

M1 protest: the worst
enemy is the cynics



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

In the article 'M1 protest: the worst enemy is the cynics' Vivek Subramanian of Glen Waverly, Vic, an M1 protestor, argues in an accepting and intellectual, subdued manner in favour of the protestors. She believes that the 'wild' protestors have a valid point that is missed by many cynical people. Subramanian is upset that someone such as Imre Saluszsky ("Protesting by numbers", Opinion, 30/4), a coherent and learned person has missed the point of campaigns such as M1 or S11.

Without creating a heated argument she kindly accepts that she has been stereotyped as one of those "crazy kids", as mentioned by Saluszsky. Subramanian subverts the label by highlighting and accepting that a learned person such as Imre Saluszsky has labelled them "crazy kids". With a well-structured and strong argument about the issue she leads us to believe that the protestors do have a valid point of view, they're not just the "crazy kids" they're made out to be.

Further Subramanian believes that such a professional person such as Saluszsky has missed the point of campaigns such as M1 or S11, and is being highly cynical towards those who are honestly trying to make the world a better place. By singling out Saluszsky and addressing that she has missed the point of these protests makes us agree with Subramanian. If we're told that professionals among others are off track with their view on the M1 protest then we are going to believe a more supported view such as the one of Vivek Subramanian, one of those "crazy kids".

Similarly she states that the protestors have only turned violent when provoked. In saying this she wants the audience to realise that the only

reason the protestors sometimes turn violent is because no one is doing anything about their concerns. This creates a negative attitude towards the cynical people and a warm attitude towards the people who are trying to improve the world.

In contrast people such as Imre Saluszsky hold a different perspective on the matter. The article 'Protesting by numbers', Imre Saluszsky, Opinion, 30/4, provides a different attitude towards the M1 protestors. Imre Saluszsky believes that these protestors haven't got a good understanding of what they're protesting about. We can see her negative and almost cynical attitude from the start. She uses generalisation by saying 'dark grey suits will be replaced in the CBDs of our capital cities by even sillier-looking colourful woolly hats. This creates a stereotypical image of the non-educated, hippy protestor. By saying this it makes us believe that all the protestors are ranting and raving hippies with the intention of causing trouble. With this image in our minds we are obviously going to agree with Saluszsky.

This form of generalisation is re-enforced by using the term 'crazy kids'. Saluszsky leads us to believe that all the M1 protestors are a bunch of hoo haas protesting for the sake of it. If we believe that all of the protestors are 'crazy' then obviously we are not going to listen or agree with them. This makes us feel negative towards them and also disapproving towards their actions.

Further she includes humour into her article as a form of mockery. 'D25: Blockade of chimneys of the world, to prevent ingress by the imperialist

lackey Santa Claus. Rationale: to protest against the commercialisation of Christmas'. By including this she is lowering the respect for the protestors. She's making a mockery of the protestors, which makes them look stupid and ignorant, which is what we are going to believe. If we are laughing about all of this then it's going to be hard to agree with the protestors.

In conclusion of analysing both of these articles I thought that Vivek Subramanian's argument was more effective. After receiving a highly negative view produced by Salusinzsky she constructed an argument, which was presented in a subdued manor, as well as being very persuasive. Although there were not many persuasive elements, the ones she constructed such as subverting the label 'crazy kids' were done effectively and persuaded me to agree with her.

On the other hand the article written by Imre Salusinzsky also contained some effective elements but wasn't as strong as Subramanian's. Her use of generalisation created this illusion of these 'crazy kids', which worked quite well in trying to create a negative attitude towards the protestors.