any of us, women, can be abuse by the people we trust the most. People we think are our friends, our family. It is sad to know that a lot of women suffer from physical abuse and this act does not affect only the physic, but also it affects their whole life. Feeling hated and powerless make many of these abused women make the wrong decision, just to avoid feeling that way. In my mother’s case, the person who made my mother’s life miserable was her own cousin.

After my mother stood up from the floor she yelled at my uncle because he was there, doing nothing to stop his wife. After hearing my mother yelling I started to cry. I felt that my mother was hurt, my mother never yelled like that before and it scared me. I think that I cried not only because my mother was yelling but also because I wanted my uncle to help her. I felt powerless because I was too little to help my mother and my babysitter wouldn’t help her either because she was scared. I knew that the only person that could help
my mother was my uncle. My plan was successful, my uncle heard that I was crying and he finally took his wife out the house by her arm. When my mother went to the kitchen she was a different person. She had her hair all over her face, her blouse ripped and a purple knee. She was crying and she huge me and my babysitter very tight. She whispered “do not worry, they are gone now”. When I heard those words I felt protected. I stopped crying and I felt asleep.

When I woke up, the same day of the fight, my mother took me and my babysitter to my grandparent’s house. She was sad, and she felt powerless because my father was not there with us. He was here in the United States and my mother was afraid of what could happen the next time her cousin came to our house. These fights with her cousin had been coming for a long time but never got to the point of beating. The fights they had before were just name-callings. This time the fight went over the limit and for that reason my mother was afraid.

Many women make wrong decisions because they feel nobody love them. O.W. Barnett states in his article “Depression remains the foremost response, with 60% of battered women reporting depression” (Barnett). They always try to look for the people they love to find comfort. These women are the most sensitive women in the world who need love and support. My mother was looking for that love and support on my father. She wanted to feel that there was a person who love her and would protect her against anything or anybody. For my mother necessity of love she and my father got into an agreement; they decided that the best thing for us was to come to the United States. My mother tried to get visas for both of us, but it did not work. Then my mother decided to leave me with her parents and come illegally to this country. She decided to leave after my birthday party. Now I know why my mother wanted to make such a big birthday party to me. She felt that it was not just another birthday party but the last birthday party we would be together.

In this photo my mother looks happy, but it is just a mask. If you really see into her eyes you will notice that she is sad and worry about what could happen next. I do not look happy either, that day my mother was too busy cooking and baking and she did not pay too much attention to me. She was so concentrating and worry about the party that she forgot about the birthday girl, me. That day my grandmother was in charge of me. I do not know why but that day I did not like to be with my grandmother.
I just wanted to be with my mother. I was angry because my mother did not have time to be with me. I believe that it is not only me who felt that way. Many people make birthday parties for their children and they try to make the guests happy but they forget about the main reason of the party, the birthday girl/boy. She made my birthday cakes with her own hands. The three in the middle which form a tower were of vanilla flavor and the two on the sides were of strawberry. They were delicious; all the people in the party were asking who made them. My mother would answer proudly “I made them especially for my daughter”. All the people were surprised of it because the cakes looked just like the ones in the bakery store but with a better flavor.

She made sure that every single detail was in order. She decorated the whole house with pink, yellow, light blue and white balloons. She said that those colors were good because they were the same colors of my dress. My father did his part too; he sent me the dress I’m wearing in this photo and the money to make the party, but all the other accessories for the dress my mother bought them in a boutique next to my favorite ice cream place. I do not remember if I liked the dress back then, the only thing I remember is that I never wore it again. A few years after I used to played with the dress and my dolls. I used to put the dress on the doll and pretend I was her mother. I played for a long time with the dress until it got ripped and I had to throw it out.

Every time I see this photo I ask myself “why is my mother wearing black and white?” I don’t really know the answer, it seems strange because in a birthday party the people in Guatemala wear other colors, they use black and white but for funerals. I believe that it was just a coincidence that she was wearing black for my party and a few weeks after she died. Maybe she was feeling sad and for that reason she picked those colors. Other thing that looks strange to me is her necklace. In this photo she is wearing a necklace with her initial. Before she left to the United States she gave the necklace with the initial to me. I do not know why she did that, this necklace was her favorite. She never took it off and for some unknown reason she gave it to me. I believe that she somehow felt that I would not see her again and she thought that having the necklace I would have a piece of her in my power. This necklace has giving me the strength I need when I’m about to give up on something. It always reminds me that my mother is up in haven and she would not like to see me defeated. Having the necklace is like having my mother with me. When I feel lonely I always hold the
necklace between my hands and talk to my mother. That makes me feel better because I feel she is with me all the time.

One week after the big event (my birthday party) my mother left to the United States. One of my uncles (her brother) and a cousin was with her. A week passed after my mother, my uncle and my cousin left and still I was not used to live without my mother. My grandmother every night when I asked her about my mother she would say “she just left to get you a doll, she would be back soon” those words always made go to bed in peace. One day a strange man came to my grandparents’ house. He told us that my mother and my uncle have died. They died as many other illegal immigrants who try to cross the barrier. As a report on Illegal Immigration on BNET says “They come in search of a better life, but each year hundreds of them die--hit by cars, drowned in rivers, or overcome by the merciless desert heat” (BNET). In other words, the people who decide to come to the United States are hoping to have a better life here by unfortunately they die before they can achieve their goals. These people come with the hope of having a better life style. Some of them leave their families in their country and come to the United States just to work hard and give them a better life in their country. These people know what the consequences could be of crossing illegally the barrier, but they know that they need more money to survive. They know that if they can make it to the United States they would find a job which it will pay them more than what they earned in their countries. My mother wanted to have a peace life with her family. She wanted to be with her husband and enjoin life, but she could not do it. My mother and uncle’s deaths shocked my grandparents. Two of their children die in the same day. I was too little to understand that I would never see my mother again.

I did not understand that the photo of my second birthday would be the last photo taken with my mother. I did not get that from that moment on my entire life would change. My mother and my uncle died drowned. They were disappeared for a week in a large river in Mexico. All my uncles (my mother’s brothers) and my father were looking for them in the river. Finally they found them but they were in the decompose state. My uncles and my father brought the bodies to Guatemala and my family immediately buried them because they smelled bad.
Now that I'm older I see this photo and I realize that I did not look like her at all back then. Now when I see myself in the mirror I see that I am identical to her. I believe that God wanted to remind me how my mother looked like just by looking my reflection on the mirror. Because this is the last and only photo of my mother with me, it is my most valuable treasure.
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It has been said that Walker Percy is an intricate author, and in his essay “The Loss of the Creature,” he demonstrates it precisely. “The Loss of the Creature” is a cerebral piece of literature which consists of strange analysis and stipulations with the intentions of leaving the reader discomposed. This makes it complicated for the reader to grasp Percy’s point of view. In his essay Percy uses terms that would be considered out of the ordinary: terms like “a dialectical movement,” (470) “symbolic complex,” (469) and other expressions to support his argument. Among his idiosyncratic analyses consist his views on the outcome of today’s society. He proclaims that human beings tend to neglect the good things in their surroundings due to their superficial lifestyles. His innovative argument made me become aware of my symbolic complex. My idea of a symbolic complex is on my trip to America. I had this thought of what America is, based on the things I heard about it, so I moved here searching for the things I was told instead of manufacturing my own experience. After my years of empiricism, I finally discovered my American experience, not through the agency of what I was told about America, but through my own eyes.

Percy uses an analogy of taking a tour of the Grand Canyon to support his statement about a “symbolic complex”. He states “It is almost impossible because the Grand Canyon, the thing as it is, has been appropriated by the symbolic complex which has already been formed in the sightseer’s mind. Seeing the canyon under approved circumstances is seeing the symbolic complex head on” (Percy 469). In his illustration of taking a tour of the Grand Canyon, he implies that it does not really count as seeing it when you are being told what to perceive, you have to experience it for what it is in order to categorize it as a trip. For example, if you were to go camping you have to lay down with the wolves and sleep in the dirt in order to say you have been in the wild. I can relate to this in many ways, but the most appropriate illustration is my journey to America. Before my peregrination to America, my friends and I were accustomed to the culture of America through the eyes of the media. I dreamed about the things I saw on TV and all the updated technologies. I
tried to learn as much as I could about America, as a result of being familiar with the culture once I arrived. My research and curiosity caused a symbolic complex.

Percy believes we read promotional materials and follow a line of investigation before we embark on a journey; he refers to this process as a symbolic complex. I was an acquaintance of a symbolic complex, because I was basing my trip on the things I thought I was going to witness, and not on the memories I was to create for myself. Once I arrived here in the United States and I experienced the culture for myself, I was astonished by the differences. It turned out that not everything about America is as great as it seems on TV. Some things I saw that were surprising to me were the lack of high tech electronics. I remember seeing *Back to the Future* and there was a flying car, which made me even more excited to come to America just so I can ride one. Another thing I experienced was the weather conditions; I discovered there is more than one season in America as opposed to it being sunny every day. To recapitulate, Percy would say I had to live here and learn about the culture, in order for me to say that I know the ways of the American culture.

In the midst of the symbolic complex is a term Percy refers to as a “preformulation”. He elucidates it this way “The thing is no longer the thing as it confronted the Spaniard; it is rather that which has already been formulated by picture postcard, geography book, tourist folders, and the words Grand Canyon” (Percy 469). In a way the quote foreshadows my voyage to America in terms of using the media and other resources to gather information about the country, prior to my departure. Since I had seen previous images of America it was no longer a surprise to me when I saw it in real life. If I had not seen images of America prior to my voyage, I would have had a much more authentic experience.

Although Percy makes a fine argument about restraining from research prior to going on a journey, one might object that there are circumstances in which prior information could be useful to your experience. Knowing information about a location prior to visiting it, gives you an advantage because it puts you on familiar terms with the condition of your destination. Perhaps I would have been prepared for the weather with a heavy coat if I knew more about the weather conditions. Plus when you have previous information, it can help you be more accustomed to the location in case of an emergency. Nevertheless, if we keep searching
for an experience based on the things people have already discovered, we only end up making experiences that everyone has had already.

Another term that is included in Walker Percy’s strange nomenclatures is a “Dialectical Movement.” In his article “The Loss of the Creature” he uses the term dialectical movement as a way to point out the things common people neglect the most. I comprehended it as the process of seeing a place in the eyes of a tourist. I do not think that I have ever encountered a dialectical movement. An example of a dialectical movement through my analogy would be a person who drives down a road every day to get to work. The street is a unique street, but he fails to appreciate it for its beauty. One day his car breaks down on that street, while he was on the way to work, and he is forced to walk on the road seeking for assistance for his car. As his search for help progressed he begins to notice the features of the neighborhood, things like the beauty of the houses, kids playing and the trees on the lawns. Suddenly he realizes all these years he has been missing out on a lot of features in the neighborhood, “he seen the road, but he never really saw the road” for what it was. This man’s whole experience would be considered a dialectical movement. What it is basically saying is, you should stop and smell the roses before you move on with your life.

Percy’s strange terms make a compelling argument within the human society. He uses his strange terms as evidence to prove his point of a symbolic complex and a dialectical movement. When you go for a tour, you see the place under certain circumstances which limits your experience, the act of that is a dialectical movement. Taking prior knowledge of a trip before you embark on it would be considered as a symbolic complex. I think humans should stop creating a symbolic complex and take matters into their own hands. I had a symbolic complex, when I based my experience on the things I saw in the media prior to my trip here. I feel like the idea of that would be like taking someone’s vacation pictures and saying that it is yours. I came to America, with pictures from the media in my hands and I ended up with disappointments. Who really wants personal memories that someone already had? You have to seize the day and make it yours.
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Why do people constantly tarnish the image of our favorite celebrities? Why do people even bother putting them on pedestals, if they’re only going to take them off of it? In Neal Gabler’s essay, “Our Celebrities, Ourselves,” he addresses the reasons we are constantly putting down celebrities. The reason Americans do this is because we are practicing schadenfreude, which is receiving pleasure from the misfortune of other people. We do this by reading magazines like People or US Weekly and going on websites like perezhilton.com or eonline.com. When we read an article from these sources and viewing celebrities when they are not at their best, we immediately criticize them for their action. This is when we practice schadenfreude and begin to demolish the image of our favorite celebrity. We do this in order to make ourselves look and feel better. We also do this in order to make our lives appear more interesting than it really is. The reason we receive pleasure from celebrity misfortune is because our aspirations to be like them our aspirations are affected by our emotions, which in turn leads to an obsession. Schadenfreude is a cultural phenomenon that has spread across the country and has created a new obsession with the rich and the famous.

Schadenfreude exists in today’s culture for many reasons. One reason it exists is because of Americans are striving to be just like celebrities. They want all glitz and glamour of celebrity life. They see that celebrities don’t have any problems and don’t have to deal with everyday problems, like paying bills. They are jealous of that and strive to be live that eccentric life. Another reason schadenfreude exists is because of jealousy and envy. People are envious of the good life celebrities live and look for any reason to criticize the celebrity life. When they criticize their life, they feel pleasure from criticism they just gave. When they criticize them, they just try to make their lives look better than it really is which gives them a feeling of self-gratification. They feel an accomplishment of making someone else look bad, in order to make themselves look better.

Americans are constantly putting celebrities on a pedestal. They watch every move that celebrity makes and expect him or her to be perfect. Except, when the celebrity makes a mistake or doesn’t live up to a person’s expectation, he or she will start bashing his or her “supposed favorite celebrity.” A prime example of
whom this happened to is Michael Jackson. Michael Jackson was arrested and charged with molestation charges; most of fans couldn’t believe it. Some of them stayed by his side and advocated his innocence, while others believed that he molested the children. They began to slander Jackson’s image and said all these horrible things, like how he shouldn’t be allowed near his own children, how he’s a horrible father to his children, and how could he do such a horrible thing to children he was supposed to be taking care of. In the span of a couple of months, Michael Jackson went from being the king of pop to a molester. At the end of the trial, Jackson was acquitted of all the molestation charges against him. After that, Michael Jackson somewhat disappeared from the public eye. When Michael Jackson died, people gave him the respect the respect he deserved, but never forgot about what happened in his past. This event shows schadenfraude at its finest point. Many people enjoyed the pleasure they received when defacing the Michael Jackson’s “king of pop’ image. They loved taking him off the pedestal they once had him on. The obsession we had with this celebrity narrative was never-ending. It was what everyone was talking about. His trial was constantly on the news, radio, magazines and Internet. This is an example of a celebrity narrative because it was telling the story of what Michael Jackson was going through at the time of the trial. Gabler states “celebrity narratives resist closure. They go on and on and on” (429). This narrative is a perfect example of a narrative that resists closure. Even after his trial and death, his narrative is still going on. Celebrity narratives are nonfictional and appealing. It also keeps the media guessing and wondering about what is going to happen in the life of the celebrity.

    When Americans see their favorite celebrities do something that is not up to their expectations, they immediately take them off their pedestal. However, when people see their celebrities make a lapse of judgment, they begin to realize that celebrities are real people like themselves. In his essay, Gabler says: “ each of us, to a greater or lesser degree, is fighting the same battle as the celebrities, which is why celebrity, for all its obvious entertainment value, resonates psychically in a way that few modern fictional narratives do”(430). Gabler and I both agree that Americans are probably fighting the same battles to a certain extent as celebrities. An example is celebrities like Jennifer Aniston and Brad Pitt getting a divorce. People who are
getting a divorce are able to relate to this because they are through the same battle. When Americans can relate to celebrity problems, they begin to realize that celebrities are real people.

Websites like perezhilton.com and eonline.com watch and report every move each celebrity makes. These websites give celebrity notoriety and allows America to admire everything celebrities do. The negative thing about these websites is they can also give celebrities a bad appearance. The way it can be a negative thing is these websites can tell lies and spread rumors, which can give celebrities bad image. These websites also influence schadenfreude. These websites show the good life the celebrity is living and when something wrong happens, people will receive pleasure from the misfortune the person encounters. People will be ecstatic that something terrible finally happened, which knocks the celebrity off his or her high horse. In Gabler’s essay, he states “the audience doesn’t seek to be elevated; it seeks to bring the celebrities back to earth” (426). This is one of the main reason Americans practice schadenfreude is because they are tired of seeing celebrities living the good life and having things so easy. They are happy when they have the chance to bring a celebrity down and bring them back to reality. I feel this is the main reason gossip websites like Perezhilton.com spread gossip. They do in order to give the celebrity a shot of reality and show them that people are watching and waiting for them to mess up.

In his essay, Gabler quotes “celebrities aren’t known for being well known. They are known for living out real-life melodramas, which is why anyone from Elizabeth Taylor to Joey Buttafuoco” (428). This quote is accurate in today’s media because this is really what celebrities are known for. They aren’t known for doing anything momentous like discovering the cure for cancer or winning a noble prize for a new discovery in science. Celebrities are known for living out their melodrama in reality. If celebrities are known for this only, then why do people constantly put them on pedestals and then take them down, when they do something that’s not up to the expectation people have for them. I believe people do this, in order to have something to do. They also do this so they can receive pleasure from the misfortune of others. Receiving pleasure from other people’s misfortune make their lives appear normal and makes them feel better about themselves. The way it does this it gives them a boost of self-confidence and gives them a feeling of superiority above others.
Schadenfreude is a never-ending cycle that will continue as long celebrities remain in the public eye. As long as celebrities are doing something that is worth talking about, magazines and gossip websites will constantly report on what they’re doing. This fuels schadenfreude and gives people a reason to deface the image of celebrities.
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In both “The Black Cat” and “The Tell Tale Heart” Edgar Allen Poe suggests many emotional conflicts within the narrators which lead them to commit horrific murders. In “Tell Tale Heart” the narrator internally struggles between the sense of remorse and the old man's eye which he feels is watching him. The reader can have sympathies with the narrator because he seems to have a fairly strong sense of caring for the old man and he does in a way feel badly about his deeds. In “Black Cat,” however there is still a small connection with caring about the cat, but the narrator is selfish and has a lack of remorse. The reader does not have sympathies with him because even thought he tries to make himself seem as if he is good the reader can still see the evils within.

There are many internal struggles between the narrator and the old man's eye in “Tell Tale Heart.” The narrator in “The Tell Tale Heart” seems to have a deep true liking for the old man, but his eye is truly driving the narrator mad. For example, when he stalks the old man ant night and hears him groan in terror, he claims "I say I knew it well. I knew what the old man felt, and pitied him although I chuckled at heart"(1590). He feels for the man, but it he also wants him dead because of the eye. He is showing the reader at a glimpse that he might not be all that stable in the head. The narrator seems to care a lot about the old man and how he feels. "The old man's terror must have been extreme!"(1591). The narrator himself has felt such terror and is realizing what the old man must be going through.

Other internal struggles in “The Tell Tale Heart” is when the narrator shows remorse and how he is not truly happy about what he has done. The narrator is going crazy because he keeps hearing the beating heart of the old man which serves as his conscious because he feels bad about killing the old man. When the police officers are there in the old man's house the narrator tries to play it cool and be confident about what he's done, but then his conscious e gets to him and he cracks. A quote that shows how he truly does break down is "Almighty God! -- no, no? They heard! -- they suspected! -- they KNEW! -- they were making a mockery of my horror! -- this I thought, and this I think. But anything was better than this agony!"
 Anything was more tolerable than this derision!” (1592). His conscious does get the best of him in this occasion seeing as it is somewhat supernatural that he feels this way and hears the hearts beat repeatedly. The narrator also has another quote that exposes his remorse and unhappiness with the uncleanly deeds that he has preformed. "'Villains!' I shrieked, 'dissemble no more! I admit the deed! -- tear up the planks! -- here, here! -- it is the beating of his hideous heart!'"(1592).  This makes it easier for the reader to sympathize with the narrator because he does really seem remorseful and not like happy about his deeds.

The narrator is truly mad in this story because of the way he talks in the story. In the story he talks with a lot of different punctuation and in different sentence structures to show the underlying maddness. The reader has sympathy with the narrator because it is sad that he really does care about the man. The reader can see that there is truly something wrong with the narrator and this also draws sympathy. "TRUE! - nervous-very, very dreadfully nervous I had been and am; but why WILL you say that I am mad? The disease had sharpened my senses-not destroyed, not dulled them."(1589). This seems to generate a lot of sympathy because the reader truly does believe that the narrator is truly insane. It makes it seem like he has more of a reason for doing the deeds. "No doubt I now grew VERY pale; but I talked more fluently, and with a heightened voice. Yet the sound increased -- and what could I do? It was A LOW, DULL, QUICK SOUND -- MUCH SUCH A SOUND AS A WATCH MAKES WHEN ENVELOPED IN COTTON. I gasped for breath, and yet the officers heard it not. I talked more quickly, more vehemently but the noise steadily increased. I arose and argued about trifles, in a high key and with violent gesticulations; but the noise steadily increased."(1592).When the narrator starts to talk about his appearance because of the recent events that happened the reader can do nothing else, but feel just a little bit of sympathy for him.

The two story's “The Black Cat” and “The Tell Tale Heat” are different in many ways. The way that seems to be the most evident is the lack of remorse for wrong doings in “The Black Cat”. The narrator in the beginning of “Black Cat” tries to make it seem like he is relatable because he shows his love for animals and his wife, but as we read on we learn that that is just a sorry attempt to gain the readers trust. Then he becomes more of and alcoholic he also becomes more selfish and begins to not only neglect the animals, but also mishandle them. The narrator's selfishness is very evident in this story by how he treats people and
things around him (e.g. Wife and pets). He insist that his pets and wife be loyal, but doesn't see why he should be loyal to them. "I had so much of my old heart left, as to be at first grieved by this evident dislike on the part of a creature which had once so loved me. But this feeling soon gave place to irritation." (1594).

This was a good quote because it shows how he tries to make the reader feel sympathetic for him.

The narrator in “Black Cat” has an extreme lack of remorse because after he kills his wife in a way he sort of rejoices. He seems to have a unusual happiness to his swagger and personality. He also seems to get happier when he hurts his cats. "It is impossible to describe, or to imagine, the deep, the blissful sense of relief which the absence of the detested creature occasioned in my bosom. It did not make its appearance during the night - and thus for one night at least, since its introduction into the house, I soundly and tranquilly slept; aye, slept even with the burden of murder upon my soul!" (1598). The narrator shows a lack of remorse in every single category of this story. He rejoices in the pain and suffering he brings upon the things around him. On top of that fact that he gets joy out of their despair he expects them to still be loyal. This is a ludicrous idea which also plays into the feeling of his horrible personality. In a way because of the stories that the narrator tells the reader at the beginning of the story that in a way tosses out any idea that he is insane like the narrator in “The Tell Tale Heart”. There is no possible way that a person could have that type of recollection of their past and start of in that type of mind state and be insane. It takes a truly just evil person who has problems overcoming feelings and emotions to do deeds as horrible and disgusting as the deeds that the narrator in “The Black Cat” did.
In the essay “The loss of the Creature”, by Walker Percy, he argues that we do not look at things for the truth that lies in them but only for what media has advertised to us. Percy raises the idea of “preformulation”, which is to idealize something without actually looking at it. Throughout the essay he gives us many different examples supporting his argument; Percy shows us many scenarios where people look at things in different perspectives and understand them. Percy is trying to get the point across that everything is already “preformulated” for us. He is implying how everyone in the world sees things; he is giving his point of view on our points of views, in other words he is explaining to us how he thinks that we all look at things. He feels that everything we look at is already “preformulated” for us; therefore he feels we do not have our own sense of thought and we only look at things for what we are told to look at. Whether it is “by picture postcard, geography book, tourist folders” (Percy 469), Percy encourages us through his descriptive style of writing, to not look at things through media, but through our own eyes to fully understand them. If we were able to look at the world the way Percy persuades us, everybody would have a different outlook on the world and life itself.

Percy starts his essay by stating, “The thing is no longer the thing as it confronted the Spaniard; it is rather that which has already been formulated- by picture postcard, geography book, tourist folders, and the words Grand Canyon” (Percy 469). He is telling us the readers that we do not look at things the same way, as it was first seen. In the example given to us he is explaining that we only look at the Grand Canyon the way it is advertised throughout the media, we do not look at it the way the Spaniard first did when he discovered it. Percy gives us an example of how to recover the sightseer of the Grand Canyon. Percy states that “It may be recovered by leaving the beaten track. The tourist leaves the tour, camps in the back country. He arises before dawn and approaches the South Rim through a wild terrain where there are no trials and no railed in outlook points...” (Percy 470). The beaten track would refer to the path that everyone takes; he is trying to have us leave in order to get the full understanding of it. Percy is trying to get his point across, that we should think
for ourselves and not just look at what were told to look at, but look at it for what we truly believe is the deep inner beauty of it.

Another example that he brings about in his essay is that “A young Falkland Islander walking along the beach and spying a dead dogfish and going to work on it with his jackknife has... a great advantage over the Scarsdale high-school pupil who finds the dogfish on his laboratory desk” (Percy 476). This example is bringing out the fact that we learn better hands on. He gives us the scenario of a young islander dissecting a dogfish for his own reasons; he has a better understanding than a student who has to dissect it for class. He relates this example well with his argument because the young islander who found it has no intentions to learn about it but he decides to. Percy states, “The great difficulty is that he is not aware that there is a difficulty, surely, he thinks in such a fine classroom, with such a fine textbook” (Percy 476). This shows readers that you are open to learn more when you see no barriers preventing you from further learning; therefore we learn better through our own encouragements rather than through the school system.

Percy gives us a variety of occasions that support his argument, so he gives these examples that we can easily relate better to. Some of his examples include the American going to France and when he was about to leave he just saw “it” (Percy 474), the couple going to Mexico City and they found a village with their occasional tradition going on, but they need an ethnologist to just prove it was worthwhile (Percy 473), or the person finding Shakespeare’s sonnet in the garden (Percy 476). Percy tries to speak through all of these cases so we can relate to it with our own real life experiences. He feels that this would help us connect better with his idea. All these scenarios relate to Percy’s main idea because they all show that when seeing something for the first time you have an opportunity to learn more than if you already heard of it or are pushed to do it.

All the examples relate to Percy’s argument showing us that we should look at things like we would have if we saw it for the first time. Through the first case of the Spaniard who saw the Grand Canyon for the first time wanted to learn more about the Grand Canyon out of pure curiosity, not because he was pushed to. It can relate to the second of, the dogfish and sonnet example relate to this because in both scenarios they are not pushed to learn anything but of their own curiosity they can understand. Percy gives us the reason that “The great difficulty is that he is not aware that there is a difficulty, surely, he thinks in such a fine classroom,
with such a fine textbook” (Percy 476). He is just explaining that when you do not know there is a difficulty or reason for something you get rid of all difficulties and curiosity takes over, curiosity in the sense that we want to learn more through our own motivations and not told to do so.

This reminds me of a trip I took about three summers ago when I visited my parent’s home country of Guatemala. If you look on Google or any other search engine and type in the words Guatemala, you will see these pictures of beautiful hilltops, acres of rainforest, and exotic animals. Truly you can find these things, but if you really look at Guatemala you see poverty and whole different society than what we are not used to. This relates to Percy in the way that Guatemala was already “preformulated” through media, making it seem like a great place, but in fact it is full of poverty and sorrow. Another way this relates to Percy is in his “dialectical movement”, meaning in order to see something for what it truly is then we need to see it through someone else’s eyes. This statement is true, because my mother wasn’t as curious as me and my little brother. Her main reason for going there is for us to see our family that we haven’t seen in a while. Her own thoughts already “preformulated” the trip for her, her own experiences from there prevented new ones to enter. If she looked at Guatemala the way we did, her eyes would open to the sight of the beautiful landscape and wide open scenery.

Walker Percy writes in the style he does because he does not want to be related to the “class of privileged knowers”. He refers to this class of privileged knowers as theorist or artists. These are the people who create things in which other people surrender their own sovereignty to, they are the one who “preformulate” our lives. He gives us all these examples so that we find out the point he’s trying to get across. He does not want us to surrender ourselves to his idea like he says, “A reader may surrender sovereignty over that which has been written about, just as a consumer may surrender sovereignty over a thing which has been theorized about” (Percy 474). If he told us how we should look at things then he would just be contradicting himself. He does not want to be like the ethnologist “to certify their experiences as genuine” (Percy 474). He wants us to think for ourselves and get off the “beaten track”.

If we all looked at the world in the way Walker Percy encourages us to do then we would understand most of things going around us. We would be able to take every little thing into consideration, and then
maybe we would be able to stare at little things that have no importance now. Like Percy asks us, “Why is it almost impossible to gaze directly at the Grand Canyon under these circumstances and see it for what it is- as one picks up a strange object from ones backyard and gazes directly at it?” (Percy 469). Then maybe looking at the tiniest things or even huge breath-taking things wouldn’t be so impossible, looking through the eyes of Walker Percy. He gets his main point across that we do not look at things truly for what we should be doing. He gives numerous examples in order to get his point across; each of the different situations provides the same moral, that when looking at something we should look at it through our own eyes not through the popular views of media.

**Works Cited**

Celebrities are very common in the boring society that we live in today. They are people chosen by the society, who will then be publicized and in some cases, ridiculed. We see them every day from televisions to movies to posters. Some people praise them like they are role models while others gain amusement from their misery. For example, the public and the media immediately criticized the famous pop star Britney Spears when she shaved her head. Celebrities’ lives are ruined by the media because the media takes every little embarrassing detail and spread it across the nation. Celebrities, after all, are humans just like all of us, so why is this popular yet immoral method accepted in our society? Perhaps we like to compare our lives to others or maybe we are just simply bored. Because of the overwhelming boredom that contributes to a negative feature of today’s society, it caused Americans to take pleasure from celebrities’ misery.

One way to tackle boredom is to do things in a whole new level. In today’s society where there are so many different types of entertainment; people are still bored. They are bored not because of having little activities and games to do, but instead they are sick of doing the same type of things all the time. We can watch a movie or read a book, but after years of the same entertainment; people will become bored again. One will feel bored when he or she has been doing the same thing repeatedly to the point where it is just not fun anymore. However, a solution to this is to do the same activity but take it to the next step. For example, people swimming frequently will eventually become bored of it; likewise, kids climbing trees everyday will have the same result. This doesn’t stop them from quitting, but instead it makes them take it to the next level. The people swimming may go on to do something more extreme such as scuba diving and the children climbing trees may take it to the next step and do rock climbing. What do people do when they are bored of watching movies or listening to music? They take it to the next level and read about famous actors, singers and other celebrities.

Boredom exists in our everyday life and to get rid of it we watch and read about celebrities because they are real people unlike fictional stories. John Gatto graduated from Columbia University and taught
public schools for twenty-six years. He points out in his essay “Against School,” “Boredom was everywhere in my world, and if you asked the kids, as I often did, why they felt so bored… They said they wanted to be doing something real, not just sitting around” (688). Gatto concluded that kids wanted to do something real, but what exactly is real? Real refers to something that is not made up such as people, life and feelings. As a result of boredom, people gave rise to the popular process of judging celebrities. Because celebrities are real people just like everyone else, we are interested in knowing everything about them. Instead of driving a car in a video game, wouldn’t it be better to drive in real life? Instead of listening to someone’s song on a radio, wouldn’t it be better to listen to them sing at a concert? Or how about reading a book about a fictional character? Wouldn’t learning about someone in real life be more entertaining? The concept of real has been embedded into our mind where it is almost second nature to us. When asked whether you want a picture with an autograph of a famous celebrity or a copied version of that, you will most likely pick the original picture without hesitation. The reason for this is because the original is a real picture unlike the copy. We enjoy celebrities’ lives and misfortunes because their situations and reactions are real. Boredom is part of our lives and as a solution to wipe out boredom we decided we wanted something real, celebrities.

When we are bored, we like to watch a movie or read a story or better yet, watch the lives of celebrities because of more suspense. Neal Gabler, author of “Our Celebrities, Ourselves” and a member of the Study of Entertainment and Society at the University of Southern California, acknowledges, “When you think of celebrity as a form of narrative art – the romances and divorces, the binges, the dysfunctions, the triumphs, the transgressions – you can immediately appreciate one of its primary appeals, which is the appeal of any good story” (426-428). The life of a celebrity is very similar to any story because of its conflicts, daily life, and communications between people. However, if celebrities’ lives are just like any other story, then what would make people read about celebrities as opposed to a fictional book? The reason is because celebrities’ lives are real and anything can happen. When reading a book, most of the time the main character wouldn’t die in the first couple of pages. You probably won’t expect the main character to die so quickly because then there will be no story to tell. This same concept applies to movies; you have a general idea of things that will probably not happen. If you’re watching a movie about aliens taking over the world, things that probably wouldn’t
happen would be a random volcano eruption that killed all the aliens. The reason for this is because such an ending will upset the audience. The lives of celebrities are unexpected compared to other forms of entertainment and they offer the element of surprise to capture the reader.

Suspense on celebrities’ lives can cause the audience to continue watching, but it also gives more pleasure to the viewers. Walker Percy is an author of numerous novels and he has won the National Book Award for fiction. He declares, “As a result of this preformulation, the source of the sightseer’s pleasure undergoes a shift” (469). He uses the term “preformulation” frequently throughout his essay “The Loss of the Creature”. The term means your expectations or ideas of something before you see it. The sightseer has preformulation because he or she knows what the place will look like based on pictures or videos. The joy a person gets when he or she has preformulation is significantly less than without. For example, you have an idea of what is going to happen in a movie because you know the things that won’t happen like a random volcano eruption. On the other hand, celebrities’ lives are different types of stories where anything can happen. There are no authors for celebrities because what people are watching are their lives. As a result, there is no preformulation and therefore the audience will obtain more pleasure from watching celebrities.

We gain satisfaction from watching celebrities because we can communicate and share our thoughts with others. Our everyday boredom has contributed to the raise of the media. The media simply shows what the public want to see. As writer Gabler has noted, “the cheapness of programming real-life celebrities as opposed to fictional stories, and to the power of celebrities to sell magazines and tabloids by appearing on the cover” (427). Because the media can profit by using celebrities, more and more people will recognize them and will enjoy keeping up with the latest news. When you put a group of people who shares a common interest together, they will talk among each other. It is more exciting to talk to others than being alone. Imagine watching a movie by yourself as opposed to watching it with a group of friends. There is no doubt that watching it with friends is more enjoyable because you can discuss the movie and share ideas. As a result of boredom, the media escalated and as a result of the media, it brings people together to talk about celebrities. For example, the media advertised all over the world about the recent death of Michael Jackson.
This in turn caused people to socialize about Michael Jackson. We find it pleasant to watch celebrities because of the discussions between people.

The only treatment to cure boredom is celebrities. We overcome our boredom by taking entertainment to the next level to the point where we bash celebrities. We enjoy their misfortunes because they are more satisfying than watching videos and the fact that celebrities are real people just like us. It is enjoyable to watch celebrities because then we can communicate with people who share the same interest. We have devised a method where we ruin celebrities’ lives for our own personal entertainment. Living off celebrities’ misery will only last for so long; we will eventually get bored again. Who knows what the next level will be or how realistic it can get. The best solution to cure boredom is to not get bored in the first place. As Gatto would say, invent your own ways to fight boredom (689).
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Genuine, authentic, real, original, bona fide; how does one know that one is living such a life? The idea of authenticity varies from person to person depending solely on their lifestyles and interests. In the essay “The Loss of the Creature,” author Walker Percy gives his readers various examples regarding his theories on living a genuine life. Percy makes it a point that if one is always looking to seek out other people's approval, the individual may never actually receive the satisfaction of having that experience listed as genuine (473). The inspiration for an authentic lifestyle may be achieved by understanding that you are the only one who can consider the life that you live genuine because true authenticity follows your own values and standards. These principles and ethics can include the interests that offer one happiness and gratification, such as a fulfilling future and stronger individuality, as well as enhancing one’s independence and sovereignty.

The proposed idea of “preformulation” (469) predetermines an individual's outlook in different situations. This act of having already formulated information at hand may impact a person’s true approach and stance towards an event or a position. In his essay, Percy uses an example about exploring the Grand Canyon. He describes to his readers that many visitors take vacations to see the Grand Canyon but do not actually ‘see’ the Grand Canyon. Percy explains that the idea of taking a trip to perceive this famous landmark “has been appropriated by the symbolic complex which has already been formed in the sightseer’s mind” (469). In other words, something as extravagant as the Grand Canyon gets talked about so often that people may feel like they have already been there even when they have not. When people are given the opportunity to visit this well-known attraction, they find themselves subconsciously comparing it to what others might have described it as or to pictures they have seen in the past. This preformulation leaves it impossible for an individual to make the experience “their own” because they unintentionally do not know how to. The object of living a genuine lifestyle is to make real experiences your own and I think Percy portrays this thoroughly when expressing the reality of this Grand Canyon situation.
“Dialectical” (470) knowledge is used primarily to reach an agreement concerning what is actually accurate or factual in diverse conditions. As a result of using both rational and logical discussions to determine the truth, this dialectical method may also interfere with one’s own viewpoints on the matter. Percy depicts the significance of using the dialectical method under certain circumstances as well. He uses the example of the beaten track as a way to get his message across: “After a lifetime of avoiding the beaten track and guided tours, a man may deliberately seek out the most beaten track of all, the most commonplace tour imaginable…just as a man who has lived in New York his whole life may visit the Statue of Liberty” (470). Percy is trying to reveal how different it is for one to see something that they have seen many times before through someone else’s eyes. Sometimes when a person is overly exposed to one thing, they will not realize the role of importance that the thing may generally hold. As a result of this, they may have to experience a situation in other people’s footsteps in order to accomplish the important discovery. By seeing something for the first time, one can make this occurrence of their own significance and be able to look back at this event and remember it just as they saw it.

Vagueness and doubt may lie under the same conditions that include both authentic and unauthentic elements. Percy makes ambiguity and uncertainty a main point in his essay, especially when describing how many individuals feel that they need to fulfill “it” at some time in their lives. He says that some strategies of direct confrontation are less authentic than others and may evidently serve other purposes than that of offering access to being; for example, various unconscious motivations (Percy 472). When people experience different events during their lives, there is always one that leaves them feeling as if they have accomplished something great; they have finally achieved “it”. How though, does one determine whether or not “it” has happened? In the words of Percy, this “too good to be true” experience may take place when sightseers or tourists “come face to face with an authentic sight; a sight which is charming, quaint, picturesque, unspoiled, or a sight in which they see and then leave feeling rewarded” (473). For me, I would consider an experience that brings me the utmost satisfaction as conquering “it”. I absolutely love to travel so being in new places with new surroundings always leaves me feeling pleased and content. I believe that after experiencing “it”, one can consider this genuine and authentic because it is an event that one has partaken in oneself.
The stimulation for an authentic lifestyle may be attained by realizing that you are the only one who can deem the life that you live genuine because true authenticity pursues your own morals, values, and principles. I think Percy actually thinks accurate authenticity is possible in any aspect of life because individuals can reach a life of actuality by making experiences their own and in the future, remember them as they want to. While I feel as if there are more consistent ways to live an authentic life, I do think that Percy’s theories and arguments had some validity to them. As a reader, I was able to depict the obvious and apparent provided examples that could take place in any real situation. As said by Mounier, “the person is not something one can study and provide for; he is something one struggles for. But unless he also struggles for himself, unless he knows that there is a struggle, he is going to be just what the planners think he is” (481). You are responsible and accountable for the outcome that you wish to achieve, thus resulting in your own authenticity.
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Walker Percy’s essay entitled “The Loss of the Creature” depicts life experiences people expect to have in their everyday lives. Both Percy and John Gatto share some of the same ideologies about students becoming consumers instead of individuals. Gatto explains his theory in a simple manner, whereas Percy goes further in depth to explain the concepts behind why students have this constant feeling of boredom which prolongs their childhood. Since “The consumer is content to receive an experience just as it has been presented to him by theorists and planners” (Percy 474), why do Gatto and Percy believe a student has to go through years of training before becoming a great citizen? Whether the material being taught is boring or not, students must go through years of training in order to develop the proper skills, such as having respect towards authority and other citizens, and the logics of being an educated consumer. By obtaining these skills through compulsory education students will learn how to have experiences in life that are worth remembering.

The system of compulsory education is one which requires a lot out of the students who take part in it. Since it is required, students are in a sense forced into this system of boredom. Waking up early hours of the morning to stay in a building for around six to seven hours just to return home to complete homework that requires more of your time can end up being a stress to all who have to participate in the activities of school. So what is the purpose of this place we know as school? I believe this institution was designed so students could learn through different subjects to determine their interests. The ideas behind the schooling system are good to a certain extent. The system allows you to have knowledge in other fields beside your interests; this is good because it gives the students personal gains and more astuteness. Percy would agree that by learning other subjects a student can gather more information than someone who may be majoring in the same subject. The system can also give students the drive into another subject which may strike a new interest.
Is the schooling system one that actually helps students reach a level of success? Gatto argues about this system of compulsory education, stating that the schooling system only makes the students less interested in learning and decreases individuality (Gatto 688). But he also sees some good in its structure such as it creates a strong citizen and makes students their personal best (Gatto 690). Gatto acknowledges the fact of whether school is needed by saying: “Do we really need school? I don’t mean education, just forced schooling…a considerable number of well-known Americans never went through the twelve-year wringer our kids currently go through, and they turned out all right” (Gatto 690). Even though Gatto agrees with the system of boredom he still questions the importance of it, especially seeing that Americans from the past have become successful without completing the criteria of this stressful process. Percy would state that a student could teach themselves the basic information and get a full understanding of the subject, which proves that forced schooling may not fully be necessary. I believe that this system of schooling trains students to become leaders and to “obey reflexively” (Gatto 695). By teaching students these skills they will know how to conduct more meaningful lives while at the same time comprise respect for those in the society they live in.

Percy on the other hand would view this system along the same line as Gatto, but as for Percy, he believes in the educational package, which is the atmosphere in which the student and professor share. (Percy 476). I believe the educational package describes the setting of the school; the teacher fails to see the difficulty of this set up and believes that their message will be delivered but in reality it keeps the students from actually learning. By the students constantly having to sit in this style throughout their academic day becomes frustrating and eventually just causes boredom upon the student. Percy confirms that: “The educator is well aware that something is wrong, that there is a fatal gap between the student’s learning and the student’s life” (Percy 476). It is clear to the teachers that something is wrong with the system of compulsory education, which is the fact that it bores all of its students. Once the student reaches into the classroom it may become intricate for the student to separate learning from their individual life because events taking place in their life could be more fascinating than the information being taught to them. The educational package proves that it can be very difficult to mold students with the skills needed to have memorable experiences.
Does it really matter where one goes to receive their education? Who determines whether or not the education being taught at an institution is more advanced than the same lessons being taught at another establishment or from home schooling? Percy believes the institution has nothing to do with the knowledge the student leaves with. I believe the name of an institution should have nothing to do with the intelligence level of the graduate student. Whether a student attends an Ivy League or a normal university, the students all receive the same lessons in some way or another. Percy emphasizes his ideas on where a student receive their education: “I am serious in declaring that a Sarah Lawrence English major who began poking about in a dogfish with a bobby pin would learn more in thirty minutes than a biology major in a whole semester” (Percy 479). Percy believes that there is no difference in the universities, a student can study a subject for a few hours and get more from that lesson than those who major in the subject and spend more time studying the subject. I would agree with Percy, if a student can master a subject without having to go through the demanding system of schooling then this could be an alternate way of learning.

One issue with compulsory education is the fact that it teaches students the ways of consumption. To me the idea of becoming a consumer can be a scary subject. Consumers are expected to have a need for something whether needed or not at any given time. There are no set rules in the game of consumption, but once advertisements become a part of our quotidian life it becomes challenging for consumers not to buy into these ads. Therefore it is up to the consumer to take full responsibility and know the limits of the game. This is the main theory of being a manageable consumer. Percy believes that: “The measures taken are measures appropriate to the consumer: the expert and the planner know and plan, but the consumer needs and experiences” (Percy 479). Percy states that consumers only buy what they believe is an appropriate necessity. He goes on to say the planner know how to arrange items in a way which forces the buyer to crave for whatever is being presented. Instead of always having a constant need for something Percy wants consumers to have an experience that urges an accomplished feeling once completed. Percy blames this feeling on the ‘it’ factor, which is to be blamed for the constant need for something (Percy 472).
Who can be blamed for teaching these students to have the desire to crave so much? Professors are the ones who teach these students a majority of the information they know so it is a possibility that their teachings are the cause of the continuous desires. Percy claims that:

The educator is only partly to blame. For there is nothing the educator can do to provide for this need of the student. Everything the educator does only succeeds in becoming, for the student, part of the educational package. The highest role of the educator is the maieutic role of Socrates: to help the student come to himself not as a consumer of experience but as a sovereign individual. (Percy 481)

It is not the professors role to give the student the feeling of gaining the it factor, but their job is to provide the students with the knowledge needed to become successful. I believe the professors help push the students to find not only the consumer within themselves but the individual as well.

In conclusion, it can be said that both Percy and Gatto share many of the same view points. Both express that the system of compulsory education only creates a scene of boredom for the students and leaves the question who is to be blamed for this boredom? By knowing how to live with respect for others and the logics of consumerism, students can go off and explore the world with the initiative of gaining some form of fulfillment. These skills can help the student get around being able to ask questions of verification, and also help limit their spending during certain trips. The system tests the students’ attention span and directs the path of the students’ future. In a sum the schooling system willingly trains its students to become respectful towards their society and to be manageable consumers.
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In George Orwell’s “Shooting an Elephant,” the author portrays the way in which people tend to undermine their morals and beliefs to satisfy others. He uses his own experience to show the reader how we lose our authenticity in an overbearing society, while highlighting the pressure he endures under the colonial system. Throughout the essay, the reader is presented with evidence of the author’s challenging surrounding and is swayed to believe that Orwell is stuck between a “rock and a hard place”; leaving him with two choices with little promise. Furthermore, Orwell manipulates the reader’s ideas of fitting-in by focusing more on his pressing environment and its social demands, rather than on his weakness of sustaining his sense of self. In an environment controlled by societal beliefs, Orwell strayed from his own opinions and instead, did what was expected of him. He disregards his morality and uses his environment as a crutch; falling back on it for assistance in explaining his behavior.

The author uses his problematic surroundings to excuse his behavior. Orwell attempts to prove to his audience that shooting the elephant was what he had to do in order to validate himself in the community. He describes Burma as a place where the white man was frowned upon and elaborates on how he wears a mask and grows to fit it (225), only trying to justify his shooting of the elephant. He blames the social demands of the colony as the source of his action and does not own up to the fact that he is not confident enough to stand up for what he believes. The author wants the reader to see his environment as the reason he acts the way he does, to show that he has no choice but to, when he does. Orwell lacked self-confidence and was afraid of a defected reputation and that held him back. He was the only white man within a Burmese population and had to represent the European culture and not shooting the elephant would compromise that. His reputation depended on his shooting of the elephant. Orwell perceived that at that moment, if he had turned tyrant and decided not to shoot the elephant, he would become a hollow, posing dummy, [a] conventionalized figure of a sahib and would be destroying his freedom (224).
Orwell was being controlled by the society. He even blames the crowd following him as the reason he “marched down the hill, looking and feeling a fool, with the rifle over [his] shoulder” (224). Every one of Orwell’s actions stemmed from a feeling he got from the colony. He says “it is the condition of his rule that he shall spend his life trying to impress the “natives,” so in every crisis he has got to do what the “natives” expect of him (224). He never does what he truly wants to and fails to acknowledge that. He is comfortable with blaming his environment because it makes him look better. It simply takes away from the coward persona he would have had otherwise.

The author neglects the fact that during his time as an Indian Imperial Police officer, he had lost sight of what he found morally correct, due to the political and societal demands. Orwell knew it was “a serious matter to shoot a working elephant” (Orwell 224) and he clearly “did not want to” (225), but he goes on to do it anyway because “the people expected it of [him], and [he] had got to” (224). As a man “stuck between [his] hatred of the empire [he] served and [his] rage against the evil-spirited little beasts who tried to make [his] job impossible” (222), one would think that would be enough to make him follow through with his beliefs, purposely trying to evade the position he finds himself in. He had been overwhelmed by the impressionable society in Burma and was stripped of his own voice and ability to do the right thing. He let his feelings of having to fulfill what the ‘natives’ expect of him (224) take center stage, instead of accepting his own values. Orwell allowed the crowd’s pressure to influence his judgment, although he had come up with plausible reasons why he should not kill the elephant. He forgets his thoughts and continues to adhere to what the crowd wants.

The author’s argument of how people act differently under certain circumstances is defined but questionable. Nowhere in the essay does it show Orwell performing an act he found morally just or does it show one in which he is taking a stance for his beliefs. He does not emphasize his failed attempt at staying true to himself, a point that would have improved the essay. Orwell’s ideas and beliefs about imperialism are prevalent amid the paper but are only there to help show that even when we have particular outlooks on situations, our environment can outweigh them and lead us to a point of trying to fit-in. The evidence would have been far more useful if Orwell had stuck to his opinion and rebelled. Rather than shoot the elephant, he
could have argued one of his points, saved an animal and avoided a furious owner. Sometimes we have to follow our intuition and do what we feel is the right thing.

Orwell only killed the elephant “solely to avoid looking a fool” (227). He does shoot the elephant to essentially “fit-in” but more so because he disregarded his beliefs. Orwell was unsuccessful in staying true to himself and if he had, the second-guessing at the end of the essay would not be there. The author says, “Besides, legally I had done the right thing, for a mad elephant has to be killed, like a mad dog, if its owner fails to control it” (226), clearly showing that he has second thoughts about his choice to shoot the animal. Once again, he tries to justify his behavior by producing arguments to counteract his real opinion that shooting the elephant was wrong. Orwell has to prove to himself that his actions were relevant.

In writing this essay, the author wanted to show the reader that neglecting our morals and beliefs to “fit-in” is wrong. All through the essay, he expresses his opinion but does not follow it. He is too busy trying to establish his self in the colony, just as we do today, and endure the white man’s struggle of not being laughed at (225). He wants the reader to understand how important it is to stand by our opinions and beliefs. Orwell does not want the reader to bear the embarrassment he bore in order to impress and fit-in to a crowd. He is only telling his audience that when we fail to stand up for what we believe is right, we are left second-guessing and trying to justify our behavior.
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In the “Speech to Third Army Troops” George S. Patton does not want to let the world call the American Army a “goddamm mess” (Patton 450). As a result of that he tells the soldiers to devote their everything to their job so that America’s history of only winning the wars can be repeated. By giving this speech, Patton tries to provide soldiers enough motivation and inspiration to win World War Two.

In the beginning of his speech, he says, “Americans love to fight traditionally [and they] play to win” only (449). History shows that up to that point America had been undefeatable and it was in our army’s hands to continue this tradition. America’s future was in these hands and it was up to them to keep it safe or not. This depended on our soldiers to give us the “undefeatable” honor back and or let our pride go. Patton’s technique of motivating soldiers forces them to take it personally so that they can put their best in it.

By calling soldiers “veterans” Patton means be brave, honest and alert. You are not real soldiers if you are scared that you might die. Soldiers have to keep their life on their hands and fight; whoever still saves it is a real “fighter.” Patton even says that “the real man never lets fear of death overpower his honor” (449). As breathing is necessary to survive, alertness is required to save the country and yourself. Patton talks about one incident where “there were 400 neatly marked graves… one man went to sleep on his job” (450). Not worrying about their own lives, gives them more inspiration for caring about others.

Patton says every job of the army has the same significance and importance to the country (450). Every finger together makes a fist just as every person together in the army makes the “team,” even a “quartermaster [who] bring[s] up the food and clothes” has the same participation in winning the war as a soldier (450). The level of the job does not matter, what matters is how you do it! If everybody does their job with honesty and bravery then there is nobody in the world that can make America “defeatable.” To become undefeatable, they needed motivation along with team work.
Patton is using these three elements pride, responsibilities, and unity to encourage the soldiers toward success of winning the war. America has learned (only) how to win and if we apply the same concept of devotion to our duties in our life then America will be successful as a country.
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As the essay “Throwing Like a Girl” states women should not go off participating in any manly activities at which men have already accelerated way beyond any women’s capacity’s. Women should stay home as they were before August 18, 1920, when the Nineteenth Amendment was passed (This allowed the women to move up in the world, and start to make decisions by them self’s, like going to work). Women’s greatest accomplishment is taking care of the children at home. When the male comes back from work there should always be a meal waiting there for him. Like a typical housewife who never leaves her house, a woman should just do anything that is needed in the house.

Recently, I was watching a tennis game; a girl threw the ball from her side of the field to her opponent. The way she threw the ball underhanded with her arm straightened downward, that was the funniest throw I have ever seen. That is what society refers to as “Throwing like a girl.” The way she balance her arm while she threw the tennis ball, and the whole body motion that was way off compared to the way a guy would throw it. While experiencing that throw in action it made obvious, that women are not meant for any sports that the guys mostly participate in. It is like they are making fun of any throwing sport in the eyes of a male that was experienced this that type of sport whether it was baseball, tennis etc. The sport that the male puts in an enormous amount of efforts is simply destroyed by a single woman’s throw. This world was built by men, woman have no experience on how to solve the problem at hand. The problem being, to be able to throw a ball in a dissent form, that would not make fun of the sports that man care so much about. The best way to solve this is to place them were they belong in there kitchens, houses. With this they will at least not bring forth another problem that males have trouble with, and still be a great help to them by catering the mans expectations.

Women’s role is to remain in the house and take care of the family while the man is suppose to go to work and provide. A woman is supposed to provide anything that the male may need after a long day of work. A woman should not be able to go out without the male to accompany her out. It would be best for
woman to act as lady’s and just stay at home and to take care of the children, do not move too much from the house that may cause trouble for the male. God’s purposes of bringing a female in this world is for them to reproduction, and take care of the male that helps her make that goal possible (passing on her DNA, starting a family).

Woman should stop wasting time in sports that they are not even close in comprising to the ability’s of a male. They should be staying at home taking care of the house chores, the children, and cater the male of the family, when he asks for something. I believe woman were supposed to act as they have been doing for centuries before the Nineteenth Amendment was but in action with out that they would not have troubled the males (by making them start fights over a single woman), if that were to stay the same as then the males would have had clearer minds for there futures they would have created many new things that they have not yet created to this day.

II. Expository and Satirical way

In the previous piece when I rewrote Fallows’ main thesis in a satirical way, I felt really confident talking about it. I relayed to it as if I was the one making the point he was. The way Fallows wrote the essay “Throwing Like a Girl” made it extremely easy to understand his main point. So I was able to talk about it in a through satire with no problem. When I wrote about it I started to feel like this way of writing made me a sexist. I repeatedly degraded the entire female race. By the techniques in which they do things (throwing a ball) that males have done better than they can ever do; “women should not go off participating in any manly activities at which men have already accelerated way beyond any women’s capacity’s.”(Lefter Dinkollari) It was really easy to talk about a gender issue in a satirical way, because we experience sexism everyday. Satire way is useful even when any audience members can relate. Why? It can attract the reader to read the essay more then an expository method would because it would make them more curious what other things the write is trying to express to them. Familiarity is essential, because it make the article flow, easier to follow, understand. My purpose in writing this is to state that satire writing is easier to write about and harder to understand while keeping the reader focused on the story, because you have a lot of things you can make the reader argue about your writing so it keeps him intact to your essay till the end.
In the essay “Throwing Like a Girl” James Fallows states a lot of straightforward facts (examples) that introduces the main topic. Ivy Stabell cited “Fallows expository method to solve the mystery of men and women’s throwing patterns.” His way of writing is right to the point and is easy to follow and understand. Expository writing is mostly based on facts that have a lot of background information that Fallows refer to the statement that he is trying to prove. Fallows says that “One is a surprisingly valuable drill suggesting by the Little League’s How-to-Play handbook.” Cite Fallows shows that he does not allow any space in his writing to fool around with the readers meaning to talk sarcastically he just talks straight up facts. Another way Fallows stays on the topic without writing satire is by getting more information on the theories between males and females. That way he does not confuse the readers, and also keeps the readers attention by getting them involved on the topic (by making the reader throw a ball with their bad hand so they can see the different of the throw; “like a girl”). The way Fallows wrote his essay “Throwing Like a Girl” explained that expository method should be used as the best form, only focusing on his thesis even though if it means adding information to support his thesis with based facts by proven facts.

“Satire is a way of writing which human vice or folly is attacked through irony, derision, or wit.” Cite Dictionary.com Jonathan Swift over does it in the essay “A Modest Proposal” by: Swift confuses the reader by using sarcasm to no limits on this essay he wrote, in by not noticing when he was talking sarcastically, or when he was being serious. Swift says: “whoever could find out fair, cheap, and easy method of making these children sound, useful members of the commonwealth, would deserve so well of the public as to have his statute set up for preserver of the nation.” Cite Swifts In this sentence Swift is basically confusing to the reader by implying that if the poor people sell their babies it would benefit society and the wealthy owner of the person that the poor family sold the baby. If they do not then they will get killed by the owner of the slaves, or be eaten. He it is hard to understand the satire while reading it. Satire sounds crazy to most people unless they catch the sarcastic point the author is trying to make. In my evaluation of the essay “Throwing Like a Girl” I used a lot of sexism talking about girls, and where they really belong: “The biggest accomplishment I see women do is taking care of the children at home, and when the father comes back from work, there should only be a meal waiting there for him; Like a typical housewife, she never leaves her house, only to get
anything that is needed in the house.” I wrote satirical but my points were straightforward so it was not as confusing as trying to read “A Modest Proposal” by Swift.

The satirical method of writing helps me relate more easily to the topic by just writing what I think of the topic like “Throwing Like a Girl.” Even though satire made write write some really offensive things towered the women this would make me sexist. Since I am writing in a satirical form, the reader takes sarcasm which helps me write freely. It is not really easier to understand then writing expository since I am not writing straightforward. But this challenges the reader a little more, because they have to read carefully to understand the message that I am writing about, so I like satires better than expository writing because it goes straight to the point.

Swift was not unable to demonstrate the topic clearly because of his sarcastic points in his essay, when he was talking freely by pointing out facts and issues about the topic like the example I talked about the “How-to-Play handbook.” Cite Fallows Swift has it easier he jumps around in his essay talking about why it is bad to kill babies, and then talks about the benefits of selling babies while doing this he keeps his readers interested in the point his trying to prove. This does not make the topic pretty clear, which changes my mind about Swiffs essay.
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I never would have thought that one image can represent so many issues and possible have impacts on people lives. Through this image I present the difference in life two social classes may have. These two types of classes portrayed in the art, is a white man representing the wealthy and a factory worker that represents the poor. There are a few points that I am trying to get out through the text. One is how the difference in social class has an effect on their everyday lives, and how the wealthy people feel about having so much money. Either the money falling from the sky can show that they get so much money, that it feels that it just falls from the sky, or they have so much already that they can just throw it to the sky and still have enough. Also, on the picture, you can see the sad face on the poor man’s life and the happy sun on the rich man’s life, reason being because we know that they both are living two different lives. In this paper I present an issue many of us may be familiar with, namely poverty. Through my artistic text, I will relate it to past course texts including Lars Eighner, Peter Singer, Barbara Ehrenreich, Jonathan Swift and Howard Zinn. By using the text wealthy people will want to help those around them and not just international foundations, reconsider being greedy and think twice about buying something they don’t need and represent the problems that poverty may cause on appearance and self appeal. Also through the text I will focus on explaining my view on getting wealthy people to get involved with helping the poor, by making donations and helping out with the shelter, and possibly leading to a prevention of poverty in this world.

The purpose of creating this image was to get attention to the viewers, because there is nothing being done on this issue. I want this to be viewed by the wealthy, because I want them to see the issue from ever aspect. They don’t see the struggle that the homeless people deal with, because they feel that it isn’t their fault that these people are homeless. And make them want to help, by donating money and volunteering in shelters in order to get these people in the right direction, or else the situation is going to get worse. With targeting this audience, I hope that it doesn’t make the wealthy people look like the “bad guys” and make them not want to donate money to the needy.
After creating this text, I can make many connections to the passages of the writers stated above. Lars Eighner makes many good points in his essay. For example “I find from the experience of scavenging two rather deep lessons. The first is to take what I can use and let the rest go by”. He said this statement after going through the experience of being homeless and realizes that there is many things that people have that isn’t necessary. Even being homeless there are things that you don’t need. In relation to my image, the rich businessman has so much money and a fancy luxury car, but he doesn’t really need all of it. I can also relate this to another point in the essay “Opened containers require caution and some attention to the question “Why was this discarded?” But in the case of discards from student apartments, the answer may be that the item was discarded through carelessness, ignorance, or wastefulness” (Eighner 382). This is a perfect example of people wasting their money, when they could’ve have helped many others in need. In the artwork, the rich many could have instead of buying an expensive car, could’ve bought a cheaper one or spend less money on necessities.

A major counterargument that has been brought up was “why do we have to give up our money that we earned to these people that many of them don’t even care about themselves in the first place”. I grant this, but still believe that if you at least give some of what you have to the ones in need, you at least don’t have to live with that greed. Because as said in Ehrenreich essay “From the vantage point of the continent’s original residents, or, for example, the captive African Laborers who made America a great agricultural power, our “traditional values” have always been bigotry, greed, and belligerence, buttresses by wanton appeals to a God of love”. The rich man represents this value of greed. I agree with her statement because there are many people in this country that represent this value of greed. But there are many homeless people that when given money, tend to spend it on drugs, lottery tickets, or alcoholic beverages, which is why I can see why these Americans greed. Some lie to get money from the rich. This is why I agree with Singer when he says he rather give money to foundations internationally (Singer 803), because he feels that they actually use the money to help these people in poverty. Sometimes there are areas that need help and there are no foundations that are helping within that area, and there are some really bad conditions in these areas, so when people look to donate and they see that there is nothing being done in these areas, they rather donate to other counties. But I
strongly think that these people should hold their own programs in their selected cities in order to see the change they want to see. We spend so much money on war, and still people are dying in war and we are still fighting. Why that money can’t be used to help people in our own country, rather than wasting it and focus on getting these people out of the streets.

I want my image to have an effect on those who have money and haven’t struggled one day in their life to live one day. I want them to think about all the money they have wasted throughout their life and how they could’ve helped many lives in the past. I’m not only saying white people, because they aren’t the only ones with money, but those they have highly ranked jobs and live comfortably.

In the city I come from, Hartford, CT, I can see the difference in homeless people there are. Like previously said many of them ask for money, making people think they need it for food but not really. Most homeless people in my city are addicts and waste the little money they get on drugs, which upsets many people, especially the wealthy ones and that’s why they rather not give anything to homeless people in general. In Eighner’s On Dumpster Diving, there are different types of homeless people out there, scavengers and can scroungers. “Can scroungers, then, are people who must have small amounts of cash. These are drug addicts and winos, mostly the latter because the amounts of cash are so small.” These are the ones that are seen in my city, and it is really sad to see this happening because this is why people tend to not want to help the homeless. This is why in some way I disagree when people try to force the rich to give up what they earned and worked for to these people. Personally when a homeless come up to me and asks me for money, I most likely will say no, but sometimes or rarely I will go and pay for a water or coffee and something small for them to eat, because I have given money before and see them spend it on drugs. I’m sure this happens in many other cities and countries in this world.

In Singer’s essay he points out his philosophical view in his essay “An American household with an income of $50,000 spends around $30,000 annually on necessities…” (Singer 805). Americans rather spend their money on things that aren’t needed, which is similar to this issue, because here we have low income families that don’t have anything, but here are many wealthy people that could help these poor minorities, with just giving up a fraction of the amount they make annually. In relation to my solution, I believe that
these wealthy families that make more than $50,000 should not just make donations, but highly consider helping the poor, because the money they spend on unnecessary things can be used to provide help for these poor people. I believe these donations should be made to foundations that will make good use of the money, and try to put the homeless on the right direction to live a better life. What if we have a program that is similar to shelter, but also supply a job to the homeless, in order for them to get a place for themselves and get them on their feet and on the right direction. This will open opportunities for many people and the rate of poverty will decrease. Everyone should be valued the same, so why not help the homeless so there is equality in this world.

Howard Zinn points out something that we should really take into consideration. Many people living in Americans stress that they do everything right and nothing bad happens in America. This is absolutely wrong. We have so many issues that people thinking this way makes it even worse, and I definitely agree with his perspective when he says “Hollywood isn’t going to make movies that are class conscious, or anti-war, or conscious of the need for racial equality or gender equality”. This is a very strong point because, most films don’t depict this issue and if they do; it won’t be take place in America, rather in other countries. I personally can’t recall seeing a movie that depicts poor people in America.

The solution I will like to introduce to this issue would be to charge the rich people more taxes and use the money for shelter and insurance programs for everyone. Writing letters to the ceo’s of these huge companies, in order to get them involve and support these people. Making films on these issues in order to bring up the awareness on this issue, and getting people involved. Many people should cut back on spending, and by necessities instead of being Materialistic. This may lead to people disagreeing because this world is based on your appearance and how you represent yourself, and that’s why I feel many people spend too much money on things they don’t really need. It is understandable if the man in the art needs his money to buy suits and keep a good appearance in order to keep his job, or else he wouldn’t have had it in the first place. Poor people don’t have money to have a good appearance, so when they go for an interview they have a less chance of getting hired. Ask yourself this question, “If you were a manger, and had to interview both people in the drawing, who would you hire just by looking at them?” Of course many will choose a man in a suit
rather than one in construction clothes. And many find this a huge responsibility maintain a good social life and a job.

One major argument that many people have against the programs in the United States, that help the poor people, such as welfare, is that they give these families food stamps and money, but most of the people that live in the projects use the money on other things. This is a major issue, because all these people take advantage of these programs. Many people that live in my cities sell their food stamps for money and spend that money on drugs, alcohol, and other things they don’t need, while the money was needed to feed their children. When I see this happen it really makes me mad and it just makes me want to tell these people “Why you rather spend money on cigarettes, ditches and weed, instead of spending it on food for your family?”

The art shows so much emotion. You can see that the rich man doesn’t seem all that happy because they already have what other want, and so they feel like they don’t have to do much and their life isn’t so much fun, while the poor man is happy in way that he is struggling but there is opportunities’ for him to work at a factory at the minimum. Of course we know that the homeless aren’t happy with how the way their life is, but everything happens for a reason. Many rich people usually have emotional and morale problems rather than homeless having economical problems.

Instead of proposing a sarcastic solution similar to Swifts, I share similar views on poverty. There is a need of attention to this issue. I’m with him with the sarcastic solution, because people only pay attention to things that are so bizarre. But there shouldn’t have to be a sarcastic solution in order to get something done. Basically, I mean that for an issue so huge throughout this world, I don’t think that there is a need of a sarcastic solution, just to get the viewers attention. There should already be people aware of this, because they can see it everywhere they go. Now, since there is nothing being done, then I may agree with representing a sarcastic solution.

There millions in this world suffering from poverty and the number keeps increasing, and yet nothing is still being done. After feeding you with my ideas and views about the situation, will this take the poor people hunger away, after the wealthy people start taking action. I looked through this issue in many aspects, just to get my point across, this can lead to a decrease in poor people, and put an end to seeing so
many people not getting help from the wealthy. Having my solution introduce a new plan that can not just help people in other countries, but maintain to help those that are struggling right in front of them. I know that by using supportive arguments and making relations to previous texts, I have represented this issue to make my solution seem reasonable. But last time I knew, I am only one out of billions and people need to stop being hypocritical and start getting involved as well. The end to this issue begins with you.
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**Battle of the Bilinguals!**

*Hispanic vs. Latina*

The notorious rivals Gloria Anzaldúa and Ricardo Rodriguez were spotted indulging in alcoholic beverages at a local dinner party. The heated conversation between the two, on bilingual education will have you biting your nails!

WORDS LISETTE ESPINAL

So there was Gloria Anzaldúa and Ricardo Rodriguez, unaware that the other was there, until boom! Anzaldúa and Rodriguez bump into each other and the temporary awkward silence commenced. Both Anzaldúa and Rodriguez stood there with looks of frustration and distrust. Out of disingenuous courtesy they began to small talk, which led to a full on argument on bilingual education and its importance, or lack thereof. Their brawl over whether a child should be taught academics in their foreign language became louder and louder.

Rodriguez said to Anzaldúa, "[You] supporters of bilingual education imply that students like me miss a great deal by not being taught in their family's language" (492), and frankly by the looks of it, it seems like the opposite is true...

The room became silent, and uncomfortable. Anzaldúa then responded with anger evident in her voice. "Listen Rich-heard!" (493). “You’re speaking the oppressor's language by speaking English; you're ruining the Spanish language...” (512). So you can insult me all you want, but in the end, you're the embarrassment. Anzaldúa's attitude was not unexpected because of her rebellious nature, and non-conformist reputation. What was surprising was that her statement reverted everyone in the room to their elementary-like mindsets, where every insult was followed by an “oooh” and instigation.

Then Rodriguez, adamant about winning the argument, brought up the issue of individuality. He claimed that "... while one suffers a diminished sense of private individuality by becoming assimilated into public society, such assimilation makes possible the achievement of public individuality" (496). This
aggravated Anzaldua, since she believed the exact opposite. She believed that public individuality comes from resisting assimilation. He then said to her that "bilingualists...equate mere separateness with individuality" (496). Rodriguez condescendingly smiled at her.

She quickly replied, "I am my language" (515) that's all the public identity I need. They continued to dispute the others' point and to challenge the others' legitimacy. One debated that to gain a complete identity, one must be able to express their separateness and uniqueness from the crowd. The other argued, that in order to set your self aside from the crowd, one must first be part of that crowd. Something Rodriguez failed to explain, because he did not go into detail about why he thought being part of the crowd was important.

Fed up with the malarkey, Anzaldua took the first glass of water she could find and poured all over Rodriguez's fake Armani suit, and walked away. Rodriguez's mouth dropped in disbelief, not knowing what to make of what just happened. Then, he ran after her and stopped her by holding on to the strap of her Louie “Faux-tton” purse. He told her that they needed to settle their issues once and for all. She agreed and stayed to talk. Rodriguez said to her "Look Gloria, don't like me and you already know how I feel about you...so lets act like adults..." She then took a deep breath and asked him, “How is it that a native Spanish speaker can be against bilingualism?”

He claimed that the “[constant reminder of his public separateness]” (497) gave him an unwanted, isolated feeling. Anzaldua understood the fact that he was traumatized as a child, but she could not help but notice that his experience was unique to him, and it was foolish of him to try to terminate bilingual education altogether.

That was when her feminist views began to come out. She said, “I understand it’s just that… no offense, but you men want to control everything; [language is already] a male discourse” (409). “Your separateness is what Latinos consider unity.” She wanted to get across that most Hispanics cannot relate to Rodriguez and his experiences. His efforts to end bilingual education were useless due to his ignorance. Such ignorance is widespread among other races alike that do not need bilingual education.
Then, Rodriguez noticed he was losing, he did not hesitate to go down a bad road. He said, “Why can't you understand that it is people like you that make it so hard for minorities to get ahead in life. You want everything handed to you.” He had accused Anzaldua of using her native language as a crutch. Conversely, native Spanish speakers say, that if you know two languages you are twice as useful. Anzaldua rolled her eyes, and chuckled a little. She shook her head as to say Wow! You are so desperate that now you are just saying anything. So she ignored his comment.

He seemed perplexed by the fact that she just stood there. He asked Anzaldua in a low voice, “why is it that she feels so strongly for bilingual education?” She explained that students should not have to jeopardize their grades because of an involuntary language barrier. They should be taught in their own language, while incorporating English. This way they can learn English and not stay behind in other subjects. Such subjects do not necessarily need to be taught in English, in order to comprehend them. He argued that without bilingual education, a child can still get by in other subjects, as he did.

Anzaldua said “that's great for you, but what may work for you may not work for everybody...besides you shouldn't condone the termination of bilingual education when you never even had it yourself; it defeats your whole argument”.

Rodriguez said, “Look, we are not getting anywhere. Let’s agree to disagree. We are two different people with two very different opinions.” She happily agreed, and handed him a napkin for him to dry himself.

The party continued and everyone there acted has if the dispute never happened. Gloria Anzaldua and Ricardo Rodriguez each walked away separately. In the end it seemed like these two will never find a common ground. Still I have a feeling that they have more in common, than they will ever realize. On her way out Anzaldua muttered, “Men are impossible”, and on his way to the bar Rodriguez said, “Women are impossible. Hit me.”

-Lisette Espinal
Braulio Feliciano

I. A Loving Death

It was August of 2008 when I first saw her. Cariña Rodriguez the most beautiful girl at the University of Connecticut in Stamford, CT 06902. A detail that my dad also would keep bring up was that she was also a Mexican immigrant. My name is Alexander Davis. In my opinion, and apparently everyone else’s too, I’m just a rich white boy; nothing else. I was majoring in pre-med and so was she but she didn’t notice anyone in my group which I found weird because all the new girls flocked around us like flies to garbage. Normally I wouldn’t even notice someone like her just because of what she is but she was different. I figured all I would have to do is flash my money around and she would come running to be with me. I was dead wrong. I started spending money around her like crazy. I bought new clothes, new phones heck I even bought a new car she didn’t even notice.

All she said to me was, “¡Mira gringuito, usted ni su dinero me interesan así déjeme en paz!” I knew enough Spanish to know what that meant and it shocked me. Usually money gets me whatever I wanted but this time it didn’t work. I was completely dumbfounded at her independence from needing anyone.

That rejection just made me want her more. I wanted to caress her golden brown skin. To run my fingers through her long silky hair. The thing I wanted to do the most was stare into those beautiful green eyes that pulled me in and never let me go. I couldn’t give up. I had to have her. For weeks I chased after her. I looked up her schedule and rearranged my schedule just so I could be there when she got out of class. I always tried to be the gentleman around her. My friends disapproved of her completely. They were annoyed at all the things I did for her. Every time she would walk by they would look down on her but me, I kept her on a pedestal. To me she was an angel sent to me by God himself.

The most annoyed with my choice in women apparently, my best friend John, the nosiest brat in the world and he was so pathetic when he was jealous of someone it’s just so stupid. If anyone had anything that he didn’t have he’d want it. If he didn’t get it then he would just act like it was crap. I wasn’t going to let him get in the way of me getting the girl, not this time. The last time we talked was when he insulted her by saying
“Hey dude, just leave her alone man your pathetic that roach is just going to drag you back across the border.” I decked him without hesitation. Then before I was pulled away I told him “If I ever catch talking about Cariña like that again so help me I will beat you so bad not even God will recognize you!”

I finally gave up the whole “look cool” plan because it had been five weeks and it clearly wasn’t working. I just lost it one day and decided to put it all on the line. I parked about ten feet away from her, got of the car and started walking towards her. At first I didn’t even notice it but in the background “Ms. Independent” by Ne-yo was playing and it took me a minute to realize it was coming from my Cadillac. It was the radio it just randomly started playing that song, I took it as a sign. At that point I started running. I ran to her, pulled her in my arms and kissed her like I’ve never kissed anyone before. When I finally pull away all I could say was “I love you.” All she did to show me that she felt the same was tell me to shut up and kiss her again.

We have been going out for about two months now and we were inseparable. We were together always the only time you would see either of us alone was in our classes. I took her everywhere to the mall, to the movies, to the fanciest restaurants in the city and no matter what she just said “I don’t want to be here” and I would always ask why. She gave me the same answer every time, “I don’t want to share you at all and if a guy looked at me, you would beat his ass and get arrested and then after the cops dragged you away I would beat the shit out of him for making you beat his ass”

Unfortunately not everyone liked this. John, that bastard, went and told my father like I was some little kid that had to be watched and reported on. To make a long story short when I got home my dad gave a lecture that would put a caffeinated crack head to sleep. I didn’t care what he thought and I made that known then walked out. He didn’t take it so well. He came to the campus and found us sitting under one of the trees, her in my arms. He just started screaming saying things like “You whore what have you done to my son go back to your country and leave him alone.” I got up, angry as hell, and told him to leave. Well actually my words were “You jerk leave us alone ok just because you ruined your relationship with mom doesn’t mean that you get to ruin my relationships too.” He left all right but he was not letting it go.
Next day he went and bought her apartment building. For the next few months he did everything that would discourage her from seeing me. He raised her rent up; I helped her out by using the money I wired into a private bank account. In total it was about $600,000 in the account so enough to keep him from kicking her out. He threatened to evict her from her home if she didn’t break up with me. She, like most Latinas, was hard headed and stood her ground against that threat. The last thing that he did was the one that could’ve worked if I wasn’t there at the apartment. He called the police to have them search the apartment but I told them and showed them who I was, that the apartment was mine; that my dad was just worried it got broken into. They left without protest.

Later on that night I stormed into my father’s house and just started screaming at him about how he was being a jerk and how dare he interfere in my affairs?! He just kept saying “You and that Mexican bitch are a disgrace!” I just responded, “And you’re a horrible father and person you old scrooge when you’re done being an idiot call me that’s when ill come home. When my father is back from whatever hell he was in I’ll be here.” I was too angry to notice that he had been drinking and I didn’t care. So I stormed back out the house, got in the car, and started heading towards carina’s apartment. Little did I know that my dad was following me with his .45mm right next to him.

I rode around for hours. I couldn’t go home not now I was afraid I would say or do something that I regretted. So I decided to go to the one place where I could finally calm down and think clearly. So I went to Cariña’s because she could always talk sense into me. I hadn’t really been paying attention or I would have noticed the black car following me at every turn.

I walked to her door, she had just got home. We just stood for forty minutes talking about what happened at my house. We were planning to just run I had enough money in that bank account to keep us living comfortably while she and I found jobs. I was not aware that my father was on the stairs listening to our conversation and in his inebriated state it just infuriated him. He came out of the shadows of the staircase and pointed his .45mm at us and fired. Two shots hitting there marks. One hitting me in my heart and the
other hitting hers. I fell first and she landed right on top of me. It wasn’t the best way to die, but to die with the one I love was the death I always wanted.

II. Response to “A Loving Death”: The Sad Truth That Wealth Divides

I feel so sorry for others who aren’t really given the choice to pick who they fall in love with, so sad. The short story “A Loving Death” is about a young Caucasian male named Alexander Davis who falls in love with a Mexican illegal immigrant named Cariña Rodriguez. He doesn’t let her go so easy after she rejects him. For weeks he chases after her eventually getting her. His father is furious at the idea that he is going out with an immigrant when he finds out. He forbids him from seeing her but he refused. The father took drastic measures to separate them. Alexander helps Carina through it all. Alexander loses it, goes to his father’s house and just starts screaming at his father to stay out of his affair unaware that his father had been drinking. He storms out without knowing was right behind and went straight to Cariña’s house. The father being drunk gets mad and pulls out his .45mm he had brought with him. He fires twice. The bullets hit their mark in the hearts of the two teens killing them instantly.

I wrote this story to show how Society in the U.S. divides itself and others by race, income, or whether or not we are legal in this or any other country. We, the natural-born or the legal citizens, divide ourselves by looking down on the ones who are not natural born citizens only because they do the job that no one among us would do. By comparing and contrasting this work to the works of Patty Griffin, Jonathon swift, Howard Zinn, Barbara Ehrenreich and George Lipsitz I will discuss the social issues of division between social classes and immigration in our schools and our homes occurring throughout my story and why it occurs. There is division between classes and it causes difficulties mainly because the problem isn’t known until now. I’m going to show how the division of class could affect anyone no matter who you are.

I as the author am trying to enlighten my readers to the differences between the social classes. To show the differences between the privileges that the wealthy receive as opposed to those given to the middle or lower class, which are evident within this piece, like on page two when I refer to the father buying the girls apartment to raise her rent among other things to discourage her from seeing his son other than in school. It seems that this could remind you of what swift says in his essay “A Modest Proposal” when he speaks
metaphorically about the landlords devouring the parents, in which he means just taking every cent they had (828). This is usually true of landlords when it comes to rent. The landlords of this country have unfortunately taken over and even in this recession have made it impossible to make it from day to day. It’s exactly the case in my story when the father buys her apartment to force her to break up with his son. He does everything he can like raise the rent, threaten to evict her. At one point he calls the police to search the apartment as a show of force. It doesn’t work but he does everything he could think of to discourage her. That’s exactly what swift says he “devoured” everything she had to get what he wanted.

Another way you could possibly see it in is the way that if Hollywood were to get a hold of a story like this, they wouldn’t bother even looking at it. As Zinn says in his essay “Stories Hollywood never tells” ‘if such films are made about war, about class conflict, about the history of governmental lies, about broken treaties and official violence, if those stories reached the public, we produce a new generation.’(881) For the most part the thing that would relate Zinn to this piece would be the class conflicts. More specifically how they aren’t represented in the way that they should be. Like all the war stories that are never really truthfully told neither are stories like mine. They are warped around so that instead of showing the truth they end up having a “happily ever after” and it gives society the wrong idea that every story ends up happy and everyone content with their choices. That is nowhere near the truth. Hollywood has made stories like mine once or twice but do to the fact that its realistic they don’t get advertised as must go see. Most movies I or others of my peers have seen they have found not seen in advertisements.

As the author the biggest issue I try to tackle is the privileges the wealthy have over the middle and lower class especially immigrants. It’s like when Lipsitz says in his book, The Possessive Investment in Whiteness, when he speaks about the housing loans and how they were given to the Caucasians more than they were given to minorities because the minorities had a low net worth (14). I know it doesn’t exactly relate to the situation in the story but try and see it through my eyes. The basic thing I want to point out is who is chosen over whom. In the most common cases that you see but aren’t exactly dealt with is the choice of the wealthy over the poor. Which in the story basically was the police chose the rich Caucasian male, Alexander’s father, over the poor immigrant girl, Cariña, as like they chose Caucasians to give loans to rather than
minorities (14). That has been how it’s been for a while in the U.S. Now don’t get me wrong its not all but there are those people out there that do take advantage or try to take advantage of anyone colored. They have the financial power and in this country that is all that matter.

Our schools are divided so that everyone has to be somewhere to feel comfortable. Everyone has niche that they must stay in or there will be issues. The top of the social food chain are the popular rich kids. Then the middle classed sort of popular kids and so on. Now unless you hit the lotto or you can somehow get money that is the only way you could move up in this vicious food chain. My Characters Alexander and Cariña are in a situation of being in between that food chain so they face the difficulty and tragically they fought it but couldn’t win. Unfortunately this kind of belief of school tends to stem from home.

Our homes are just as divided as our schools. You here the parents of not only the wealthy but the middle class saying “don’t associate with these people because there….etc”, which is what causes the food chain in schools in the first place. Throughout my story you could sense that the father was not pleased with the couple and even voiced his opinion twice once as just a lecture when he first finds out, another when he is drunk which unfortunately led to the end in which he shoots Alexander and Cariña.

By this point you’re probably asking “what is he talking about? I have never heard of anyone doing any of these things.” I just hope you are talking about the shooting his son because that’s the only part that I would agree with you. If it’s the parents causing the division within the schools, unfortunately it is happening, parents hold prejudices on certain races and they pass it on to their children. That’s the only way it keeps on living.

Both sides of the social ladder would argue on the same point that this is how it’s established and that’s the way it’s going to stay. Others may argue that the view of the wealthy in this short story is completely unreal. Others may argue that it isn’t just immigrants who suffer from this problem. Some people on both sides of the social ladder would argue that this problem doesn’t exist.

Finally people would also argue that this problem doesn’t exist. That people are imagining the whole thing. I really have just a question if there is no real inequality between the social classes then why can the rich avoid treating there employees horrible and it not matter but if your the manager of C.V.S. and you treat your
employees the same way you would probably be fired. I can see those differences clearly enough to know that they are there.

I believe that if we just change our perception of the social ladder we could end all these problems such as lower class having no financial problems. All we would need to do is just keep pressing this issue until it gets into people’s head that this is wrong. Zinn speaks of the same thing in the last paragraph of his essay of how we must educate to do the “modest thing” of changing the world. I really believe that if we educate all classes to this problem we can end this issue once and for all by showing what is happening when society as a whole is divided. We can take to see how the half lives and have them live the same exact way for about a month. That way they can truly experience what it feels like to be in that situation.

Another way is just to stop separating ourselves by making the effort to get to know the different cultures, religions, races, and whatever general diverse person. If we don’t separate ourselves, we don’t have the social hierarchy, and that would cause less strife in between the social classes in terms of the parents who are concerned with whom their kids are hanging out with. It will also ensure that kids grow up normally without prejudice comments such as minorities are poor or that all white people are rich. If we can all come together no matter what race or social class it should end this issue. In all basics I say we act like true patriots and protest against the shackles of the financial dungeon that is our society like Ehrenreich says in her essay “Family Values” “Dissent, rebellion, and all-around hell-raising are the true duties of a patriot” (671). People could volunteer to talk to mayors, senators, write letters to the president, whatever they can do to get the point across that this needs to end and now. The voice of one isn’t heard over the crowd but the voices of the crowd could make any one person listen.

First, the view of that’s just how it is and that is how it’s going to stay on the differences in social class privileges. I believe that if we can educate the world on what they refuse to see then and only then can we truly know to end it. I grant that it may stay the same but I still believe that this will at least open the world’s eyes to the issue. If it does at least that then it has already started a chain of events which could possibly lead to the end of the division of social classes or as some would say make it worse and cause a bigger divide which I doubt. Something’s should be seen as what they are not what they should or could be.
Next, how the view on the wealthy is wrong in the short story. I will admit in my story it is a little extreme because I say that the wealthy do horrible things like, in basic terms, torture the girl. Yes it is extreme how I portray it but it’s not incorrect. The wealthy have been known to take advantage of anyone who is “below them” in social status. Perfect examples of this are the boycotts, protests, and strikes of 1866. The wealthy who owned factories gave these people long hours of work and little pay which they could barely survive on. Thankfully though they protested against it and won the right to eight hour work days and higher wages. It was good for the people who were legal in this country but not really the illegal.

Altogether people argue that immigrants aren’t the only ones that are affected by the problem. That may be true but they are the main ones targeted. Illegal immigrants in the U.S. are employed only because they can’t do what Americans can. They can not go to the government or strike because if the police come to arrest them they can be deported. Knowing this the rich employ immigrants of all races to get the job done without hassle of pay raise or breaks.

I think the social class problem could change if and only if we could educate ourselves to the problem. That’s what the story was written for, to show the differences in class in public, in behaviors, even in the work force. Even race plays a part in this class difference, a huge part. No matter the argument of whether it will change how everything is or who is affected by the problem or who is the problem. The main point I’m trying to get across is that no matter what the problem is that you see they all relate to the to the same big issue and it all comes to the same solution that we need to open our eyes to what has to be done.
I believe that among the many one of the most important issues to America today are the ones that relate to money and discrimination. People are being discriminated because they don’t have money. I want to look at the issue of children that grow up without money and unsafe housing and I will explain on why it happens. These children are being subject to poor schools and unsafe communities because of where they live. Housing is the leading cause in my paper as it is the main reason these children are being discriminated and set to one side opposed to wealthier children. Throughout the essay I will analyze my drawing to explain how much the average American has to experience just because they aren’t wealthy or live in a rich community and I will analyze why certain people are constantly backing up the rich and why the rich have so many supporters. This is an issue that has been straggling around the government for years and it has been ignored. I want people to feel the same way I feel about it and notice that it is a problem that must be addressed. I will prove the way Americans are discriminated through course texts written by Zinn, Alexie, Griffin, Lipsitz, and more.

The artistic text I have come up with shows my view of this social class issue as a drawing. The drawing consists of a separation of class between a rich living community and a poor living community. In this case they are separated by a line and on the left side there is an amazingly large home in a safe community. On the other side there is a broken down home in a ghetto community. Right in the middle of the picture there is a pair of young boys and the rich boy is clearly having a brawl and punching the poor boy. Off to the right we have both mothers of the boys arguing whose son is the bad one staring all the fights. Right behind the rich mother we notice that there are a group of people supporting her and cheering her on. This group consists of government officials, teachers, beauty stylists, and the common upper class American. The poor mother stands alone with nobody supporting her because she has no money and lives in an awful neighborhood. Visually you can clearly see who has more power and who has more support, money being the underlying issue affecting this cause.
What this drawing means is that someone as innocent as a child can be suffering and the government or any higher official easily ignores it because the child may be underrepresented or very low on the social class ladder. Something similar is seen in Peter Singer’s essay “The Singer Solution to World Poverty.” There is a part in the story where a woman takes a poor boy from street and hands him over to an organ collector (Singer 801). Just by knowing that this sort of issue is a reality we can notice that poor children living in the streets don’t have the safe protection they should have. Or the type of protection a wealthier child will have. Singer also says “to be able to consign a child to death when he is standing right in front of you takes a chilling kind of heartlessness; it is much easier to ignore an appeal for money to help children you will never meet” (801). This quote also relates because these higher officials know what these underrepresented kids are going through but because they don’t know them and because the children or the parents don’t have a voice in the community because they are poor; officials tend to ignore the truth. This is the fact that they don’t have money or support. Specifically in my course text the poor boy lives in a ghetto community and his family is poor. Behind the rich mother there is a cop, government official of high rank, a stylist/designer and a local teacher. All of these people supporting the rich mother who clearly is defending her guilty son are supporting her only because she lives well in a great community and has money unlike the poor mother.

The reason I placed a cop behind the guilty boys’ mother is because cops can be very powerful in our communities and they are suppose to be around to help everyone no matter where you live or how much money you have. This is done in most cases but there are many situations where cops have been able to get away with negative doings. Not only have they committed illegal things themselves and got away with it but they have also supported people and treated people different because of their social class. An example of this is seen in a recent issue including Henry Luis Gates Junior, one of the most powerful academic voices in America. He experienced discrimination first hand after being called the cops on for trying to enter his own home. He is a highly successful professor who lives in a wealthy community. The issue began when the cops arrived and arrested him because he became upset about the fact that the cops didn’t believe that it was his home. It even came down to the point where he had to show his ID and they still didn’t believe it was his
home because he was an African American claiming to be the owner of such a wealthy home (The New York Times, “Officer is Accused of Bias”). This is a racial issue that directly relates to housing and discrimination because the police was suspicious of him just because of his skin color. This goes to prove that society might claim that the majority of African Americans do not love in safe gated communities, and how higher officials in charge such as police are bias because of someone’s skin color.

The second person I placed behind the rich mother is the government official of high rank. This is justified because the government says that they know how discriminated poor communities are and they say they will do something about it, but in reality they don’t. They make promises to clean up ghetto neighborhoods and eliminate crime but that is always easier said than done. This directs me to Langston Hughes short essay called “Liberals Need a Mascot”. Throughout his essay he connects an ostrich to liberals because they hide themselves when faced to act against certain situations. “Old ostrich sticks his head in the sand whenever he don’t want to look at anything. An ostrich is just like nice white folks who can smile at me so sweet as long as I am working and sweating and don’t ask for nothing. Soon as I want a promotion or rise in pay, down go their heads in the sand and they cannot see their way clear” (Hughes, p.708). I believe that this can easily connect to the way certain government officials put up an act and brag about everything they will do to help poor communities. When it actually comes down to repairing these broken down homes, wiping out gangs, giving their children better schools and education supplies they hide in the sand and act just like the ostrich and the liberal. What this truly means is that they are quick to say they will help but when it comes down to actually doing the work they ignore it. These are important issues that shouldn’t be ignored and they have the power to do something about it, but unfortunately they do not.

The third person supporting the wealthy mother is a stylist. The reason I chose a stylist was because people assume that if you are from the ghetto you may look a certain way. You are judged that if you live there you probably can’t afford nice clothes or look a certain way. The reason I specifically chose this title to support this mother is because of the way people from ghetto communities are looked at and discriminated as. This specific issue brings me directly to a point Sherman Alexie explains in a section from his book The Dairy of a Part-time Indian. “You start believing that you’re poor because you’re stupid and ugly. And then
you start believing that you’re stupid and ugly because you’re Indian” (13). This connects to my issue because many people are judged by the way they look and are put down because they look a certain way. Stylist and the beauty industry has proven to show that if you don’t look a certain way you are not beautiful and if you don’t dress a certain way you are also not beautiful. This all comes back to not having money and how being poor is automatically seen as a negative thing. For example if you can’t afford a new expensive hot brand that everyone has you are a loser or someone of less importance. This is another reason why I placed this person behind the rich mother; because you can only look the way society and the media wants you to if you have money and enough of it to spend on luxury. This directly connects to Peter Singer who states throughout his essay The Singer Solution to World Poverty. Here he states that Americans spend way too much money on luxury when they could be spending it on saving someone’s life (805). He quotes that “you shouldn’t buy that that new car, take that cruise, redecorate the house, or get that pricey new suit. After all, a 1,000 dollar suit could save five children’s lives” (805). This clearly shows you how much money Americans can spend when they could be saving an innocent child’s life and just by knowing that they spend it you learn how important luxury and looking a certain way is to many Americans. They mainly judge by how you look and where you live and forget about what type of person you are and the helpful things they could be doing with their money.

The last person shown behind the wealthy mother; the teacher. The reason I placed her there was to show that children with more money in many circumstances receive a better education than less privileged students. Same as students being discriminated because they can’t afford to look a certain way. This is an unfair reality. Many students are separated into schools by district. If you put this into perspective you can see that if you are from a wealthy community you will be attending a school with children that are most likely as wealthy as you are and receive more funding for their education. We know this because of the town’s tax dollars. The students in wealthy communities’ parents have a higher income which can cause the school to receive better supplies etc. The same occurs with ghetto communities. They are surrounded by lower income which in the end results in less tax dollars for their education. The ghetto communities are usually the ones stuck with old books and a class where the majority of students aren’t motivated to learn because
they either work all night to help support their family, have a life formed dealing drugs because of where they live or just know that they won’t be able to afford college. Lipsitz also speaks about how poor people have less of a choice as to where they live (2). “The Federal Housing Act of 1934 brought home ownership within reach of millions of citizens by placing the credit of the government behind private lending to home buyers, but overtly racist categories in the Federal Housing channeled almost all of the loan money toward whites and away from communities of color” (Lipsitz 2). By this quote we learn that people from poor communities really don’t have a say or merely a chance to live in better more safe homes. I don’t think it should be this way. I believe that all students and residents should have equal opportunities no matter where you come from or what skin color you may have.

This issue is very important to me. As a child who grew up in the ghetto I have experienced this type of discrimination first hand. The purpose for me to bring up this issue is to stand up for all those children and adults that are discriminated because of where they live and because they don’t have money. I think that it is important to draw attention to this issue because it affects peoples’ lives dramatically on a daily basis. Everyone classified my community as “ghetto”. My family was middle class and we never went hungry or anything but my mother was a single mom working pay check to paycheck to support her three daughters. Many people will interpret middle class differently depending on your personal status but I can specifically explain what kind of middle class I was. I define poverty as not being able to put food on your table or cloths behind your back. Fortunately I wasn’t in that situation but I still was living a not so great life. By this I mean that I felt as if my financial status was okay but in reality my mother struggled to keep things going so I wouldn’t see the extremely harsh side. I did know that we were at poverty level in relation to the government’s income but I felt middle class even though I truly was not.

I never really had a problem with where I lived until one situation made me realize the truth and how mean some people can be. I had a really good friend in the third grade that was named Britney. I had visited her house and met her mother and we became really close friends. My birthday came around and I was hosting my 10th birthday at my house. I obviously invited Britney but then this was when reality hit me and I began to learn the harsh truth about society. Britney never made it to my party and when I confronted my
best friend for not attending such a special event for me she said that her mother didn’t allow her to come because of where I lived. I burst into tears after hearing this. I couldn’t believe that her mother would not let her come to my party after her meeting my mom and knowing that it was perfectly safe inside. All Britney’s mom saw was the “ghetto”. She didn’t see how much it would hurt for me to not have my first best friend attend my party just because I wasn’t wealthy and couldn’t afford to live a rural and wealthy community.

Having experienced this discrimination first hand inspires me to share this story. This issue is so incredibly important to me because this very event remained with me for many years. For instance after this event occurred with Britney I would NEVER let any of my friends parents drop me off home just because I was afraid that they wouldn’t allow us to be friends because of where I lived. I would even beg my mom to pick me up from school just because I didn’t want the other kids to see where I lived. I believe that Britney’s mother can easily relate to the government official I represented in my artistic text. They try to act as if this issue is minor and that it can’t affect people in the long run but little do they know. For example Britney’s mother didn’t think that her decision would affect me and government officials might believe that these people living in difficult conditions can manage the way they have been for years, despite the fact that it’s a horrid way of living.

Luckily I grew out of this and noticed that just because I grew up in a negative community doesn’t mean I can’t be whoever I want to be. When I read Patty Griffin’s song lyrics for “Sweet Lorraine” I was able to relate to her because I don’t want to stay at the same state my family has been. I personally do not believe that if you are born into a poor family you have to be poor also. I believe that you can choose your own future and it is true for everyone. It is difficult and takes a lot of work but anyone can do it. I will admit that when it comes to paying for education things can get really tough and that’s when more government help can be truly helpful, but there is a lot of aid out there that can help you pay for school, all you have to do is search for it. People need to see how important it is to not judge a book by its cover. I am a confident over achiever with aspirations to be incredibly successful in life and till this day some of my friends can’t believe I live where I do. I don’t want people to think this way. Just because you are surrounded by something does not mean you will act the same as your surroundings.
One counterargument that parents might say is that they want to protect their children by not allowing them into these types of dangerous communities. You can also say that the parents themselves don’t feel safe in these places so why should they allow their children to be in the area? Either way it does not necessarily follow that they should discriminate their child’s friend and/or think less of them because of where they live or because they have little money. As a parent other than keeping your child safe you should also be responsible for raising them knowing that you should never judge a book by its cover. Just like my story Britney’s mom had gotten to know me and she thought I was a great girl. As soon as she found out where I lived her perspective of me changed completely, which I thought was incredibly awful. As explained in my artistic text government officials, stylist, police officers and any one of high rank should take the responsibility of addressing the problems occurring in poor communities. They can easily use the power they have to bring more attention to this specifically the teachers that have to teach with terrible text books and unmotivated children.

This text is directed for many audiences but mainly for the upper/high class Americans. They are the group that has the power to change these communities and stop this segregation that should have ended a long time ago. This can also be directed to government officials and officers that have the power to act and support lower class communities. It is not fair that drug rings for example are rapidly broken up if found in a rural community but if found in a “ghetto” community nothing is done about it just because it is common there. That sort of issue should be stopped not surpassed just because it is common. If an official were to see my drawing and actually be touched by it I would hope that they try to make something of the issue and spread the word to other higher officials on how terrible this problem is and how quickly it is growing. This is a quote taken from a section of Lipsitz passage, and this quote was told by George Bush’s Secretary of housing. “New Orleans is not going to be as black as it was for a long time, if ever again” (George Lipsitz, The Possessive Investment in Whiteness, 249). Right here you can see how people of high rank feel about housing and minorities. He doesn’t believe that it will ever be the same because he doesn’t want to give minorities a chance to expand and succeed in a new community.
Another solution to this issue should include with African Americans having a say in what may or may not go on in the community they live in. It seems as if higher officials are the ones who decide what goes down in every situation. For example another statement Lipsitz speaks of is how African Americans aren’t able to live in certain places of New Orleans. “Shifting the focus from the richest to the brokest enables us to see possibilities where others see only problems” (Lipsitz 248). Here Lipsitz is referring to all the attention that is given to wealthy white communities. He proposes that if we try to help the poor community we can do more than the expected. Officials of high standing only see trouble with this type of request but they would know because they haven’t tried to do anything about it. I do strongly believe that after reading my text my audience will feel differently about this issue. They will see the point of view of someone that actually experienced this and how badly it can affect a child’s life. Sadly this might affect a person differently depending on who they are and where they are from because a rich person would have never gone through it while a poor child grew up with this sort of issue but I hope that a wealthy person would be able to put themselves in a poor child’s place. People are being killed in ghetto communities by gangs because where they live doesn’t have a fast enough response from the police. This reminds me of Alexie when he speaks about being angry at life because his dog and only true best friend had to be killed just because they couldn’t afford a veterinarian (Alexie 13). They connect with each other because both circumstances deal with underprivileged humans not being able to do anything about the issue they are in. Alexie had to deal with the death of his pet because of money and civilians living in the ghetto are put in danger because police officers don’t give ghetto communities the attention they need. If they had more cops in those areas regularly I know change can be possible. I do not want this text to have a hopeful mood because I haven’t seen anything done for this. No progress is occurring what so ever. And living in America; an equal country with opportunities for all, it shouldn’t be this way. Every single American should have the same security, education, and most importantly the respect for who they are; not what they look like.
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I am going to explain how Mill and Kant would differ with regards to some morally important choice made in the movie called, Million Dollar Baby. This movie deals the death of a boxer and the actions and the choices that lead her there. With this I can show how Mills view differs from Kant by the choice and action that was made by the two main characters.

Mill’s view on moral duty is that only the consequences of your actions matter. He believes in the greatest happiness principle, where, happiness is the only thing that counts as a good consequence and the right outcome comes from the best actions. Actions are right as they tend to promote happiness. To understand this better, let’s say that the world depended on the death of a three year old child, where it was foreseen he or she was the future Osama Binladen. The question you would think about is if it’s okay for someone to kill that three year old child if it brought out the best consequence? A utilitarian would say that it is, because if the death of that child promoted the most happiness for the majority of the people then that is the right action because in this case it produces the best consequences. The consequence would be that there wouldn’t be another Osama, where the world would turn into mass anarchy and many people would be left unhappy. If many people were left unhappy then the act of not killing the three year old child would be the wrong one. Happiness is something that is good in itself, where it is not good for what it gets you, it just simply is good. That is what we should all aim for, whatever brings the most happiness. Happiness is when pleasure is present and the lack of pain is absent therefore, a utilitarian would do what they know would bring them good consequences and happiness is the only thing that counts as one.

Kant’s view on moral duty is that you should not treat people unjustly no matter what the consequences are. It is wrong of you to go up to a random stranger and beat him with a bat and take all the money in his wallet because you felt like it and only you get something out of it. You are violating ones’ moral rights and that act is unjust. Justice deals with perfect duties, where they are no exceptions. It is your perfect duty not to shoot someone in the head; you have the have right not to be shot in the head, saying that I have
the right not to be murder. We have to respect the fact that everyone has rights and it is wrong of us to go against them for the fact that it is our duty not to violate them. This has to do with one of the characters in the film, who decides to take a life which is not the right act to do.

Kant believes in Categorical Imperative which in his view is what acts are right, “you should never act except in such a way that the maxim should become a universal law.” This is saying, you should never act in way where it is not possible for everyone to act; also you should act in such a way where people can consistently will to live in such a place where such universal law can exist. In my movie, the main character decides that she can no longer bear to live any longer in the state that she is in, this leading to her attempt of suicide. There couldn’t be a world where everyone committed suicide. You would have to ask yourself, what is the maxim? When you cannot bear to live you commit suicide. That is saying what is the principle I am acting on? Then the second question you would have to ask is what universal law can be made from the maxim? Everyone will commit suicide when they can no longer bear to live. This is like asking what it would look like if everyone acted on that maxim. Third, can there be such a law? The answer to that question is no, because people have self-love and there couldn’t be a world where self-love worked as two contradicting purposes: to end your life and to live your life. And if you answer no to this question this means that it is wrong and that you have a perfect duty not to act on that maxim. This deals with the choices that the two main characters had acted which is something Kant disagrees with.

In the movie Million Dollar Baby the character played by Hilary Swank; Maggie Fitzgerald is an amateur who works at becoming a successful boxer. During one of Maggie’s matches she gets an illegal attack which causes her to fall and hit her head and neck on a corner stool, this causing Maggie to be paralyzed from the neck down. All her efforts hard work and determination of becoming an undefeated boxer at thirty-two now diminished. After all she has been through, suffering pain and heartache and joy of boxing she ask her trainer who is played by Clint Eastwood to relieve her of her suffering, at first he refuses but when Maggie tries to kill herself and does not succeed he realizes that he should not let her suffer anymore, and her
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happiness and lack of pain is more important than to let her suffer, so he injects her with adrenaline and she dies.

Here a very difficult and important choice was made by both Dunn (Clint EastWood) and Maggie. In Mill’s perspective he would say that Dunn made the right choice only because the consequence of his act causes the most happiness and left Maggie without pain. Maggie was happy because she no longer had to suffer; Dunn was left satisfied because as long as Maggie was no longer in pain he knew she was going to be in a better place that left him happy. Her family was happy that she had died because they would receive all her money and that’s all they wanted her for. Even though her fans would be upset that she is dead, I believe that they would be happy knowing that she is in a better place rather than lying in bed hopeless and helpless where she would be in agony.

Now, Kant disagrees with the choice Dunn made all the way. It was Maggie’s duty to live, she had the right to live her life and Dunn took that right away from her the moment he took her life. Also Maggie did the wrong thing by trying to commit suicide because Kant feels that everyone has the right to their own life. It was her duty to try and make her life worth living. It was her perfect duty to not attempt suicide, because “there couldn’t be a world where self love has a contrary function”. We should have motivation to want to live our lives. We have a perfect duty to do what whatever we can to preserve our lives. I could argue that Dunn had the motive to do what he believed was right but in the end we can only act on maxims that everyone can live by, A world could not exist where anyone killed anyone because it is not possible, there cannot be a world where everyone murdered each other because no one would trust anyone and everyone would kill each other or isolate themselves, therefore a world with this universal law could not exist which means it was his perfect duty not to kill her. Also assisting suicide is just as wrong as committing it itself, because you are helping that person kill themselves as a means to an end. And so when he injected Maggie with adrenaline to kill her, he knew that he would be taking her life from her even though at the same time she was happy.

\[\text{Kant, Immanuel}\]
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Political correctness is nothing more than sensitive, sugar-coated, language. A person may try to be politically correct when he or she wants to avoid stereotypes, racism, and/or sexism. However, political correctness is obvious and just adds to the problem while trying to avoid it. Also, in a literary sense, when writers strive so hard to be P.C, as Orwell says, he or she ruins the cadence of the sentence (Orwell 537). The point is not easily interpreted, and therefore, becomes lost due to too many meaningless words. Out of the two works assigned to read, I can agree more with Michiko Kakutani in “The Word Police”.

Kakutani has several examples of stereotypes, racism, sexism and literature throughout her essay. The first reason why I enjoy the work is because of the tone. Kakutani takes a playful, sarcastic, mocking theme. However, the seriousness of politically “incorrect” vocabulary and writings are still understood by the reader. During the reading, I giggled out loud, smiled, and even raised my eyebrows! When a reader can interact and relate to the literature, it is indeed outstanding. Kakutani wrote in such a casual informal manner because, in a sense, she wanted to be politically incorrect. Contradiction and opposites sometimes enforce main points and add to great literature.

“The Word Police” is also more relatable because people simply just need to hear the truth. Kakutani asks if we actually substitute all the masculine words for more acceptable ones will sexism essentially vanish (“The Word Police” 718). Bias-free phrases only dress-up the issues. Call it blunt or rude, but if a person is severely over weight and you refer to them as “big boned” to be politically correct, you are telling a lie. Making a statement, term, phrase, etc., fancy or kind is not the solution, it is denial. Furthermore, sometimes political incorrectness is relevant. The reference to The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and the word “nigger” rises a valid point (“The Word Police” 718). Although the derogatory term is wrote, the author uses the character to show progression of African-Americans in the novel. The candid vocabulary is not at all racist; it exemplifies the struggle of African-Americans in society. In
actuality, and until this day, that struggle exists, so making the word “nigger” pretty would be acting as if slavery was as well.

Sexism in English: Embodiment and Language” by Alleen Pace Nilsen takes a more serious approach to P.C. Alleen would like an immediate conformity of any sexist connotation (“Sexism in English…46). Though I am a woman (not “womyn”) before any other distinction, no matter how much we complain about double standards and sexist opinions in society, if some things were to change in our favor, the majority could not—and would not want to—handle such responsibility. P.C is less popular in writing, entertainment, and speech than Political incorrectness. And to be politically incorrect, woman, fat people, persons of ethnicity, and others facing stereotypes will have to accept being society’s outcast. Instead of trying to change modern English and its history, become aware of your social standing and prove everyone was created equal so that the terminology of the future will not be offensive.
Beautiful is a strong and undefined word. There is no wrong perception of what is beautiful, and it means something different to everyone. This is the beauty of beautiful. It is such an abstract concept that only exists in the mind. Beautiful language is even more of a complex theory because communication between people is the most significant part of human existence. Without language, people would never have an understanding of one another or learn to build relationships. Beautiful language is just a more personal creation from basic language that is made into something more valuable and clear to a group of people. Beautiful language used between loved ones is considered to be more beautiful than the discussions held at school because it does not direct the use of Standard English. Expressing either passion, originality, meaning, or the capability of reaching out to others is necessary in creating beautiful language because it connects the people who are interacting.

Passion in language is having desire and love for a specific topic being discussed. The most beautiful language ultimately begins with passion itself. This is the first step and without it, beautiful expressions will be impossible to create. The topic being emphasized must be of great importance to the speaker in order for them to really enjoy talking about the subject. People can also sense the enthusiasm in one’s voice. If they are not passionate about something, they will automatically lose the listener’s attention. For example, imagine being assigned an essay about a favorite hobby. This would be something easy to go on and on about and it would even be enjoyable to do. On the reverse side, it would be difficult to write about a topic concerning the characteristics of George Washington, for example, and how he has influenced the American culture today. This is an issue that is not personal so there will be a lack of motivation to write about it. Paule Marshall, author of “Poets in the Kitchen”, gives us another example of passion by showing how the women enjoy coming together and sharing stories that they are genuinely passionate about. This is why the guest speaker from the article considers women to be better writers than men. The fact that they are able to express themselves around people that they feel comfortable with enables them to reflect themselves and create what
some may consider poetry of their own (2-3). This is suggesting that their desire for the topic causes the beauty behind their words to come naturally. Once one finds something that they are passionate about, the rest will come along and they will find themself creating beautiful language without even realizing.

One’s way of expressing their thoughts and emotions makes them different from everyone else. Every group of family and friends has their own language that they can relate to and understand. This originality brings out the beauty in the language. Improper grammar and pronunciation makes speech all the more interesting. According to Paule Marshall, “The proper measure of a writer’s talent is his skill in rendering everyday speech - when it is appropriate to his story - as well as his ability to tap, to exploit, the beauty, poetry and wisdom it often contains” (1). This relates to the idea that the language we create as our own is more beautiful than the language we use in school, because what one considers as their everyday speech is unique, and unique is the key. Utilizing everyday language and replacing proper English is what really opens up peoples’ ears and keeps them interested in their discussion. It’s when common, Standard English is used that conversations tend to become boring and simple. The way you use language and your imagination along with it is what gives voice to the most complex ideas and makes them your own. This reflects you, and not someone else’s ideas. Marshall goes on to explain that she considers her family to be her major influences, not just some important figure in literature like most hope for. These are the people who trained her ear and taught her the excellence of their language that represents their family and culture (5). This is significant because the language we hear from family is what leaves the biggest impact on us. These people become role models and their style of language is passed down from generation to generation and almost serves as a legacy. A family’s language becomes who they are and can almost always tell a story of their past. This is a very essential point that everyone can relate to. Tom Dalzell also agrees with this concept in saying that, “With slang, each generation or subculture has the chance to shape and propagate its own lexicon, and in so doing to exercise originality and imagination” (1). Originality in language is beautiful because it creates a way for people to connect in their own way without the overused style of Standard English.
Friends and family ultimately bring out the best in people. When one is around their family and friends, it is much easier to reflect not only themselves, but their feelings as well. This is what makes something meaningful. Expressing thoughts becomes more comfortable around loved ones, where at school it may be embarrassing or difficult to be honest. Using Standard English is so complex that people just say common things that they’ve heard before in order to sound intelligent and educated even if it may alter one’s understanding of what they are really saying. The meaning behind the idea is lost and they become only focused on what other people think of them. The person who is speaking can also change a language’s meaning. Family and friends produce a greater meaning to people than just a random person you. Marshall makes another good point in her writing regarding who a poet really is. She states that while growing up she was always around people that she considered as poets, and people who really influenced her. These people weren’t the average image of who is commonly considered as a poet, but people who meant much more than just that (5). One will always find the language from their loved ones to be so much more beautiful than that of someone they are not close to. They learn to love and cherish these words. In fact, they don’t become just words to them, but a form of art. The ideas that are shared amongst each other are much more meaningful than any point made in a book. In reality, one’s ability to create poetry comes from their inner thoughts or feelings that they want to share with others. You don’t need to have your ideas published in order to be considered a poet. We all have a poet inside of us, you just can’t be afraid to let it out. The beauty is hidden in the beholder.

Reaching out to someone is ultimately the most complex necessity for beautiful language, because it is the only way an outsider can connect with the speaker. The more one knows a person, the more they value their words. However, in this case they are giving someone else the opportunity to hear and feel for their thoughts and this is ultimately beautiful. Creating expressions that are memorable to others is a beautiful thing because it shows that the person was understood. Allowing others to be able to hear, feel, and see what you are saying is really a special talent. It is not often when one can look back and remember something that someone has said that has really affected their life or outlook on life. When someone can really get a feel of what you have gone through, you know that you have said something very beautiful to them. Teaching a
lesson or even just sharing barriers in life that someone can relate to is really important. They feel like they share a sense of belonging and understanding that no one else may have experienced.

One may believe that the language spoken in a school setting sounds more beautiful than the language spoken at home. However, Standard English encourages political correctness and this takes out the passion, creativity, meaning, and ability to reach out to a person. In public settings one is expected to speak properly or he will be judged. But, how can you judge someone’s personal way of expressing themselves truthfully? Political correctness forces people to be dishonest with themselves and the people around them. The idea is that one’s opinion may offend or hurt others. However, holding thoughts and feelings inside, would never create an opportunity to use the right that Americans fought so long for in order to win the freedom of speech. In addition, political correctness forces people to speak in such a formal and proper manner that they ends up saying things that may mean something so different than what they may be trying to express. Creating a language between a group of people like family or friends eliminates this problem and allows for more opportunities to speak beautifully.

The more open minded you are of the different styles of language people create as their own, the more you will learn to appreciate it. Interpreting beauty begins with exposure and flexibility. One’s conception of the word beauty will only expand the more you allow it to. According to the Webster dictionary, beautiful is defined as, “having beauty; having qualities that give great pleasure or satisfaction.” Although it is technically “defined”, what does it really mean in depth? This argument is intangible. As long as one expresses thoughts that are passionate, unique, meaningful, and able to reach out to someone, they will be sure to create a language that someone will find beautiful to them.
Which Should We Use: Modern English or Slang?

Two men walk into a company office getting ready for a job interview. Both are dressed professionally with a suit and tie and a briefcase in hand. They go in one by one and are both asked the same question at the beginning of the interview by the head director of the company. “Why are you here and why would you like to have this job?” The first responds, “I’m here because I really love working with computers and if you look at my resume I have had a lot of training in that area; and I heard this was the best place to work!” The second responds, “Dude, I really need a job man. There ain’t nothing in this world that I need more than this here job, so if you can do me the huge deal bro and give it to me that would be sweet awesome!” Who out of the two men do you think got the job?

Many questions arise when a person uses slang. If a person were with family or friends, it may seem okay because it is an informal setting and nobody really cares if that person is using slang. Although, if someone used the same slang at a job interview, like the second man, he/she may not be in such a good position. It would not sound proper at all in those moments because you are talking to a superior who might be supplying you with a job. Sometimes when anybody speaks in slang, many people think they are uneducated because they do not even know how to say proper English. However, slang words can also show individuality because the person is not speaking the way as everyone else. Slang words have their pros and cons, but could there be slang words that can be better understood than the regular modern English words?

One of the most common slang is the word “dude”. Dude is used quite commonly among people today. Many people remember hearing the word when watching surf movies or just hearing it off the streets because that is where it is heard the most. The funny thing is that the word “dude” has been around since the 1850’s. According to dictionary.com, the word “dude” means a man excessively concerned with his clothes, grooming, and manners. No one would ever think that it would ever think that dude would mean this! The way many people think of it today is being referred to as any person or even calling their friends “dude”. All words have a certain history, but with history things change. The original meaning of dude was meant for a
well-groomed person; now it could refer to anyone whether they were well-groomed or not. This is interesting because the meaning of the word “dude” has changed sufficiently through the years and instead of only being known as a well-groomed man, the word now can refer to both men and women.

A lot of the time people think that “dude” can only refer to men, but today many people state it towards woman as well as men. The female version of dude is “dudette.” Dudette has not been used lately and it is just easier to say dude to both males and female. The best part is that is that calling a woman “dude” is not offensive at all. It actually shows equality when the word is used for both genders. It really does not matter which one a person uses to refer to woman because we respond to both.

There are also advantages to using the word “dude” in everyday speech. You can use it to refer to a friend or person who may be close to you. A good example would be taking the title of the famous movie, *Dude, Where’s My Car?* When this phrase is used in the movie, Jesse is asking Chester where his car is. In the movie Chester is in regular shorts and a t-shirt; he is not exactly well-groomed like the word was originally used out to be known as when it is being used. The word can also be used to fill in a blank. Let’s say you do not remember the name of the person who is in your class and you need to ask them a question. To avoid embarrassment you could simple say, “Hey dude, come over here for a second; I need to ask you something!” That way no odd questions happen if you say the wrong name or the person would not get upset if you did not know his/her name. The bonus is that since the word “dude” is used so much, the majority of people respond to it. People will not get offended if you use the word “dude” at them, it is so common that people do not even think twice when you say it to them. As long as you are looking at them and let it be known that you are talking to them they will respond.

Although, like any other word, there are many different words that you can substitute for dude. For example in the Modern English way, you can say “fellow” or “chap”. You could also use the words “buddy” or “guy”. “Dude” is a plain and simple word that you can use; and you do not need words like “buddy” or “guy” to make yourself sound better. Buddy does not sound so horrible, but dude has a coolness factor that buddy just does not compete with the word “dude”. Also, dude can be used to show amazement or shock; you cannot do that with the word buddy. An example of this could be from a quote from the movie *Dude,
Where's My Car?: When Jesse could not find his car he replied, “DUDE, where’s my car!” In this quote he puts a lot of emphasis in saying dude. This means that he is really worried about where his car is. Putting in the word buddy does not give that extra feeling like the word dude does. Now with the word “guy” there could be a conflict if someone would refer to a woman as a “guy” because technically she is a girl. Using dude would not have that conflict because using the word “dude” can be used for either a girl or a boy. Using guy would only let you use it for males only. Using either one of the two words just would not be able to replace the word “dude” at all.

Tom Dalzell is in strong agreement with using slang in everyday speech. Dalzell said in his essay “The Power of Slang”, that each slang word is different throughout each generation and they change it in their own individual way (1). There is a huge difference from our generation usage of the word “dude” to the original meaning of it. The word is no longer used to refer to a well-groomed man. This is because our generation has changed it to give it more meaning and change is usually good because how cool is it that “dude” can be used in so many different ways and it can also cause extra emphasis.

George Orwell is a critic when he talks about Modern English. One of Orwell’s rules, which he states in his work “Politics and the English Language”, of writing good English is: “never use a long word where a short one will do” (542). This is great because “dude” is just a four letter word with just two syllables. Orwell’s rule is followed and it has a clear meaning in definition. So who says that slang words are horrible? Not me, dude!

**Works Cited**


This photo was taken when I was about five years old. It was at very popular place in my town in Colombia, which was called Termales. This natural spectacle consisted of about 5 pools filled with pure water from hot springs located on the property. The people who went on the trip on that day were my grandparents, my aunts, my parents, my sister and cousins. The person that is with me in the picture is my cousin Maria Fernanda (who was four years old then). I remember very clearly this day being a hot, tropical Colombian, Saturday afternoon in July. This consisted of a temperature of about 81 degrees with a slight breeze and a few scattered clouds. Previous to the photograph (taken my Maria’s mother), we had eaten lunch; Chorizo con Arepa y Colombiana, (a Colombian sausage which our city is famous in the world for, along with a corn patty and a Colombian soda). The lunch we had purchased that day was not just an ordinary lunch, for Colombians it’s called a fiambre, which represents the traditional lunch people eat on field trips. All three things are very popular to our nation the most popular or famous is the chorizo, because we are not the only country that makes it. Rumor has it that ours is the best.

Ingredients:

- 4 kg [9 ½ lb] lean coarse-ground pork
- 7 garlic cloves, chopped
- 1 ½ Tb cayenne pepper [for sweet chorizo 2 Tb of sweet paprika]
- 500 gr [1 lb] pork or goat casing
- 5 tbsp sea salt

Method:

- Rinse casings very well under cold running water.
- In a large bowl, add ground pork, garlic, spices and mix well by hand.
Take a small portion of the meat and cook it to test seasoning and then adjust accordingly.

Tie off one end of the casing by tying a knot.

Using a pastry bag, stuff the mixture into the casing, moving the stuffing along to keep the meat free of gaps and air. Keep the sausage semi-firm, but not too tight.

If the casing breaks, tie another knot by twisting the sausage.

When full, tie off the other end.

At six-inch interval, twist the sausage in opposite directions. This creates the first link. Continue along the length of sausage to create the rest of the links. (http://www.mexican-barbecue-recipes.com/chorizo-recipe.html) Although this recipe can seem exactly what it is, to me it is time capsule back to seeing my grandmother making these delicious things that make this picture more meaningful because yes, I had lunch with my whole family but it's the meaning of the meal. I remember Maria Fernanda hugging me and then squinting due to her hair, which was still wet and now had drenched my ear. “Uno, dos, y tres,” yelled my aunt trying to drown out every other person near us. This picture is more than a flashback to the past, it is a reminder of where I come from, whose loved ones are but mostly what I am made of.

When Maria Fernanda first approached me I never expected for her to grab me and then have the picture taken so quickly. “Hay tan bellos que estan los dos,” said my grandma with joy to see how cute her youngest grandkids were. I sometimes flash back and try to answer my own question, which was, why had she hugged me so tightly instead of standing next to me how I was? As time has gone by life has answered my question, Fuerza-Strength, not physical strength but all emotional. Maria Fernanda has grown up to be a beautiful, kind, warm-hearted women, who has had the misfortune to have a weak father that decided to leave her mother, and his kids, her. Throughout all thirteen years since this picture was taken, I have been, her savior. Nanda is my nickname for her, in this picture she is telling me, one thing. “Juan, you are my rock, you are my sanity, my stability.” This affection in not of a cousin to another but of a human being, who at such young age is calling for help even if she doesn’t even know she is calling for it.

The very hip, swimming trunks I was wearing were given to me by my mother a couple days before, they turned out to be favorite for a long time. I have called her Gladys since I was about 15, I don’t know what the reason is but I feel as if our relationship is of a mother and son as well as to adult mature people. Gladys, my mother, has exactly three weeks of vacation every year. They have always been the last week of July and the first two of August. I was living in Colombia before my mother went on vacation. My parents
and my grandparents had decided that it was best if my sister and I would spend a few years in Colombia while my parents saved up money for the newborn, me. So when I was a young kid I never really had my parents as my saviors of rocks just like Nanda did, except I looked in me for that help. These swimming trunks were not just swimming trunks, my mother, the one I had missed for years, gave them to me. They were also the first gift I ever remember her giving me since my infant years I was raised by my grandparents. So although they were probably a regular size 5 kids Speedo swimming trunks, for me they were an “I’m sorry for leaving you,” gift from my mother which I accepted with out a doubt.

Though there were about fourteen people including us that day, no one else was a part of the picture not even the background. So again even in this picture it’s me trying to be strong and independent and my cousin grabs me for dear life. All that was left of my family was the empty chairs and napkins they used to devour the lunch which would probably keep us full for two or three hours. They were all doing a tour Nanda and I were too small to go on, El Tour en Las Montañas, ‘The Tour of the Mountains.’ A couple of years later after this picture (when I was older), I tagged along later to find out the tour took us to where we could see water at it’s purest form. I saw water which was about 150 degrees dispense from a crack alongside of a rock. The water was virgin water; we were pure kids, smiling with immense joy because either we where with someone who made them feel safe, happy and wanted, or simply because our family was out as a whole. We resembled purity because all we knew was how to have fun, and lived life with no negative thoughts and no hatred, as well as inspire happiness, which was the purpose of this picture.

Happiness came in many different forms in the park, your family member, the weather, or the water. But the happiness was not for just us kids; this was for every person in the park. The pool behind us served many purposes to many different ages, as well as people. For kids like us, it was a place that was extremely hot but with a few minutes of pausing between every step, until our body could acclimate. It turned to a playground, where our imagination could run wild. For teenagers like my cousins (which were all girls), it was a place where they could meet a boy think he was cute and pretend like he had cooties but still stick around because they liked him secretly. For adults it was a place to relax and get away from work, household stress, kids, and act as if they where the four year kids. And for our grandparents it was a place, which would help
sooth their tired, sore bodies from a life of working. I always remember my grandpa getting in and smiling as if the water was curing him of his osteoporosis. Although it had a different meaning to each of us, it was still a hot spring. This hot spring is one of five located in my town of Santa Rosa de Cabal, which are our towns main attractions. When I was smaller I was told it was a hot pool until I was told the truth but in very simple matter. My grandpa told me that the water of a hot spring also comes from the earth below, but instead of it being cold it was very hot, apparently hot enough to cure his osteoporosis. I believed my grandpa but I wanted the scientific explanation of what a hot spring really was and how it worked. “Hot springs are defined as springs of water with the water in them at a higher temperature than in the surroundings. The temperature of the hot springs is higher because of the internal heat of the earth's crust, known as the geothermal energy. The water sources itself from the interior of the earth and then vents itself out of the earth's crust. When the water comes out on the surface, it still remains hot with steam emanating from it. This steam is a significant aspect of hot springs” (Ward 12). “Hot springs are formed when water, heated due to the geothermal energy, comes up to the surface of the earth. This can happen in several ways. But it must basically be remembered that the interior of the earth is still quite hot. This is evident when the magma from the interior of the earth flows out through a crater during a volcano. The interior of the earth has both hot rocky material as well as molten material, such as that present in the magma” (Ward 12). So my grandpa was correct because it also is water except it is heated by earth’s core. This amazing natural spectacle in a way relates back to my relationship with Nanda because, without me knowing it I emit a feeling of strength and security, just like the earth emits this hot water. These hot springs do not occur everywhere but when they do, they are very popular. I believe I am like a hot spring because Nanda doesn’t trust or see the strength she sees in me in everyone. She only sees it in me and she is my audience or my crowd.

Why was she wearing purple? According to crystal-cure.com the color purple means protection .Why would someone wear a color that symbolized exactly what you are not, she was wearing the color of protection (I know now about what the color meant then but I know now). What was she trying to protect me from? Is that the reason she is holding me so tightly? Nanda and I grew up together and although we would have our silly fights about whose turn it is to be “it,” she was my best friend. I think this picture shows
very well what was to become of us; we would be the closest cousins, of six. We would somehow care for one another but in different ways. I was her shield from dangerous people and situations that will go wrong. I have been her crying shoulder when no one else understood her. I was the one who would remind her that she was still a kid and she didn’t have to deal with an abusive father, divorce, and pain a lot of pain. I learned at an early age that life is not perfect. I saw things I think people should never see which is a child realize their parents hate each other and the dad doesn’t want to know anything about his two daughter. I had to see a my cousin run to me crying and hugging me saying “no one loves me, why Juan what did I do wrong?” She wore that color maybe not for the same protection reasons but I know every time I go to Colombia, I know I have a girl who will take me anywhere, and will protect me from any harm.

I had won, my aunt had thrown the purple goggles, which protected our eyes, into the water, and I had found them. These goggles represented me because they protected my eyes like I protected Nanda. These goggles allowed me to enter a whole new world, one that allowed me to have an advantage over everyone else and be able to see under water. The walls and floor of the pool were beautiful, the floor; tiles, which made together made a giant picture of fish. The walls were at their most natural form, rocks they were left like this I think for one reason. To remind us that without nature this pool could not be possible and these beautiful natural wonders can happen without the help of technology.

The man directly behind us, like everyone else in this picture were not family, but were the same as us; prideful Colombians. Although we knew no one else in this park we knew they lived almost the same lives, worked and went to school in a similar environment like us. We as humans are the same, different external features but similar in that we are all emotional, social creatures that depend on others help. Nanda was the perfect example because to survive and be able to be sane, and not a troubled child after what she had gone through, she needed to depend on me for help, help I was willing to give to her.

Trips like this one happened for the three weekends we were in Colombia and then it was back to life in America where all our immediate family had were one another. Leaving everyone back home was hard for everyone, but I don’t think it was harder for Nanda and I than anyone else because the lessons we learned about life, took others maybe three or four years more to learn. The reason this picture is of such importance
is because I live here and not with Nanda or the rest of the family members that were there that night. So
every time I see this picture I remember who I really am, I am one of 5 cousins, and one of 5 grandkids. Since
I have been very little I have promised myself one thing, never no matter what I become forget my family.
This to me is another remembrance of them. Nanda is my cousin, my friend but most of all my hero, because
not a lot of people live through what she did at her age, and still turn out to be an excellent human being. Te
amo mucho Nanda, y te extraño. (I love you a lot Nanda, and I miss you).
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Why Do You Treat My Tongue Differently?

Amy Tan’s “Mother Tongue” does qualify as “a border tongue”. The definition in which Gloria Anzaldúa gives for “a border tongue” on her essay “How to Tame a Wild Tongue” is a language in which in most cases it’s considered to be broken language. From that broken language it’s obvious that the person has put effort but doesn’t successfully adapt to a new language. Having to adapt is very difficult and because it’s difficult the new language will always be “a border tongue”. Even though it comes natural it’s a way of speaking in which in many cases is not common to others. A language that is made out of two or more different languages and it’s very difficult to understand the point in which the speaker tries to make to his/her listener, unless you are one of the people that is comfortable with it. A language that does not get the amount of respect that it’s supposed to from the audience. In Amy Tan’s essay she shows the struggles that her mom has to go through because her mother does consist of “a border tongue”. Her as well as her mother’s life change and go through and face all the things that defend “a border tongue”.

A “border tongue” is a language that comes naturally. In most cases it is not done intentionally, just a special, unusual, way in which certain individuals express themselves. A “border tongue” is created from two different cultures or languages. A perfect example of that would have to be Chicano Spanish. A language in which Mexican people created from Spanish language, and Mexican traditions. Similar to that is, Tan’s mother, she uses Chinese as well as English to create a new kind of English. English that is weird and is very hard to understand. Because a “border tongue” comes from two different languages and cultures, it is very difficult for an individual to adapt to it. Trouble adapting to a new language forces individuals to create their own way of communicating and their own version of the new language. These individuals way of communicating is very uncommon to society, and because of that society treats it differently. Society gives “border tongues” less respect than they suppose to.

A “Border Tongue” is very uncommon and very hard for society to understand; but at the same time it does not mean that these languages are not important or should not exist. “Border Tongues” can be made
fun and not be respected for certain individuals, but at the same time others do use and view “Border Tongues” in a more respected way. As Anzaldúa states when she says that a border language is “Un lenguaje que corresponde a un modo de vivir” (Anzaldúa 326). In this quote Anzaldúa is trying to explain, in Spanish, that Chicano Spanish is not a bad or wrong language. Instead she is trying to say that Chicano Spanish is a language that corresponds to a way of living. What Anzaldúa is trying to teach her reader is that even though Chicano Spanish is a language that is made up from a different languages, and is not very respected. This language is a way in which people’s lives are interpreted. It’s a special way in which people communicate with one another. What this illustrates is that even though “border tongue” is not respected by certain people, to the ones who use it is a very important thing in their lives. A “border tongue” is a way of survival. Something that is used in everyday life and is not viewed in a negative way. It’s a way in which people like the Mexicans are able to isolate themselves and use a language that is very hard for others to understand, but at the same time it’s not done intentionally. Similar in which people like Tan’s family are able to communicate between one another. This is shown when Tan says “My husband was with us as well, and he didn't notice any switch in my English. And then I realized why. It's because over the twenty years we've been together I've often used that same kind of English with him, and sometimes he even uses it with me. It has become our language of intimacy, a different sort of English that relates to family talk, the language I grew up with” (Tan 291). In this quotation Tan is explaining how her family speaks to one another. She is explaining how the member of her household, like her husband and her mother, are very much understood through a language that is considered broken to others. It is obvious that the language they use is considered a “border tongue”. Tan is not ashamed of that. Through this quote she is trying to say that, yes, the language that my family uses its difficult and not respected by others, but within our household it’s a perfect language. We have used and continue to use this language even if everyone else does not understand us to the fullest. What this exemplifies is that “border tongue” is meaningless and disrespected by certain individuals, but to families like Tans family it’s a way of understanding one another with no difficulty what so ever.

Been born in a foreign country and having to learn English as a second language, I can personally say that learning English is very difficult thing to do. The reason for that is that in English everything is different.
There are many different rules that need to be followed in the English language. This is the case when you are reading as well as writing. Where I come from, we write words the way we hear them an “o” is an “o” and two of them don’t make an “u” like in English. For example the word “book” there are not any “o’s” in it so why we put two, when we can just right “buk” We do things certain ways in which we are taught from the beginning of our education, matter of fact our life. Learning a different language whatever that language is difficult to learn, not even talking about perfecting it. Similar to Tan’s mom who’s also a foreign, it is very hard for an outsider like her to adapt and get use to a new language. When doing so the old habits and language will still be there and impact your new language. A perfect situation of this is shown when Tan’s mom is explaining an event that had already happened she says, “Chinese social life that way. If too important won’t have to stay to long. He come to my wedding. I didn’t see, I heard it. I gone to boy’s side, they have YMCA dinner. Chinese age I was nineteen” (Tan 291). Here Tan is quoting her mom, word by word, as if her mom were to dictate the words to her. Tan is quoting this because she wanted to show how her mother actually speaks, to illustrate that her English is very broken and that she uses terrible habits that are created from her old language (Chinese). Because she has a broken English and because probably back in China they don’t use this, Tan’s mother is tempted to not use words such as “it” after “I didn’t see”. She says things that kind of don’t make since like “I gone to boy’s side” it doesn’t mean anything unless you have to think outside the box to understand it. From this it seems as if she is trying make up her own language. This refers to the point that because she is foreign and does not successfully adapt to this new language. Natural she creates and makes up a new uncommon way of expressing herself. Because it’s very difficult and very hard to adapt, this makes my language and Tan’s mom language “a border tongue”; a language that it’s made up from two languages and is uncommon and hardly understood by others.

From Anzaldúa’s essay it is very easy to conclude that “a border tongue” is not well respected. At some points she makes it seem that she is ashamed, as well as feeling as if her Chicanas hate there “border tongue” language. Anzaldúa is able to illustrate this when she says that “Chicanas who grew up speaking Chicano Spanish have internalized the belief that we speak poor Spanish. It is illegitimate, a bastard language” (Anzaldúa 329). In this quotation Anzaldúa is explaining a general observation that she realizes from her
community and other people around her. She is illustrating the views and perspectives on the topic of Chicano Spanish. It is obvious from this quote that people didn’t respect the Chicano Spanish language at the same time they did view it in a negative, hated way. What this resembles is the part about how “a border tongue” such as Chicano Spanish is not respected and not given credit to the fullest. Similar to the Chicano Spanish language way of treatment, Tan’s mother is treated very similar to that. Tan’s mother is disrespected. She is not respected in certain places. A perfect example of that is illustrated when Tan says “One time it was a call to her stockbroker in New York. She had cashed out her small portfolio and it just so happened we were going to go to New York the next week, our very first trip outside California. I had to get on the phone and say in and adolescent voice that was not very convincing, “This is Mrs. Tan” (Tan 292). In this quotation Tan is giving an example in which she had to help her mother out because her mother was limited in English. That she had to help her mom out in curtain actions. What this shows is that because Tan’s mother’s English was a broke English, people didn’t respect in the sense that she could not represent herself because people would act as if they didn’t understand her. Society in this action, the stock broker, would over look her. She would have to use a cover up, in this case Tan. She couldn’t express herself to others because they would not give the chance and respect it. What this proves is that Tan’s mother is not taken seriously and not respected because of her language. Because she has trouble with English she expresses herself the way she wants to but that way would not be accepted by others. Because she uses a language that is uncommon and sometimes not accepted others makes “Mother Tongue” a “border tongue”.

Tan’s “Mother Tongue” does meet the criteria to qualify as a “border tongue” that is defined on “How to Tame a Wild Tongue”. Through the two essays there are many similarities between the languages used in both essays. First the languages are both made up two cultures. In Tan’s essay, she as well as her family speak a language that is made of Chinese and English language. In the other hand in Anzaldúa essay, they use Chicano Spanish a language that is made up of Spanish language and Mexican cultures. Second both languages are understood by specific individuals. In Tans essay, the English that Tan and her family used was not understood a lot by others, but with in her family it had been understood for over 20 years. In Anzaldúa essay, she illustrates of how only people within the society that are able to understand and not get confused
by the Chicano Spanish language. Also both languages are not given the respect they disserved. Tans essay her mother is treated different because she has a language that is broken. She is given lack of respect from restaurants, hospitals and etc. In the other hand the broken language in Anzaldúas essay Chicano Spanish is considered a “Bastard” language by certain individuals. Over all there are many similarities between the two, but the most important one is that they both exist, and they both impact individuals live, in positive and negative ways. A border tongue should not be discriminated but instead they should be tried to be accepted and understood by everyone.
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In today’s society, many people speak a variety of languages. A lot of us don’t speak an entire language perfectly and often use slang or our own version of languages in conversation. In Amy Tan’s essay, she writes about how her mother speaks “broken” (Tan 294) English meaning her mother speaks the language, but doesn’t follow all of the grammatical rules or says some things in Chinese. Amy Tan calls it her “mother’s tongue” (Tan 291). It is almost the same thing as Anzaldúa’s “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) which she defines as a mixture of languages that represent who a person is and what that person believes (Anzaldúa 326). Mrs. Tan’s “mother tongue” (Tan 291) is a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) because it fulfills all the requirements that Anzaldúa has for a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326).

According to Anzaldúa, a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) is, “A language which they can connect their identity to, one capable of communicating the realities and values true to themselves—a language with terms that are neither español ni inglés, but both” (Anzaldúa 326). This means that it’s a language that defines who you are. It’s a language that helps you communicate with reality and morals that you believe in. It’s not just one language, but it’s a blend of languages you speak. Also a “border tongue” refers to geographical location. For the most part, Anzaldúa is writing about the borders between Mexico and the US. But she does go into the different borders or locations that Chicanos live within Texas. Anzaldúa’s definition of a “border tongue” is important because she puts herself in that category. To her, a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) is unique and special because they stick to what they know and what they believe makes them who they are. It was a way in which Chicanos made themselves stand out in an area that was dominated by regular Spanish speakers and English speakers. By this definition, Tan’s mother does qualify as a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) because like Anzaldúa and other Chicanos, Mrs. Tan doesn’t speak one distinct language. Instead she speaks more simple English that is easy for her and her family to understand. Mrs. Tan converses in the language that she knows whether it is “limited” (Tan 292) or not.
Amy Tan’s essay talks about the different “Englishes” (Tan 290) that she used growing up and how the way her mom speaks impacted her life. She starts out by saying that not many people can understand her mother because she speaks “‘broken’” (Tan 294) English or simple English. Tan writes, “But to me, my mother’s English is perfectly clear, perfectly natural. It’s my mother’s tongue” (Tan 291). In other words, Tan understands her mom when she speaks because she grew up listening and learning from her. It’s her mother’s way of speaking. This quotation helps us as readers see that Tan hears her mother’s language as if it were just another English speaking person talking to her. To Tan, her mom doesn’t speak incorrectly and doesn’t sound uneducated, but she does sound normal and smart. Just because her mother doesn’t sound like most people when she speaks, doesn’t mean that she can’t speak our language or that she is stupid. This just means that her tone is different and that English probably wasn’t her first language. This supports the argument that her “mother’s tongue” (Tan 291) is what Anzaldúa considers a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) because Mrs. Tan’s identity is attached to her way of speaking. She is Chinese and when one hears her speak, that shows. Amy Tan writes in her essay, “Yet some of my friends tell me they understand 50 percent of what my mother says. Some say they understand 80 to 90 percent. Some say they understand none of it, as if she were speaking pure Chinese” (Tan 291). This quotation gives us some indication that the way Mrs. Tan talks is noticeable because some of Amy Tan’s friends can’t even understand her. She doesn’t speak “perfectly” in the opinions of some of Tan’s friends. This quotation reveals the difficulty Amy Tan’s friends may go through or other people that come in contact with Mrs. Tan go through just to understand what she is saying. Still, this is what makes Mrs. Tan who she is because if she spoke so that everyone could understand her, she wouldn’t be herself.

Tan’s “mother tongue” (Tan 291) meets Anzaldúa’s criteria for a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) because Mrs. Tan doesn’t speak perfect English, but she speaks the English that she is aware of. Just like Anzaldúa’s variations of Spanish, Mrs. Tan has her own variations of English. When Tan talks about her mother, she describes a version of English that she and her family use and how it’s different from the English she would use when she is speaking in front of a lot of people (Tan 290). This is very similar to Anzaldúa’s family and how there are certain circumstances when using a version of the language she speaks is ok and
when it is not. Anzaldúa writes, “My “home” tongues are the languages I speak with my sister and brothers, with my friends” (Anzaldúa 327). Anzaldúa has specific languages that she uses to talk to family and then she uses other “tongues” (Anzaldúa 327) when she is involved with other people. Her writing gives us an idea of how she lives her life and how one language can distinguish a variety of relationships Anzaldúa has. In her case and in Mrs. Tan’s case, they both have versions of their language that they use with the people they care about and the people that are just acquaintances. This is evidence that Tan’s “mother tongue” (Tan 291) can definitely qualify for a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326).

Mrs. Tan’s “language” can be considered “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) not only because she speaks a mixture of Chinese and English, but also because there are some “borders” that she faces. These borders aren’t geographical in her case. Mrs. Tan faces racial borders in the sense that people judge her based on the way she speaks and the fact that people feel that they must separate her from themselves. There is this imaginary border line that Mrs. Tan faces because she is put in a different category than the people that are natives to the US. In Tan’s essay, she recalls many instances where she pretended to be her mother just so that her mom would be taken seriously or so that she would be treated like a normal human being (Tan 292). Whether it is a racial border or a border based on geography, they represent the same thing. They are borders that segregate a certain group and open that group to discrimination.

Both Anzaldúa and Mrs. Tan struggle with discrimination or poor treatment because they aren’t considered “experts” on their languages. For example, Anzaldúa writes, “Chicanas feel uncomfortable talking in Spanish to Latinas, afraid of their censure” (Anzaldúa 329). Basically, she’s saying that Chicanas don’t feel right talking Spanish to people in other Spanish cultures because they are self conscious and scared that they will be judged. This quotation reveals a sense of insecurity because Chicanas are afraid to be judged based on their language. Also that Latinas make assumptions because of the way a certain ethnic group decides to say certain words. Mrs. Tan was in a similar situation where she wasn’t given fair treatment because of assumption made by a hospital.

Tan explains in her essay that, “She said she had spoken very good English, her best English, no mistakes. Still, she said, the hospital did not apologize when they said they had lost the CAT scan and she
had come for nothing” (Tan 292). Mrs. Tan had spoken as clear and correctly as she could have to the doctors. They still did not treat her with the respect and care that she needed. Tan goes on to say that the doctor called her, and after speaking to Tan, he apologized and promised to work things out (Tan 293). It just goes to show you that people aren’t given the best care that can be provided because people like the doctor assume that because you don’t speak English very well, you aren’t educated. It’s almost as if the hospital thought they could cheat her into scheduling another appointment to get more money out of her. The hospital assumed that because she didn’t speak good English, she wouldn’t understand what they were trying to do. Once the doctor talked to Tan, everything changed because he realized that this woman had a smart daughter who was obviously educated in a similar school as he/she was. Like Anzaldúa, Mrs. Tan’s tongue brought about a problem that many other people may have problems with. Anzaldúa and Tan’s mother are so much alike because even though they are proud of where they come from, they still run into obstacles.

Both Mrs. Tan and Anzaldúa have gone through similar experiences. People discriminate and judge immigrants or people that didn’t grow up in English speaking households because they may sound differently when they speak or may just speak different entirely. Mrs. Tan’s “mother tongue” (Tan 291) can definitely fall in the same category as a “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) because they both deal with conversing in different languages or a mixture of languages. Both “mother tongue” (Tan 291) and “border tongue” (Anzaldúa 326) identify who Anzaldúa and Mrs. Tan are because no one else speaks exactly like them. They have their own versions of the languages that already exist.
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Eighner creates his essay directing us to be appreciative individuals while also erasing negative stereotypes by educating the audience about the art of dumpster diving. “I mean to put some of what I have learned down here, beginning with the practical art of Dumpster diving and proceeding to the abstract.” (Eighner 380)

Eighner makes it clear that scavengers are being stereotyped; he uses his experiences as a dumpster diver to disprove these stereotypes. Initially I never thought that I would stereotype anyone because I have dealt with stereotypes aimed at me that still affect me. But Eighner makes it clear that “…most people instinctively look away from a scavenger.” (Eighner 384) I realized that I did not wish to be in that category of “most people”, and this is exactly what Eighner wants his readers to realize. To eliminate the negativity directed towards scavengers Eighner compares his audience to the scavengers. “Quite a number of people… are willing to brag that they found this or that in a piece of trash. But eating from the Dumpsters is the thing that separates the dilettanti from the professionals.” (Eighner 380) Alluding to the fact that many people do go through the trash breaks down the barriers that would normally separate a scavenger from someone else. I admit that I would normally look down on a scavenger, even though they are not less of a person. Often it is assumed that people like them have mental conditions, or they cannot function in society; that is why they are excluded. We cannot judge someone when the decisions they make are based on their means of survival; we would more than likely make the same choices if in their position. Further more, Eighner states that we make the same decisions as scavengers except we are exempt from the dumpster providing us food. Because if we had to fight for our daily survival we would not have any issues with finding necessities from dumpsters.

Eighner makes an indirect comparison of the average American to a scrounger in order to prove that we are unappreciative of the things that we have. “One can extract the necessities of life from the Dumpsters directly with far less effort than would be required to accumulate the equivalent cans.” (Eighner 385) Sometimes we are like the can scrounger and focus on constantly consuming without realizing things of
greater importance. Eighner appreciates the provisions beyond cans found in the dumpsters while we Americans automatically fall into the category of scroungers simply because we over-indulge ourselves; we do not appreciate what we have. He continues giving the dumpster divers more credit than the average American; “Most divers come to realize that they must restrict themselves to items of relatively immediate utility.” (Eighner384) This is a sharp contrast to the American that enjoys eating to excess. Every time Eighner mentions the scroungers’ there is this negative connotation; he does not approach his readers with the same tone. When confronting the wastefulness of the college students he believes “…the answer may be that the item was discarded through carelessness, ignorance, or wastefulness” (Eighner382) whereas the scroungers’ have no excuse for there over indulgent behavior. “Can scroungers lay waste to everything in their path and will stir one pair of good shoes to the bottom of a Dumpster, to be lost or ruined in the muck.” (Eighner385) I think that Eighner should have used the same tone towards his audience that he used towards the scroungers because as Americans we do not have any more of a reason to be as inefficient as the scrounger. Providing that Eighner’s purpose for separating the two parties may have been to keep the respect of his readers. He did this because the opinion of the reader matters because they are more probable to making changes that a scrounger cannot.

Eighner uses many devices like tone, syntax and ambivalence to achieve his purpose in this essay. Since we are the potential “can scroungers” using an authoritative tone Eighner tells us “a true scavenger hates to see good stuff go to waste and what he cannot use he leaves in good condition in plain sight.” (Eighner385) This is a way of Eighner instructing over-consumers to live a less wasteful life.

Eighner also skillfully uses syntax, revealing his feelings. “I am a scavenger. I think it a sound and honorable niche, although if I could I would naturally prefer to live the comfortable consumer life, perhaps-and only perhaps- as a slightly less wasteful consumer owing what I have learned as a scavenger.” (Eighner380) His frequent pauses display his sense of pride, and make the text read like a speech. I can sense his pride in being a scavenger as well as his honesty in admitting that, if he could, he would be a comfortable yet less wasteful consumer. This makes me think about people not realizing what they have until they lose it. Eighner mentioned how he would still get provisions from the dumpster even if he wasn’t homeless. I found
that Eighner uses ambivalence to express his feelings throughout the essay. “I do not begrudge them the cans, but can scroungers tend to tear up the dumpsters, mixing contents and littering the area.” (Eighner385) Eighner gives the cans more respect and more of a preference than the can scroungers. This reveals his perception of them. I feel that it was again a little too harsh, because he is almost acting as if the can scroungers aren’t human. I think he does this because he knows that the can scroungers are his competition. Eighner also uses ambivalence when he gave the dumpsters a sense of ownership which gave it some sort of feelings. “I have proprietary feelings about my Dumpsters.” (Eighner385) It is almost as if he has a connection to these dumpster, perhaps because they are his means of living. Before I wouldn’t think that anyone would be comfortable enough to claim a dumpster as their own personal property. When Eighner used ambivalence he used it to show his pride in what he does, which is an important message when you are trying to get someone to reason with your beliefs.

The genre of this text Lost seems to be humor but sympathy is shown a great deal. The author uses other tools to connect his audience to his purpose; they all come in together to form the purpose of finding his long lost jacket.

In Lost the owner uses the sequence of events to capture the audiences’ emotions so that the jacket can be returned. This was done by using sensitivity and realism. When the owner begins to describe the sequence of events the reader gets a sense that he was being bombarded with a serious of events, overwhelmed he finds joy. “…she laughed her wonderful baby laugh and I forgot about being broke.” (Anonymous) Most people can relate to a babies laugh and how they bring joy so the owner uses that relation to his advantage. When we feel too stressed out and seem to be wallowing in pity, anyone who has been around children knows that they will pick up your spirit instantly with a smile that warms the heart. For some reader this may cause them to refer back to times where they felt the same way as the author. “I forgot about my anxiety of being a new parent. I forgot about eminent war. I forgot about my jacket.” (Anonymous) The owner ties in realism to make the jacket more important to the reader than it was initially. War is something that everyone around the world can relate to and cannot help but feel a connection to it because it is a constant destroyer of society. By connecting the
jacket to more serious and important events makes the reader believe that the jacket was important as well. The owner’s purpose of including the sequence of events was to get the reader to sympathize for them; I found this to actually work. I felt bad for him because he was a single father only looking out for his daughter, and he wound up losing something dear to him. I think that this makes the reader feel like they will do anything they can to help. He wants the reader to sympathize for him because he hopes that whoever finds the jacket will have enough empathy to return it.

In the article *Lost* I feel that he was successful in creating a piece that would draw attention to getting back his jacket. Almost every time feelings is the source of what makes a reader agree; this is why he used things of importance to connect to his readers. Otherwise he would not have received his jacket.

In Eighner’s essay, I believe that he succeeded in making people at least consider things before they waste them or before they judge someone who scavengers through the dumpsters. But I do think that America is far too self-involved and wasteful to change their ways because of an essay. Maybe now when people notice dumpster’s they will see them as more than just trash receptacles and maybe as someone’s source of life. “I have dutifully capitalized the word although it was lowercased in almost all of the citations.” (Eighner379). Overall Eighner’s essay was a success because he gave reverence and importance to an act that otherwise would be looked down upon.
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What is Language?

Language can be utilized for several purposes and is a means for communication. Languages have meanings and these meanings are shared by members of a society. Slang and modified languages are created so that a certain group or target audience is the only people that can understand it. In Amy Tan’s essay, “Mother tongue” and Gloria Anzaldúa’s essay, “How to Tame a Wild Tongue,” both explore the advantages and drawbacks of “modified” English. “A border tongue,” described by Anzaldúa, corresponds with Tan’s explanation of “Mother tongue” because of the origin, uses, and perception of altered English which demonstrates the similarities between the two.

According to Anzaldúa, “A border tongue” was developed naturally by people that needed to adapt and “evolve” (Anzaldúa 326). The author gives her take on what “A border tongue” is:

“A language which they can connect their identity to, one capable of communicating the realities and values true to themselves. […] Chicano Spanish sprang out of the Chicanos’ need to identify ourselves as a distinct people. We needed a language with which we could communicate with ourselves, a secret language” (Anzaldúa 326).

She is explaining how language has ties and relations with one’s identity. She also says this to show the reader that her culture is important. She says that they need to identify their selves as “distinct” people in order to show the reader that she is just as important as people that speak Standard English. When the author says “a language which they can connect their identity to,” she is referring to the fact that Chicanos are in need of an outlet or source to channel their thoughts, feelings, and emotions. This is significant because some expressions cannot be translated because they are lost in translation. This also relates to Tan’s relationship with her mother, and how in a sense, they have their own “secret language.” While this passage shows why “Chicano” was created, it also shows how Amy Tan’s “Mother Tongue” qualifies as “a border tongue” and why the two languages were originated. In Tan’s essay, she writes: “It has become our language of intimacy, a different sort of English that relates to family talk, the language I grew up with” (Tan 291). This reveals that a “mother tongue” and a “border tongue” are: “Un lenguaje que corresponde a un modo de vivir” which translates to
“a language which corresponds with our way of life” (Anzaldúa 326). The “Mother Tongue” is a method that Tan utilizes to communicate with her loved ones; also, Anzaldúa uses “a border tongue” which serves the same purpose. Creating a language would be their own way of understanding each other on a more personal level because it is their “secret language.”

Similar to Tan’s essay about her mother, Anzaldúa uses certain language around specific people. She provides an example of how she changes her “tongue.” She describes when she uses different dialect around Mexicans. She says, “With Mexicans I’ll try to speak either Standard Mexican Spanish or the North Mexican dialect. From my parents and Chicanos living in the Valley, I picked up Chicano Texas Spanish, and I speak it with my mom, younger brother, aunts and older relatives” (Anzaldúa 327). This is important because she doesn’t use the Chicano language that she refers to in the previous paragraphs. It is implied that Chicano is slang or something that is not respected because of who she uses this dialect with: her mother, and other relatives. I noticed that it is Standard Mexican Spanish rather than regular Mexican Spanish which confirms that the Chicano language is frowned upon by Standard Spanish speakers. It is ironic that she would not use Chicano because she respects the language but it is obvious that it is not deemed as respectful or polite: it is only used with other people of equivalent social standing or authority.

Tan also uses this same method of shifting “languages” between certain people and in different environments. Case in point, Tan is speaking about her book, The Joy Luck Club, with a large group of people while her mother was present:

The talk was going along well enough, until I remembered one major difference that made the whole talk sound wrong. My mother was in the room. [...] It was the first time she had heard me give a lengthy speech, using the kind of English I have never used with her. I was saying things like ‘the intersection of memory upon imagination’ […] a speech filled with carefully wrought grammatical phrases[…] all the forms of standard English that I had learned in school and through books the forms of English I did not use at home with my mother (Tan 290).

Around her mother, she uses a basic vocabulary and speaks in an informal manner. However, when Tan is around people that are not relatives or of equal status, she uses a grammatically correct dialogue and utilizes Standard English. This demonstrates the similar characteristic that the two authors have because they both shift in languages depending on the environment. This also shows that who was present in the room
determined Tan’s vocabulary. The use of a broad vocabulary influences people to believe that you have more important things to say than people who don’t. The two authors also shift languages under the same circumstances; the Standard or “proper” language is only utilized in a formal setting. Although they are speaking different “languages,” their use for their “secret language” is the same.

Chicano language relates back to what Anzaldúa previously says: “For people who are neither Spanish nor live in a country in which Spanish is the first language; for a people who live in a country in which English is the reigning tongue but who are not Anglo; for a people who cannot entirely identify with either standard (formal, Castilian) Spanish nor standard English, what recourse is left to them but to create their own language?” (Anzaldúa 326) This passage reveals that Chicanos are being isolated from people that speak Standard English as well as Standard Spanish. From the tone of her essay, it seems that Anzaldúa and the Chicanos have created this language as an alternative method of retaliation towards “Anglos” and Castilian Spanish speaking people that criticized her for not speaking proper by having an accent. Language is crucial, as it often leads society to believe that people that speak “limited” or “broken” English have nothing important to say.

To be taken seriously, one must speak seriously. Unfortunately, in the United States, our society has adapted to a social thinking that individuals that speak “broken” or “limited” English are not intelligent and lack importance. Sadly, this is the case for Amy Tan’s mother. In an incident at a hospital, Tan’s mother is denied access to speak with a doctor and is overlooked because of her accent and broken English. It is evident that the nurse overlooked Tan’s mother because she assumed that she is not important enough to be concerned about because when Amy speaks using Standard English their service changes: “We had assurances the CAT scan would be found, promises that a conference call on Monday would be held, and apologies for any suffering my mother had gone through for a most regrettable mistake” (Tan 293). Prior to Tan speaking, her mother was denied and treated wrong. The way her mother is treated and alienated makes Tan embarrassed and makes her feel that it is not okay to be foreign. This shows the perception that society has of immigrants, which is that foreigners are incompetent and lack importance. This is similar to Anzaldúa description of what “language” to use at a conference or party: “If a person, Chicano or Latina, has a low
estimation of my native tongue, she also has a low estimation of me. Often with *Mexicanas y Latinas* we’ll speak English as a neutral language. Even among Chicanas we tend to speak English at parties or conferences. Yet, at the same time, we’re afraid the others will think we’re agringadas because we don’t speak Chicano Spanish” (Anzaldùa 329). The similarities between the two incidents reveal that there is a certain tone, language, and attitude that is expected, depending on the people that are present and the environment. Standard English is believed to be the native language for places that deal with business or anything that is related to a profession or casual social gatherings.

Both essays demonstrate how language relates to social power standing and how our culture perceives foreigners. The origin, uses, and perception of language are crucial and demonstrate the significance of “tongue.” Tan and Anzaldùa differ as people but are linked through the power of language.
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Why are names so important? Name is the identity of you, the reason makes you unique. It reveals the connection between you and the world around you. Moreover, name is an access to your life, your voice, your future. Yet, it is also an access of others to have effects on you. If you let someone change your name, you put yourself under that person’s influence. That was the situation which Hallelujah (Miss Glory) in “What’s your name, girl?” put herself into, and the situation which Gish Jen in “Name Dropping” avoided because of one fact: names represent people as individuals, represent people’s power over their life because basically they are the only things that a person actually own.

Since you were born, name was the very first gift that parents gave you. It marks the very first magical moment when you came to this world. It was the gift that was formed by happiness, wonderfulness, hope and dream. To a person, name is a link between you and your family since it was given to you by someone who loves you so much. Every times your name is called, you will be reminded of the relationship between you and your family, between you and the one who gave you that name. It is connected with you by your blood and bones. Name lives inside of you. And you hide inside of your name.

Name represents you as individual. It shows the world who you are, where you from, what you do. Names do not only define the country from where you were born, but also indicate where it is standing inside of you. In this multicultural country, a name can tell a person you are communicating with your ethnicity. And moreover, it indicates respect and standing of the country from where you got that name. Even if you are living abroad, your past, your ethnic, and part of your heart still belong to the country you were born. To Gish Jen, author of “Name Dropping”, name is more than that. Her name Lillian is a connection between her Chinese background and herself. It shows the Chinese part inside of her, the part that she was no longer belonged to. That name, according to Jen, was the name that her parents adopted for her. It was the name that her parents transferred from their daughter Chinese name: “Bi Lian” (Jade Lotus). It was the name that her parents used as a scope that they tied her into. Bi Lian, Lillian are different by their spelling from the
outside, but are similar by beliefs and expectations from the inside. Lillian somehow reminds Jen of the Chinese person who was living somewhere inside the bottom of her heart, reminds her of the person that she is no longer familiar with. Compare to Jen, “Jade Lotus” somehow did not fit her since “Jade Lotuses did not wear eyes shadow, and Jade Lotuses did not wear miniskirts so short that they had to be sure their underwear was clean” (Jen 172). “Lillian” bore Jen’s parents doubled expectation of keeping herself pure and clear in a new seductive world that somehow Gish could not bear. “Jade Lotus” is a small girl who is put under her parents’ decisions; she basically was not capable to decide on her own. By changing her name, a grown up Jen disconnected her relations between Gish-an American women, and “Jade Lotus”-a pure, honest Chinese girl who Mr. and Mrs. Jen placed their expectation.

Jen defined herself a person of her own by her new name--Gish. There is only one Gish in this world, no second. To Jen, Gish is a scissor which cut the rope tied her to a scope of expectation and tradition of “Jade Lotus”. Moreover, Gish allowed Jen to have a power to control herself. “I did it because I felt like it, and because I was just beginning to realize that I could do all kinds of things if I felt like it” (Jen 175). Jen now is a free person. She could do anything if she wanted to. She created herself a new life lived by a real her.

An access to your name is an access to your power, to your rights. Somehow, in Angelou’s writing: “What’s your name girl”, Mrs. Cullinan—Marguerite’s boss, successfully got that access. She changed the name of Miss. Hallelujah to Mrs. Glory, and apparently she changed Marguerite’s name to Mary. By that action, Mrs. Cullinan had invisible keys which locked the door to the rights of Hallelujah and Marguerite themselves. Hallelujah and Marguerite were free people. They have certain rights to protect themselves, to decide themselves. But Glory and Mary were not. They were locked inside of a room which Mrs. Cullinan hold the key. They were taken away their names, their voices, and their identities. They were judged by the people who had power over them by changing their own name. Mrs. Cullinan is an educated, wealthy, white woman. She allowed herself a right to changed people’s name in term of fitting in her class. Hallelujah and Marguerite are uneducated, poor, and blacks who traditionally did not have a chance to defend. Names were the only properties belonged to them. If they let someone take it, they basically let that person shapes their lives, their fates, their futures. That was the reason why Marguerite was so furious. That was the reason why
Marguerite changed her attitude toward her mistress from pitifulness to disdainfulness since Mrs. Cullinan took away her identity, her right to speak, her right to defend. That happened because Marguerite was in a class lower than Mrs. Cullinan. That motivated her to break Mrs. Cullinan’s precious property since she broke Marguerite’s precious property. “That clumsy nigger. Clumsy little black nigger” (Angelou 81) was what Mrs. Cullinan did to show Marguerite the border of difference between white and black, between wealthy and poor, between educated and uneducated. She showed Marguerite that whites could call blacks whatever they want, but black could not. Marguerite had to fight for herself, and she did.

My country was renamed several times. Chinese called us “An Nam”, French called us Indochina (Dong Duong), we ourselves renamed us “Vietnam”. It not only the name “Vietnam” represents ourselves as an independence country, but also the history behind it represents what we gained after a thousand years fighting for our Vietnam today by blood and bones. We chose ourselves a name then we chose our destiny. Every country as well as every person has a history that is told by name. That makes its importance. Vietnamese do not want foreign to call us An Nam or Indochina, we want them to call us Vietnam, the name we decided. Jen does not want people to call her Lillian; she wants people to call her Gish, the name she decided. Marguerite did not want Mrs, Cullinan to call her Mary, she wanted to be called Marguerite. When you force the world to call you what you decide, you force them to recognize you as what you decide.

The world gets to know you by your name. It is a definition of your responsibility to yourself, a definition of self-control and power. Control to your name is control to your identities, your rights, and your fate. Therefore, it is so important that you keep them in a safe place, can be seen, but cannot be touched.
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The sidewalks were crowded with swarms of tourists as I exited the Forbidden City. After walking the long hot stricken streets of one of China’s most popular tourist attractions, I felt gross, I was tired and exhausted like the many tourists who had looks of annoyance and agony. The sun continued to beam on the pavement creating waves of heat for me and many tourists streaming out of the attraction, not wanting to look back. The rush of loud noises then came upon us: Tour guides with colored flags attached to poles screeched across the crowd, yelling “Follow me” in languages ranging from Dutch to French to English; vendors aggressively attacked and screamed at me and other tourists to buy their items by grabbing shirts and holding onto limbs. Like the other tourists, I put on a blank face and continued to follow my tour guide Ping. Our air conditioned bus seemed so far to me, I started to begin a fast pace walk towards my tour guide, Ping when I felt a tug on my shorts.

Among the chaos of the streets, I peered down to see a toddler’s extended arm’s delicate hand touch me. His gentle fingers were scuffed with dirt and fragile. His tanned skin was covered with withered and faded clothing and his face filled with sorrow and agony. His eyes peered into mine and transferred a message of struggle, pain, and need for help. He came to me, specifically me a stranger to help him. As a child he was unable to rely on a parent, family member, friend to help him; he resorted to a complete stranger to resolve his struggle in life. He needed not only money but mostly he needed support and someone he could rely on and who will always be there.

This anonymous little boy has been the change in my life thus far, I wanted to share this story to you because I know that not only me but others such as you can learn from it. I learned that one will always encounter at least one person in life that will be there for them and support them. Not mattering if it is a stranger, someone you have known for two days or six weeks; there will be someone out there for you. A person will be there to provide you with support and stand by you through thick and thin. It took me sixteen years to understand that, to know that I do not have to feel alone and to feel loneliness.
And now for us, the graduating SSS class of 2009, there is no reason for anyone to feel agony and no support. With a hundred and seventy students, RAs, advisors, tutors, and teachers to choose from, we can all say that there is someone to support for personal success. We have grown close and created emotional bonds for the past six weeks but will continue to grow throughout our next four years. You may not feel support from all but at least one person in your life will be there for you, not mattering if it is a complete stranger.
People don’t usually follow their instincts it is not easy for them to make unpopular decisions when their decisions are highly influenced by peer pressure. In the short story “Shooting an Elephant “ by George Orwell, Orwell portrays how having power destroys your freedom, so that you tend to do what is expected instead of what you believe is right in fear that you will become an outcast, therefore the one that is the oppressor is really the oppressed.

In the role of the Burmese Police Officer Orwell was forced to do things that he found distrustful, which “Oppressed [him] with an intolerable sense of guilt” (Orwell, 222). As part of his job Orwell dealt with tortured prisoners, and he saw “The dirty work of the empire at close quarters” (222). Seeing that men were put in jail because they revolted against the imperialism of Britain really bothered Orwell. He felt like it destroyed their freedom. Orwell feels like he is unfairly persecuting these prisoners who to him had not adapted to the British ways. Orwell’s guilt made it difficult for him to do his duty as police officer, causing him to not actually be the one with the power.

The scene of Orwell shooting the elephant shows that its not always what it seems, on the surface it might have seemed like Orwell was the oppressor because he was an officer of Britain, but in reality underneath the surface it was Orwell that was being oppressed. “[He] could feel [the] two thousand wills pressing [him] forward irresistibly” (224). Orwell felt that being a white officer with a gun at hand meant that he had to kill the elephant, because that’s what the Burmese people expected him to do, but he soon realized that he was an “absurd puppet pushed to and from by the will of those yellow faces behind” (224) It was as if the Burmese manipulated Orwell to fulfill their thirst for entertainment. They had some sort of mental or emotional power over him, which caused him to feel like he had to kill the elephant or else he would be considered an outcast. In Orwell’s mind “A sahib has got to act like a sahib” (225). Orwell felt that if all these people came out here for nothing, then they would laugh at him; they would think nothing of him. He internally could not let all these people that came to watch him go without a show because this would imply
that the “white man is weak and the crowd would laugh at every white mans life in the east” (225). Even while getting ready to shot the elephant Orwell considered options about how he was going to kill the elephant, he didn’t want to embarrass himself he didn’t want to kill the elephant, he didn’t want to seem as if he was scared because after all “A white man mustn’t be frightened in front of natives” (225).

Orwell clearly portrays that once a man has power its destroys his freedom because like Orwell you start to think about what others want you to do instead of what you want do. The fear of being an outcast causes you not to think with your heart but with what you think others expect of you. Orwell says that: “When the white man turns tyrant it is his own freedom that he destroys” (224). Meaning that as long as he is in power, he has to devote his life into impressing the natives, no matter the situation, he has to do what the natives expect of him. Just like when he made the decision to shoot the calm elephant. Deep down Orwell didn’t want to shoot the elephant he was stuck on a predicament and he lost part his freedom because he lost his ability to make decisions for himself, he lost his voice.

It is evident that George Orwell is showing us how having power corrupts one, it makes us not follow our hearts but influences around cause us to determine our decision and we don’t like to make unpopular decisions. So in reality the person that seems like is the oppressor is really the oppressed because they have to act a certain way to keep a certain reputation instead actually doing what they believe is right.
Man (Adam) was the first one to be on this earth. All was fine, until women came and disturbed the peace. Since then, things have been going badly. Men were superior, are superior, and will be superior forever. All the credit for wise deeds belongs only to men. The only credit women deserve is for taking care of children and the kitchen. Outside the world of kitchen, women know nothing. It has always been said that women are a step behind men in every aspect. In the essay “Throwing Like a Girl” James Fallows argues that men are ahead of women in sports because playing sports is a learned behavior. Anybody can learn to play sports but women are discouraged to play sports since childhood. Instead of going to the gym they are sent to learn ballet. But even if the women were taught to play sports they would not be able to play well as men. Sports are just one example among many where women are inferior to men.

Women are a disgrace to the world of sports. Their focus is more on the uniform than the team and strategy. When men play, they play with the thought of winning and also with the hope of learning new techniques or skills with every game. But when women play, their focus is on the good-looking guys in the audience, their female opponents, and how they are dressed. Without any reason every minute or two, they constantly check to see if their clothes are dirty. Even though they know it is perfectly fine, they still try to fix it. It is obvious that women’s body is delicate and soft so men never play sports with women. However, Fallows gave evidence that professional female tennis players serve much stronger than a normal man (417). They can do this because they have been playing tennis with women all their lives. But if they are to play with men of the same level then they would lose the game easily.

Women are slower in thinking and lack common sense. While throwing the ball, first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton had a scarf and oversized Cubs hat (Fallows 416). Thinking carefully was it really necessary to dress like that? Her dressing style was indicative of her ignorance because why would she wear a scarf and oversized Cubs hat while throwing a ball. Bill Clinton, a man, knew what to do so he had a team jacket and a hat. This just shows the nature of women and how they are only concerned with their looks. If Hillary was
smarter, she would not care about her dress and wear something more appropriate. Instead she had to show off how she dressed. Hillary is only one among many examples of superficial women.

Even though my sexist claims about the women sound true, I do not necessarily believe that women are a step behind men. I come from a male dominated society and I view women like the way society taught me. But now living in United States for last two years, I have changed my thoughts regarding women. Also when science itself has proved that women have higher IQ than men, how could one say that women are stupid and dumb? How could I even say that women are lazy when the girls in my grade rank higher than me and most boys? Moreover, after the ratification of 19th amendment in 1920, women have come ahead so far that they stand right next to men in every aspect of life.

II. Satire Obviously Works

James Fallows’ style of writing in “Throwing Like a Girl” was not quite as interesting as Jonathan Swift’s “A Modest Proposal.” It is because Swift presented his argument in a different way. He used the satirical style to catch the attention of the readers and I believe his satire has definitely worked. I could say this because to get rid of poverty he suggests eating babies, which offends the reader, making them go against Swift’s suggested views. He himself was not for this process as he says, “I profess, that I have not the least personal interest in… this necessary work” (Swift 832). His starting argument immediately caught my attention with a shocking description of “mothers [who] instead of being able to work for their honest livelihood, are forced to employ all their time in strolling to beg sustenance for their helpless infants” (826). This pulled me into the essay because it not only showed the poverty of nation but also how mothers are compelled to care for their many children. Had not the satire worked, the piece of writing would be the same as expository style used by Fallows having less interest for the readers. Likewise, after writing the Fallows’ essay in Swift’s satirical style, the tone changed completely. I now think the essay looks interesting enough to grab reader’s attention by saying “Women are slower in thinking and can never use common sense at the proper time” and many others things to argue about. With the satire style the readers will always feel that author is wrong, convincing the readers to oppose his points. With every argument the satire will be success.
So between the two styles, satire is more useful as it easily conveys the main point or idea without losing the interest of the reader.

In Fallows’ “Throwing Like a Girl,” he used the expository style to bring out his points to support women. However, this style uses so many examples with multiple angles on the same topic making it difficult for the reader to decide whether the author is for or against the point. While reading Fallows, I was confused about whether he was supporting or going against women. He supports women playing sports by giving many examples: one of them being the professional female tennis players who serve much harder than average men. And on the other side he sometimes seems to make fun of women trying to learn to play sports. He said “Mrs. Clinton spent the weekend … tossing a ball in the Rose Garden with her husband, for practice” (Fallows 417). I was not sure whether he was appreciating the practice or was making fun of it. The expository style, having multiple views, is not always clear to understand the author’s point.

The satirical style generally works better as it grabs the reader’s attention instantly. Instead of presenting ideas in a straightforward way like expository style, satire has a different way of bringing up the point. For instance, without saying that Ireland was a poor country, Swift starts the essay by describing the conditions saying “It is a melancholy… to see the streets, the roads, and cabin doors, crowded with beggars of the female sex, followed by three, four, or six children, all in rags and importuning every passenger for an alms” (Swift 826). He is not just saying that Ireland is poor but going further he describes the vivid condition of the town, the streets and the helpless mothers wandering on the streets. I myself experienced the difference between the two styles when I re-wrote Fallow’s expository “Throwing Like a Girl” using Swifts’ satire. Being sarcastic, I criticized the women; I said women are slow, lazy and stupid which I actually do not think this.

Both satire and expository are written to give the readers different emotional response to the writings. The emotional response is important because it shows how much interest the readers are showing towards the writing. People have thought of argument while reading a satirical piece of writing. Satire being written in sarcastic and dramatic views will make the readers disagree in every point the author is saying. For example, I said “Women are a disgrace to the world of sports” which is not true at all. When reading most of
the readers will get offended because women play almost all the sports that men play. Even though they are not strong enough to compete with men they are best among themselves. In most cases the average man cannot compete with the professional female players because they are too good at it and they could beat men easily. Satire piece should have ideas that will offend readers otherwise; the writing cannot be called as a satire piece. People mostly read the expository style for general information. When reading, the audience might oppose the writer’s view and also sometimes agree with them. The way people oppose to expository style is far different from that of satire. It is because this style gives straightforward opinion. Even though the writers are criticizing, they will not describe using extreme sarcastic views to offend the readers. For example Fallows thinks that Hillary Clinton’s throw was bad so he said “She was in the middle of an action that can only be described as throwing like a girl” (Fallows 416). He did not go far and make fun of it. But in my satirical views I went on further to describe not only how bad she was but also talking about how and why she was bad by saying “Her dressing style showed her stupidity…to be wearing a scarf and oversized Cubs hat while throwing a ball”.

If the two styles are compared than satire is better and more interesting way to write. Satire has sarcastic and dramatic view so it is used mostly to write on politics, social and human issues. Besides just criticizing it expands and brings the interest of readers on certain topic. For instance political cartoons make fun of government on one hand but on the other hand the public is being made aware by the sarcastic information. Instead of understanding in long boring way, the cartoons, short and funny notes creates interest making the reader read it. It will relay most information by giving strong points to justify with support. Being funny and writing differently wide range of audiences can be involved. The reader is never confused when reading a satire paper because during the entire paper there is only one argument which is backed up strongly with harsh sentences.

Both satirical and expository views are informational and could be written with same purpose. But the satirical writing might seem more extreme as it not only gives opinions but also goes further describing and making fun of it grabbing the reader’s attention instantly. So, I feel like using satire is a good way to approach a point because it not only makes the reader argue but at the same time the writer is not necessarily
agreeing with the points he is making. He is trying to bring up a point so the readers can discuss and think carefully about it again and again.
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Tom Brady, quarterback of the New England Patriots, passes an incomplete shot right to 83-Wes Welker. He then passes a short left to Kevin Faulk of New York Giants for 14 yards. Tom Brady passes a short right to 81-Randy Moss for 6 yards, TOUCHDOWN! It was an intense and aggressive event. An event that only a man could take part in.

It is obvious that football, like all sports, is a sport to be played only by men. There are absolutely no women in the National Football League and any women who have been lucky enough to be chosen to play on a college or high school football team, were chosen because they played extremely well, but not better than any man of course. Women are way too self conscious and emotional to be athletes. Their bodies are not designed to take part in such an intense activity. They probably would never even be able to get in the game because their high progesterone and estrogen levels would keep them complaining about cramps and bloating. They don’t have enough testosterone to gain the abs, biceps, and triceps that they need to play football the right way. Football games would always start late from waiting five hours for the female players to get ready. They would spend hours in the mirror making sure their hair isn’t too frizzy or their love handles aren’t too flabby. When ten hours pass and they finally begin playing the game, one million and one complaints would arise. They would all worry about breaking their seventy dollar tips or sweating out their new perms. They would moan and groan after the slightest push knocks them to the ground, complaining that guys play too rough. I doubt that they even fully understand how the game of football is played. You can’t even watch a football game in peace without hearing a woman ask one million and one questions.

“What’s a foul?” “Oh my goodness! That guy just tackled the poor lad to the ground. Why won’t someone help him?” Those are just some of the countless interruptions you will hear from a woman while trying to watch a game in peace. Women need to wake up and learn that playing sports is just not their thing and no matter what, they will never play better than any man.
A smart woman is one who knows her place in society, not one who keeps telling herself that she can accomplish tasks in which everyone knows she clearly cannot. Women were not created to be athletes. They need to stick to the cooking, cleaning, and grocery shopping, tasks that they are actually good at. It is a woman’s job to make sure her man’s meal is ready, the house is clean, and the refrigerator is stocked by the time her husband gets home. The only way women can contribute to athletic success is by giving a male player a good back massage after his hard day at work. The surplus of testosterone that men have and women lack prevents a woman from having the mental and physical strength that she needs to get in the game. If they sit around and sob in front of the television after learning that Johnny killed himself after Lisa dumped him in the two o’clock soap opera, then how are they supposed to be strong enough to sustain the aggressive aspects of sports? Women need to stay at home having their tea parties and book club discussions so that they can let a man do his job the right way.
“On Dumpster Diving” by Lars Eighner was a very unique and intriguing story. Before reading the story by Eighner, my first impression was viewed from a vague prospective. The ignorance that people do not understand concerning his life may interrogate the right of who is more ethical, the accuser or Eighner. After reading Eighner’s story, his words refined my knowledge on dumpster diving and its employees. I thought the topic of dumpster diving was an awful choice for any author to write about, especially if the author partakes in the subject. While reading, I was considering that Eighner was a moronic individual because he was a dumpster diving but has a tremendous strength in expository writing. However, I became enlightened. Eighner’s life was not a waste and has inspired me on a hidden level of comprehension. Lars Eighner wrote intelligently in his story and expressed his profession like an expert. I believe that Eighner has defended dumpster divers, also known as scavengers, in an explicit way. However, at the same time, Eighner made it seem that he put himself higher than the other scavengers as if his methods of dumpster diving were more justifiable.

In the story, Eighner looked down upon can scroungers because they would accumulate cans for their own personal needs. According to Eighner, most can scroungers spend their money received from selling cans to purchase drugs or alcoholic beverages constructing a wasteful method to survive. Eighner prefers to use the term “scavenging” but uses the word “scrounging” when he means to be obscure (379). These can scroungers are greedy and must “have little cash” for their own personal needs (385). They do not care much for their well-being and is “living for the moment” rather than their future, which is vital to their lives considering the narrowed options that are open to them. Also, Eighner has found significant products and “lost treasure” that may have lead to his success as a writer and dumpster diver. While scavenging, he discovered many student-applicable items such as graded papers, good books, and magazines. Surprisingly, Eighner was “horrified to discover the kind of paper which now merits an A in an undergraduate course.
Although he exercises intellectually while scavenging, he learns and experiences from the world outside of dumpster diving.

Eighner is a successful dumpster diver because he does not waste his time on transient materials. The value of an item a diver finds does not compare to the highest potential of value to someone else who had lost or thrown it away. For example, a ring found in a dumpster may not have a “special” value to a diver because the history of the ring has its own story. The diver may only adore the ring for its “obvious structure” and the convenient moment of the diver’s life. My definition of the American Dream is to leave a legacy and become a successful person by overcoming hardships and obstacles delivered to an individual. Eighner has overcome many challenges and obstacles and still continues to pursue this American Dream.

**Work Cited**

In “Throwing like a Girl” by James Fallows, writes about why girls throw the way they do. According to Fallows, girls’ “throwing like girls” is true because they haven’t had as much physical activities as the boys have had during their earlier years of childhood. I disagree with his argument; girls throw “like a girl” because about 95 percent of girls don’t have the time to practice how to throw a baseball the right way because girls have the household physical activities that they have to be capable of to do their assigned job, a housewife. At a young age girls should be learning how, or already doing, their household duties around their parents’ house.

After school everyday, mothers of young girls should not allow the girls to play outside because they will be wasting time practicing things that are not important to what their purpose in life is. The purpose in life for a young lady is to be a housewife. Being a housewife is the best career that any women could ask for. As a housewife you should be able to cook, clean and bear children but there are also some other aspects like being at home and knowing what your schedule is going to be like until you die. Knowing your schedule is so exciting; you will never forget to do anything on the list. Bored? Is that even a word in the English language? Well at least not for the average housewife. The average woman will never get bored of the routine that she does daily. Routine requires a lot of thinking and trying to figure out how to plan the daily’s activities, so that their day could be perfection. This will not get them tired of doing the same because you know what to expect and will not have to deal with any stupid surprises. Playing a sport might affect the image of a housewife. Housewife are supposed to be dainty little people not rough and hard like people who play sports.

Once a girl learns how to bathe herself, they should be able to start training to be a house wife, so that by the age of sixteen they are able to get married, settle down with a wonderful husband that is continuing his education so that he can support his family. During the first year of marriage the wife should just be perfecting her household skills, help her husband with his studies in school, and rest up to bear a child for nine months in her womb.
Giving birth is the most important job for a housewife because of her ability to produce the offspring so that the family generation can continue on the earth. Without offspring, the earth would end because there would be no one to live on it, taking care of the green trees, and to recycle without women producing children. The womb has to be capable of holding a child, so that they are able to give birth to a healthy child and to give birth a natural way. Having a womb that is able to give birth to multiple healthy children requires a lot of hard work and practices, and exercises to get it the womb to the point where it is able to give birth; it’s not like throwing a silly ball which helps you accomplish nothing in life or even teach you any life skills or life lessons; like if you put hard work into something it will pay off.

Cooking and cleaning are also a major part of a housewife is job, don’t you look forward to cooking for the family every day, three times a day over a hot burning stove and oven? Cooking requires someone to be intelligent and also physically active because you have to be able to read use your brain to measurements right, not everyone is capable of pouring milk or sugar to the line measuring cup and also they have be strong enough to lift all of the pots that are as heavy as an elephant, and pans that women cook with. When doing that you are using a lot of muscles in your arm because it so heavy to lift. Cleaning is also physical activity because it working all the muscles groups to brush that heavy mop and broom back and forth across the floor to try and get the house like as if it came straight out of a magazine or movie.

Why wouldn’t you love to do this plus wait on your children and husband, hand and foot? The best part of a woman’s life is to be enslaved after the age of 16; that’s the age that all the fun times should begin when you start with the cooking, cleaning, and bearing the children.

I honestly do not believe that women only propose in life to be a housewife, (birthing the child, cooking, cleaning) that takes care on only responsibilities and physically actives that come with being a housewife. Women could do anything that they put their mind to and if that is throwing a ball, they will be able to do that with a little practice and determination. Their only physically activities do not have to be thing related only to housework unless they want it to be. The housewife role is not a boring role to play; some things are not right for certain people. That is why people have to find what they are passionate about work with that.
II. Analysis

When writing essays, short stories, and poems there are various genres that one may use to express their ideas on paper, along with getting their argument across to the reader. A number of good authors write in either satirical or expository styles. Satirical writing is often used to counter an argument that has already been made, but countering it in comical way. Unlike satirical writing, expository writing is a very direct to the argument that the author is trying to formulate. Readers may be drawn more to the style of satire writing because it is exceptionally comical, however it could be incredibly confusing because the argument may be indirect. These two facts it should persuade writers to write in expository style. Readers should read more expository writing because it is easier to comprehend the concept of their argument.

Satire may be puzzling because of the style that it is written in. Though it can be very comical, having a great deal of sarcasm can be baffling if not used correctly because it could be easily mistaken for the truth. Jonathan Swift has written his essay “The Modest Proposal “ in the satirical writing style; this essay is a very good example of how satire can be mistaken for the truth when used in the right technique because his idea of eating children to cure poverty in Ireland is so extreme that it is almost believable. The concept of eating children in Ireland to alleviate the poverty is incredibly ridiculous because no one would sacrifice their children and sell them for rent money; so that the person that bought children could eat them or even the parents eat themselves for dinner. An example of a sentence that is so sarcastic from the essay is on page 829: “A child will make two dishes at an them plump and fat for friends; and when the family dines alone, the force and hind quarter will make a reasonable dish, and seasoned with a little pepper or salt will be very good boiled on the fourth day, especially in winter” (Swift 829). This sentence is so ridiculous; people would never do this to their children. This is why his essay is an excellent example of satire; however this style of writing does not work for all writers.

An example of this writing style, which was not very affective, was my own essay. I have recently written a satire that counters the argument of James Fallows essay “Throwing like a Girl”. Fallow’s argument in this essay is that people are not born knowing how to do things; it takes practices, and ambition that is the reason stated why girls “throw like girls”. My counter argument of why girls “throw like girls” is because they
do not have time to learn that kind of physically activity because they are too busy learning how to be good	housewives; that is the role that women should play. I do not think my essay was sarcastic enough like Swift’s
was for people to perceive the style of writing and my argument that I was after, which is a satire. But yet it
still was fetched enough that it is unbelievable. The fifth paragraph of my essay talks about cooking and
cleaning; that paragraph has the least sarcasm. That paragraph probably will confuse the readers, causing
them to think that being a housewives is the reason why girls “throw like girls” and also that all girls should
be housewives. “Cooking requires someone to be every intelligent and also physically active because you have
to be able to read measurements right, and also be strong enough to lift all of the heavy pots and pans that
women cook with”--this sentence came from the fifth paragraph of my essay “The Prefect Housewife.” The
reader could possibly think that I was not being sarcastic in this part and take my words for being serious,
especially because of my word choice.

For that exact reason expository writing is more efficient. All writers should perhaps write in the
expository style so that it is apparent to the reader what the argument may be in their piece of literature. In
expository there are no gray areas, meaning that the author’s ideas are clear enough so that you understand
what the author is arguing. An exceedingly great essay “Throwing like a Girl” written by James Fallows is a
tremendously well written expository essay because his argument is clear, throwing a ball well is not a gender
thing because guys spent “time learning at some point long ago” (Fallows 420) . There were various
arguments that were obvious to the reader that supported the thesis. In addition to expository writing being
clear it is also relays more information than a satire would because when writing a satire I think that the
author might be concentrating a lot on the sarcasm piece forgetting about the details about the argument.

In writing it is very important to keep the reader interested in the piece of literature that you have
written but it is also important that you are getting your argument across to them. Satire is very appealing and
entertaining to readers but it can also be very bewildering. When writing a piece of literature it very important
to understand that a reader has to be able to understand what you are arguing. Even though expository
writing may not always be as comical as satire it is a very effective writing style. It gets the point across to the
reader that you are trying to make and might possibly persuade them to agree with your argument more because they are able to comprehend the argument.
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VERA YIGLE

I. We are So Better Than This: A Satire

It is a poignant idea to those in our society who think that women are lethargic just because they do not have time for sports. You will hear people say to their peers that women are weak and do not like failure. This is true sometimes because we are perfectionists unlike many men who rush through everything and are rough. James Fallows says: “The answer to the question cannot be anything quite as simple as, because they are girls” (417) but his tone in this quote shows the reader that women do not just throw “wrongly” because they are women but because they have reasons to do it that way. Those reasons are far more important than throwing a ball and are the following: taking care of their children, catering to their husband’s needs and besides, no men wants a woman who smells bad and has bruises on her body. She becomes unattractive and she is considered a “tomboy” which is not acceptable because women are delicate creatures who are not aggressive, but sensible and caring. Women are fragile individuals who take no pleasure in hurting or getting hurt by others so they do not like to get “down and dirty.”

As women transition from girlhood into adulthood, they have priorities which are way more rewarding than learning how to throw a ridiculous ball. First and foremost, they have to take care of their children and provide them with a great education so that they do not end up thieves or beggars because women need to keep an eye on their children, those bastards. The education provided by mothers is the most reliable. A mother knows what is best for her child, so she can provide him/her with physical help (teaching him/her how to behave in society. If it is a girl, teaching her how to be respectable and act like a woman which include putting on deodorant, smelling good and looking good at all time), mentally by mentoring her children and having daily conversations with them whenever they have problems. This will help decrease the amount of domestic violence and help men be more understanding of their spouses because they will see how soft and hardworking their wives are by trying to raise their children in a fantastic way.

Women are sensitive and do not have time for sports but instead, they save their precious time to cater to their husband’s needs and save their floating marriages. It is a smart idea to cater to those cowards’
women called husbands because that way, they would care more for their spouses by showing their love and affection. Having more time to stay at home will benefit women because they can spend more time with their husbands and avoid being beaten up. They have the ability to produce babies who would not end up being neither jerks nor cowards but follow the example provided by their father and become respectable men. By staying more at home, women would not get beat up by their cowards because they spend most of their time satisfying their husband’s need whether they are sexual, mental (men are not going to be bored but have someone to talk to) or even pleasing them by being there when they call, making the house look nice and cooking great meals. A way to a man’s heart is through his stomach so if a woman accomplishes all of these things, there is no need to worry about her husband cheating on her. If you think about it, he has all the satisfactions in the world at home and does not need to be going around and put his marriage at risk, which is not a good thing at all.

When women have more time for their coward husbands and stay more at home, it benefits them as well because a husband can improve his wife’s image in front of others; the woman would not be classified as a “slut” because she is always at home and her husband knows what she is up to. Real women know how to take care of a household but sluts have no time for it and they just cannot focus on one man because they are too busy sleeping and going around to random men. For all men out there who think that women “throw like girls” and that the idea of throwing like a girl is bad or wrong, they need to ask themselves these questions: Do they really want a woman who “throws like a girl” because she has to stay home and support her family or do they want a boyish girl who throws like a man but does not even know how to stew chicken or rice or anything else? The answer to that question is that men want women who can cook because since they are beasts who eat too much and always have sexual drives, they need a woman available for them all day so that they may be satisfied.

II. The Different Use of Satire

Is the expository or the satirical writing style the most important style of writing? Which one is the most effective? In James Fallows’ “Throwing like a Girl,” which is an example of the expository style, the tone was sincere and straight to the point with evidence to back up his argument, while Jonathan Swift’s “A
Modest Proposal” was more satirical because he is trying to make a point by being sarcastic. But if the audience doesn’t understand the meaning behind the satire, they might perceive Swift’s message of eating babies literally. The expository approach is the most effective because it goes straight to the point whereas the satirical approach leaves the reader confused while trying to figure out if the writer is serious or not. Because the expository approach is not confusing, it allows the reader to receive the writer’s message because if the message is not clear, people would not understand the deeper meaning of the satire.

James Fallows uses the expository approach to make his message clear. Even though his thesis statement comes up later in the text, he says: “A successful throw involves an intricate series of actions coordinated among muscle groups…Like bike riding or skating…Everyone has to learn” (Fallows 419). The tone of this quote is understandable and it clearly illustrates how Fallows wants the reader to understand the point he is making (throwing is a learned experience just like any other activities). Jonathan Swift on the other hand uses the satirical approach that is not clear. He says: “I have been assured by a very knowing American of my acquaintance in London, that a young healthy child well nursed is at a year old a most delicious…and I make no doubt that it will equally serve in a fricassee or a ragout” (827). The tone in Swift’s satire is more complex because he is using sarcasm to make the reader understand the point but the diction “delicious” is too vivid and is not funny. In the contrary, it is disgusting because a normal person is not going to think about eating a child or make jokes about it. Swift’s tone was confusing in this quote because he did not pay attention to his audience and everyone has a different understanding of things and some people might not understand the deeper meaning of this satire. Swift and I have the same style because when I said: “First and foremost, they have to take care of their children and provide them with a great education so that they do not end up thieves or beggars because women need to keep an eye on their children, those bastards” the tone of the quote has a deeper meaning to it. People do not think of children as being bastards and some readers might not understand the real meaning of the quote and might become aggravated by it and draw bad conclusions.

Throughout history, women have always been seen as been caring and delicate human being. It is almost hard to believe the reasons why people accuse them of “throwing like girls”; they obviously are girls
but they do not just have the time to learn how to throw. Decisions need to be made on whether women should stop being housewives and start learning how to throw because it is a learned experience. It is up to the hungry beast to choose: Do you want a woman who is classy and knows how to take care of her man? Or do you want a woman who will spend their time learning how to throw and not pay attention to you at all?
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