

Tv isn't violent enough essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The immediate and alarmist tone of Mike Oppenheim's inductive essay, "T. V isn't Violent Enough" is a flawless example of the ineffective strategy that Oppenheim has taken in conveying his rational and completely biased argument. The described imagery of cinema action scenes are unrealistic and not violent enough; Oppenheim's essay falls victim to the fallacy of authority and Oppenheim confusion of television not being violent enough with television violence being nonsensical.

Today, as physician, I still sneer at TV violence, though not at because of moral objection. I enjoy well-done scene of gore and slaughter as well as the viewer, but "well done" is something I rarely see on a typical evening in spite of the plethora of shooting, stabbings, muggings, and brawls.

(Oppenheim 138) Almost immediately Oppenheim shows off his accolade, by mentioning his profession; but does being a physician or anyone in the medical field, give you the authority to judge what is not violent enough?

It is very clear that being a physician only gives you the authorization to understand that if any television action scene damage was inflicted upon you, such as a bullet piercing the shoulder, than you would either be crippled for life or at best have to undergo many acupuncture and chiropractor appointments due to traumatic arthritis. (Oppenheim 138) It cannot be argued that the amount damage inflicted on characters in television and in movies is beyond farfetched, as Oppenheim demonstrates throughout his essay. "The human skull is tougher than TV writers give it credit.

Clunked with a blunt object, such as the tradition pistol butt, most victims would not fall conveniently unconscious." (Oppenheim 140) This is a sound

statement and is even more convincing when written by a physician but, this far from demonstrates that television needs a boost of violence. Rather Oppenheim is stating that television needs an upgrade in realism when it comes to violence. Oppenheim inductive essay is riddled with television violence and Oppenheim explaining what the realistic damage would be to an actual person.

Upon first read it is fairly easy to become ensnared with Oppenheim's reasoning but, when you take a critical approach to his writing you realize he is a one trick pony. The way Oppenheim essay is structured he describes a television scene, then he gives details on how that event would play out in real life. Oppenheim does this strategy throughout the essay without ever proofing that television is not violent enough instead he uses his position as a physician to persuade and misinterpreting the difference between realistic physical trauma and TV lacking in violence.