

Rhetorical Analysis Essay of Kevin Williamson's work

Posted on November 9, 2024

Analyzing the perspectives of different authors on aligned and similar topics may lead to an intensive debate. Various authors have distinct notions and viewpoints on the same subject matter in a different way, while some authors may present similar perspectives on identical and same topics. In this context, it is quite difficult to decide whose work is more persuasive and significant. For example, the viewpoints of two authors, Kevin Williamson and Pierre Atlas, are distinct from each other on the subject of gun control and gun culture in American society. Kevin Williamson provides concrete and comprehensive arguments against gun control and declares it a delusion. On the other hand, Atlas associates American gun culture with roots and the basis of need. However, this piece of writing will provide a rhetorical analysis by exploring the fact that Kevin Williamson's work is more persuasive because of raises concrete questions, propagates sympathetic emotional connectivity to the reader, presents logical reasoning and statistical data, advocates the prevention of crimes, incorporates ethos and enhanced credibility.

As far as Kevin Williamson's viewpoint is concerned, he challenges the idea of gun control and raises concrete questions about the effectiveness and logic of restriction. In this context, he provides multiple arguments in the form of different rhetorical strategies. His perspective and notions consider gun control as a delusion. As he raises question about law-abiding and possession of arms to persuade the reader about his viewpoints. Similarly, he creates an emotional connection with the readers and the respective audience. He uses pathos to appeal to personal anecdotes regarding those individuals who need guns for personal safety and protection against any harm. Meanwhile, numerous stories of the past about gun usage for self-defence and personal protection provide sympathetic emotions. He incorporates historical stories in such a manner to attract emotional attention. It ultimately evokes a strong emotional alliance with individuals which finally strengthens his perception against gun control. In addition, Williamson engages various logos in the form of logical reasoning and statistical data. His arguments become more solid and appealing in this way. Through such facts, he proves that gun control only limits law-abiding individuals to use weapons and does not probe the primary causes of violence in society (Solnit).

Further, he elaborates on the usage of guns to protect innocent lives and prevent crimes. In other words, he nullifies the assumption of effective solution associated with gun control. His usage of logos appeals to the rational approach of the reader and increases his arguments' credibility. Finally, Williamson integrates philosophy and ethos in his arguments by declaring himself an authority on the subject matter by providing legal frameworks and historical contexts. These speculative arguments enhance the trust of audience and prove him a knowledgeable commentator on the matter under discussion with upgraded credibility.

On the other hand, the viewpoints of Pierre Atlas are less persuasive due to several reasons. For example, he considers the romantic concept of self-defence as the basis of the current gun adoptability culture among the public. Such romance and the contemporary practical demands of society are somewhat different to each other. He argues that the root causes of American gun culture lie with false notions and concepts that are aligned with frontier mythology. To convey his arguments in this context, he uses multiple rhetorical strategies. In first instance, he employs logos regarding historical evidences where his counter-partners label the frontier as a lawless society. He provokes a rational approach through legal records and court cases to prove the characteristics of that era. The unlimited gun rights were not crucial according to these records. Such factual data and argumentation urges the reader to reconsider the wrongly perceived notions about historical evidence of gun control (Atlas). On the other hand, he fails to appeal to the reader's mind because his work loses the type of comprehensiveness that inspires and urges the reader to believe the notions. In addition, Atlas demonstrates a comprehensive analysis based on expert opinion and works of researchers. The references to historians and scholars strengthen the credibility of his arguments and declare him an authority on the topic. Undoubtedly, His analysis appeals to the reader to trust his perspective and analysis but is not as persuasive as Williamson's work displays.

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that both Kevin Williamson and Pierre Atlas have given distinct perspectives through their articles on gun control and American gun culture. But Williamson has a more persuasive tone and his usage of emotional anecdotes in the arguments is a strategy that appeals to the readers. However, Atlas challenges gun restriction through historical data but his tone and way of argumentation are somewhat of low persuasive and convincing. Overall, both the writers have made the readers well aware of gun control and American gun culture through their arguments.

Work Cited

Atlas, Pierre M. "Frontier violence and law and order: Historical and geographical variance in the great plains of the North American West." *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 57 (2020): 3-26.

Solnit, Rebecca. *Whose Story is This?: Old Conflicts, New Chapters*. Haymarket Books+ ORM, 2019.