2009 Question 2: Rhetorical Analysis (Wilson Satire)

Student Sample: 2A (2 ¼ pages handwritten)

If all that was said on earth was interpreted by those who hear it as literal and exact, so much would be misunderstood and misconstrued. In his book *The Future of Life*, Edward O. Wilson illustrates the unproductive manner of environmentalist and people-first debates by highlighting their ironic parallels and similar techniques throughout his satirical works.

One of the most overarching points made is the way both sides use highly-strung and emotional appeals rather than statistically, scientifically or logically-based arguments. This sue of pathos comes bluntly across in his diction as he calls out names on both sides, calling environmentalists “greens, enviros, environmental extremists, environmental wackos” and then on the opposing side calling people-first advocates “brown lashers, wise users, and sagebrush rebels.” Side-by-side as in his book, such name-calling is stressed as childish, insignificant, and above all—unconstructive. He moves on to claim in one peice [sic] that the people-first advocates want “unrestrained capitalism with land development über allies” and then that the “environmental wackos” only want “power” and to “expand the government, especially the federal government.” Again, such diction—especially the fascist Nazi reference of “über allies,” meaning “above all else”– is both illegitimate and juvenile—a point now clearly made by Wilson of the two groups. Childish discussion is nearly by definition unproductive.

 Besides simple diction and syntactical similarity and unproductivity, Wilson also utilizes a general pointing out of subjectively-based hypothetical thinking on both sides of the issue. When a citizen “relaxes [their] guard” when “these people” (referring to the environmentalists) are in power, their “property rights will go down the tube.” Wilson includes no relevance to true environmentalist marketing, nor any appeal to merited objectivity—a feature seen throughout arguments against environmentalists. He uses the exact same tactic on the other side to illustrate the back-and-forth nature of the argument without backing. He states that people-first advocates’ idea of conservation is “planting trees around a golf course”—again, no backing. No quotes. No substance—just the truth about how environmentalists argue. These traits standing alone would provide little impact, but Wilson puts the peices [sic] together writing opposing arguments ironically similar, for a strong impact on the reader, pointing out what was there the whole time.

 There are many times we don’t see what is right in front of us. Edward O. Wilson takes the arguments of people-first and environmental advocates to the extreme, and puts them together to show the unproductive arguments and diction they share. He points out what was always true.

2009 Question 2: Rhetorical Analysis (Wilson Satire)

Student Sample: 2B (1 ¾ pages handwritten)

 Sadly, it often seems like many conflicts in the world will never be resolved due to polarized political parties and political agendas. One of the best examples of this is the debate over the validity of global warming and environmentalism. In *The Future of Life*, a book by Edward O. Wilson, Wilson satirizes the language of environmentalists and people-first supporters to critique the way Americans have let politics pervade non-political issues.

 In both passages, Wilson’s satirical language emphasizes the pathetically unproductive nature of debates on the environment due to the polarization of the two factions. In the part “written” by the people-first critic, the critic refers to the environmentalists as “wackos” (4). He also claims that the environmentalists have a “hidden agenda that always comes from the left, usually the far left” (7-9) and that their only goals is to “get power” (9). These three ridiculously outlandish and satiric language [sic] is usually only heard on Fox News or Rush Limbaugh, and not believed by any moderate thinker. Wilson, though overdramatically, does express some of the fears of the far right about the left-led conservationist movement, which is why the satire is so effective. Similarly, Wilson expresses frustration felt by environmentalists toward the right wing’s efforts to thwart conservationism through more satirical language. The environmentalist “writer” of the critique classifies the right wing as “anti-environmentalists” (39). In the real world, through many people have reservations about major environmental changes being enacted, very few, if any, people are against protecting the environments. The author then uses the fish stocking and golf course examples in lines 51-52 to make a satirical point about the ingenuity of their conservation efforts. These two satirical passages definitely show an overdramatized version of the fears each group has about the other.

 Wilson, through his satirical language, provides the reader with insights into the minds of the most radical members of each group. The most evident characteristics of these passages are that they cleverly show the complete distrust of and disrespect for each other. Therefore, in showing this lack of trust and respect, Wilson succeeds in displaying the futility of discussions between the groups through satire.

2009 Question 2: Rhetorical Analysis (Wilson Satire)

Student Sample: 2C (2 ¼ pages handwritten)

 Since the two-party system was created, there was much banter and arguing back and forth. The Democrats or liberals or environmentalists versus the Republicans or conservatives or anti-environmentalists is always a close battle, showing how split our country is today. In Wilson’s The Future of Life, Wilson satirizes the typical language that both sides would use against the other. By the end, both sides sound ridiculous and neither is effective for their cause.

 Both sides are constantly calling the other side names, sounding immature and tasteless. This form of rhetoric is ineffective because it shows that they are stooping down to each other’s level. It is as if they are in elementary school, calling each other names to feel superior and bullying them with hurtful quips. This stereotyping makes their followers truly associate what they are saying with the kind of people the opposite side consists of, without actually meeting them or getting to know them. It is a form of propaganda which dehumanizes the other side, making it easier to defame them without guilt.

 Both sides of the argument are very sure of themselves and sure that the other side is wrong. Given, the two parties usually split on environmental issues, the amount of argumentativeness makes them seem nasty and cruel. They both try to appeal to their followers and try to woo those who have been taken advantage of by the government or if they are in an unfortunate circumstance. Since both sides blame the other side for people’s misfortunes, people probably do not know which party is telling the truth or merely pandering for their vote. Both sides feel that they are not getting the attention they deserve, especially the environmentalists who claim that their issues are not brought up in the meetings or big conferences.

 The combination of complaining, name-calling, stereotyping, and blaming is immature and lacking respect. Who knew such educated people could stoop so low and who knew that their rhetoric, at its base, was so similar. [sic] Their view points [sic] are at opposite ends of the spectrum but their diction is so similar and very unattractive as well as completely ineffective.

Overview:

 This question asked students to read and analyze two passages taken from biologist Edward O. Wilson’s book *The Future of Life* in which he satirizes the language of two diametrically opposed political factions. Students had to write an essay analyzing how Wilson’s satire illustrates the unproductive nature of these discussions.

Sample: 2A (Score: 8)

This essay **effectively** analyzes two passages illustrating opposing attitudes toward environmentalism from Edward O. Wilson’s *The Future of Life*. The essay demonstrates a **clear understanding** of satire, the two passages, and Wilson’s purpose in setting the passages side by side; the student points out that “Wilson takes the arguments of people-first and environmental advocates to the extreme**.”** The essay focuses on the **“ironic parallels and similar techniques” of the passages, pointing out that both sides use “emotional appeals rather than statistically, scientifically, or logically-based argument.”** In its evolving comparative analysis, the essay acknowledges the **significance of tone** and is organized around Wilson’s strategies. The discussion of the **effects of diction is good (“name-calling is stressed as childish, insignificant, and above all—unconstructive” and “Childish discussion is nearly by definition unproductive”)**. The essay also comments on the “**subjectively-based hypothetical thinking” that characterizes the language of both groups**. The analysis is supported by well-chosen references to the texts. The student demonstrates understanding of how the satire develops, how the passages work together, and how the language of the two groups hinders discussion and possible resolution of differences. The prose style is mature, with a solid command of language.

Sample: 2B (Score: 6)

The essay provides an **adequate** explanation of Wilson’s satire. The **introductory paragraph is promising**, putting Wilson’s paired passages on environmentalism in the context of conflicts that “will never be resolved due to polarized political parties and political agendas.” **The use of quotation marks (“In the part ‘written’ by the people-first critic” and “The environmentalist ‘writer’ of the critique”) indicates that the student is aware of Wilson’s attempt to convey the arguments and language of the opposing groups in the two passages, not his own more reasoned position** (weaker responses did not always notice this distinction). The student is **sensitive to tone**, pointing out examples of “**ridiculously outlandish and satiric language** . . . not believed by any moderate thinker” and noting that the satire is effective because it shows “an **overdramatized version of the fears** each group has” about the opposing group. The essay concludes by arguing that because the language used by each group indicates complete “lack of trust and respect” for the opposing group, **discussions between the two are bound to be futile**. While not as full an analysis as that provided in higher-scoring essays, this response offers a clear and focused discussion. The prose style is lucid and conveys the student’s ideas adequately.

Sample: 2C (Score: 4)

Although the **introductory paragraph of this essay suggests an understanding** of Wilson’s satire (“both sides sound ridiculous and neither is effective for their cause”), the **development** of the analysis is **inadequate**. The essay attempts to examine the rhetoric of the two passages, **identifying name-calling, stereotyping, and blaming as strategies and paying some attention to tone**. However, the analysis is limited and is not supported by specific examples from the passages. At times (particularly in the third paragraph), the response lacks focus and becomes **vague**. The prose conveys the student’s ideas but sometimes lacks precision (“This stereotyping makes their followers truly associate what they are saying with the kind of people the opposite side consists of”).