

Lesson 4: language analysis

[Philosophy](#)



Lesson Assignment 4: Language Analysis Letter to the Editor Third-party stumbling blocks Published: September 5 I am once again puzzled by Matt Miller's enthusiasm for a "radically centrist" third-party presidential candidate ["Billionaires to the rescue," op-ed, Aug. 31]. Mr. Miller and other supporters of this third-party movement need to think harder about what they are trying to achieve. Do they really disagree with the types of policies that President Obama would pass on issues from infrastructure to debt reduction if he had his druthers? I suspect not. So how does running a candidate with no party to support him or her in Congress — think Jesse Ventura in the White House — improve the situation?

If they do not like what Congress is willing to pass, maybe they should focus their efforts on opposing members who disagree with their agenda. Or maybe they should create a movement to minimize the number of veto points in the House and Senate to facilitate the passage of legislation. Running a "radical centrist" billionaire is an interesting thought experiment until one remembers that the president cannot simply will Congress to pass legislation.

David Beffert, Washington

The thesis of the author is that he does not believe that having a "radically centrist" third party billionaire presidential candidate is the solution to opposing the policies of President Obama or any legislation for that matter. The article was written as a reaction to the editorial of Miller about the need for a "radically centrist" third party presidential candidate and a billionaire candidate who should run for president rather than just devoting himself to a foundation.

The author's language style convinces the readers to oppose Miller's ideas.

<https://assignbuster.com/lesson-4-language-analysis/>

Words with connotations were used to give more emphasis to his arguments. He supported his opinions with explanations. Beffert's style worked to his advantage. He supported his thesis by pointing out that it would be impossible for a candidate without a party to get support from Congress. Beffert made sense when he said that if one does not agree with the bills that Congress is going to pass, one has an option of supporting the members who oppose such bills, instead of thinking of introducing the concept of a third party presidential candidate.