

Do we have the courage to stop this? essay sample

[Sociology](#), [Violence](#)



It is thought to be a human right for citizens to bear arms, but how do we control gun violence? Nicholas D. Kristof's article "Do We Have the Courage to Stop This?" explains current complications having to do with gun regulations in the United States. Kristof focuses on school shootings and the high percentage in which they occur nationwide. Kristof making it clear that society seems to turn their heads away from the idea of regulating guns. Attempting to persuade his audience, Kristof utilizes a number of rhetorical strategies to effectively capture the audiences attention and persuade them into taking a positive stance on his beliefs. Initially Kristof fails to present sufficient and credible support, which is needed to support his opinion and create an appealing argument. On the one, hand Kristof used rhetorical strategies that allowed the audience to feel connected and understand the issue; one the other hand but he lacked support disallowing a strong and effective argument. Kristof utilizes multiple rhetorical strategies to persuade his audience. Throughout the article he uses words like "we", "our", and "you" allowing a personal connection to the audience, reinforcing their attention. An implication of Kristof's treatment of personal connection is when he states, "so what can we do?".

Kristof also addresses issues with "we should". The use of "we" creates a personalized bond, which is needed to cause a stronger reaction from the reader on the issue being addressed. Kristof implements a range of comparisons throughout his article to make his points clear and easy to understand. For example many times in his article article he compares the regulation of cars to the regulation of guns; this comparison allows the audience to put the issue into perspective at ease. By comparing a car, an

important resource in a person's everyday life, to an unfamiliar resource helps create a clear explanation. Towards the end of the article he reaches out to the audience by using emotional appeal. For example, he states " your children will die because of our failure". He is direct to his audience, using emotion to sway the readers. Parents, of course, may want to question whether Kristof is a parent himself. Minimal credible sources or quotes are present to strengthen Kristof's opinion. The article begins with the bold statement that most gun tragedies occur because of the lack of political regulation on guns.

As the article begins to conclude, there is no explanation as to how we politically fail to regulate guns compared to other countries. With minimal explanations, Kristof ineffectively uses Canada and Australia as examples. Kristof explained that these two countries have less gun accidents based on their regulations. For example, there is a waiting period to obtain a gun in Canada and there are stricter regulations in Australia. Not only is there no comparison to the United States, but the information provided is dull and ineffective. What are the stricter regulations placed in Australia and how does the waiting period positively reduce gun tragedies? But this information is minimal, not addressing information as to what the United States' current regulations are. The importance of providing such facts is that it would induce more information of how and why these two countries are more successful. But instead, Kristof uses minimal explanation, throwing facts at the audience in hopes they will be swayed. But, the audience can not be persuaded when facts that are not explained are compared to the United

States' regulation. In order to believe the regulation In the United States needs to be stricter, an explanation on current regulations must be provided.

The lack of such information causes the article to become unable to give the audience a better understanding of Kristof's views on the subject. Kristof's theory of gun violence is not as convincing as it may have been if it had included solid support. Kristof provided an argument on gun regulation with numerous strategies, which helped him out in the long run. By connecting to the audience in a personal way, Kristof shifted focus away from the minimal support and explanation presented. Kristof came across as very sneaky, he closed the blinds halfway on the audience only letting them see only what he thought was best, without any further evidence. His word choice influenced the reader on how to view the issue however, he failed in providing factual and credible support. Without support, the article was not able to fully sway the readers to believe and understand why the United States need stricter gun regulations. Although it may be granted by some that the article lacks crucial evidence, kristof was slick to have included rhetorical strategies to help himself out