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Reading 1: Using the assigned reading from Rowlandson, and then EITHER the assigned reading by Columbus OR Cabeza de Vaca, discuss the tone and the purpose of each piece. Which piece best fulfills its purpose? Why? How does the first person narrative form help the purpose?   
Rowlandson’s approach was more formal and less direct. The narration appeared less personal as compared to how Columbus made his letter, although both authors were telling the story of what transpired base on personal experience. The content of the reading was pure of emotions—fear, anger, rage, pride, remorse. However, from a reader’s perspective because the presentation was rather too formal the emotions seemed to fly along the words after they have been uttered or read.   
On the contrary, Columbus’ letter was more cheerful and festive. The words that were used were less formal. It was more conversant than Rowlandson's. The author was also very visual graphic as far as narrating goes. In fact, in one incident the Columbus even quoted what he heard from the locals, “ Come, come! See the men from the heavens.” Columbus did not only settle to use one of the five senses when he was writing his letter to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella. Instead, Columbus tried to incorporate as many of the senses in his pursuit to inform the people he was telling his story to about the that he had in his voyage.   
2. Franklin and Red Jacket both support and defend the Native Americans. What arguments do they make in common? What prompted the writing of each piece? Do you find both authors reliable? Why or why not?   
Both Benjamin Franklin and Red Jacket share common arguments in reference to the Native American’s religion. Both leaders defended the native’s religion as something that they both think is a right that should never be taken away from the Native Americans. From reading the entire article of both authors, it appeared that the purpose of each article was to give the Natives the impression that their best interest are still being protected amidst the pursuit to merge them with the whites. On Franklin’s side, it appears as though it was a persuasive pursuit to convince the natives that they were their ally whose intention is only to get on the best side of the people he wanted to lure into agree with him. This is because he wanted something out of them, and that was to earn their trust. Franklin knew that the natives were very sensitive, and religion and their spirituality matters to them.   
On the other hand, Red Jacket was defending religion because according to him it represents the Native Americans and their tradition. This is only thing that is left of them when everything is taken away. Red jacket was the Native’s leader and as a leader he has a duty to safeguard the interest of his people with the outmost sincerity.   
In terms of sincerity, Franklin’s intention might not be as credible as Red Jacket. It is because Franklin was a representative of the American or a “ white." That alone cast a little shadow of the doubt in the sincerity of his intentions. On the other hand, Red Jack being Indian himself is most credible because he also believes in the tradition that he intends to defend at all cost.   
3. Thomas Paine's Common Sense is an argumentative essay. What argument is Paine making? How does he structure his argument? What do YOU think is his most persuasive point and why?   
Thomas Paine was making an argument that the society is the reason government is formed. According to Paine, the government is a product a society in pursuit of trying to establish order and structure. The government is created by man. Thus, it is plausible. Constantly is needing amendments and changes because it needs to adapt to the demands of time.   
Paine further argue that is the social order is necessary, people would simply need to meet. Those people who share the common interest and goal would work together to try and find order. Whoever is deemed the most influential would automatically get appointed. The order of the government is to ensure that the best interest of the society and the people is protected and secured.   
However, Paine suggests “ society in every state is a blessing, but a government even in its best state is but a necessary evil in its worst state an intolerable one (Paine, 2003)." The point into this argument is that while everyone aims to create a sense of order in society, man’s selfish vested interest and their desire for power gets too overwhelming to control them. It is the reason the society falls prey into the evils of the institution because the leaders appointed into power are unable to maintain the integrity of the institution that it was created.   
The government should at all time represent the people’s best interest. However, when greed and corruption reigns no matter how many laws are enacted people in power can always find ways and means to manipulate the system in order to serve and protect a limited few.