Chomsky Seminar #1

Absent: Kairos—Schutter,

John Geyer: Chomsky won’t write a literary masterpiece. Short, choppy sentences give her a chance to insert important words. Spoke about Chomsky’s diction (positive towards immigrants, derogatory towards anti-immigrant sentiments). Powerful diction sparsely with good results.

* Spuzzillo: Small, pithy phrases to stick the knife in really quick.
* Fendinger: Reader will be able to better understand her point for the “lower” people.
* Geyer: More quotable…
* Marshall: Allows her to quote other people quickly, effectively.
* James Harper: Doesn’t address her audience…
* Geyer: Jumped in… I’m sure that this would be different in the last chapter.
* Harper: Fresh in our minds… I found myself asking “So what?” She doesn’t review the reasons of things that we can avoid. Something is missing.
* Geyer: Vague often… uses many qualitative words, but her quantitative facts, she uses statistics that are only against her.
* Spuzzillo: She drowned you in facts…
* Eble: Drowned you in logos
* Scott: She just threw them at the audience… didn’t apply them…
* Eble what do you mean?
* Scott: Paragraph of statistics
* Harper. Gave an example on 112 of stats not being connected
* Weber: 116… pointed out a contradiction
* Eble: how?
* Weber… read quotes…
* Eble read the end of the chapter.
* Fendinger: Wastes your time, then…
* Harper / Fendinger: Challenge to her…
* Menke: Challenged… you need information
* Geyer: Book written to show, not to tell…
* Eble: Title? How does the title of each chapter fit here?
* Menke: Purpose is not entertainment.
* Geyer: Chomsky does a good job of covering up the fallible parts of her argument. For all of her vagueness… unsupported claims… fairly unanimous. Chomsky recognizes the opposition, but doesn’t give as many statistics as she does with her own.
* Harper: Chomsky only presents her point of view.
* Geyer: Sarcastic tone on page 116? Sounded ironic.
* Fendinger: Well-funded = presenting fake facts?
* John Geyer: Read the sentence without that phrase… **Nice!**
* Marshall (Harper stopped): She takes the opposition’s view, makes it one-sided.
* Harper: Read from page 117… Chomsky’s stance on bilingual education as a political issue—not an issue of science!
* Marshall: Contended with James
* Menke: Most facts are one-sided.
* Diesslin: Read from 117 about Conservatives…
* Peed: Media = one-sided
* Eble: Depending on the network
* Poch: I noticed that throughout the book
* Marshall: That hurts here ethos…
* Diesslin: Not trying to prove her point; trying to disprove the opposition…
* Eble: How is that not good argument?
* Geyer: Straw man…
* Menke: Going after political figures…
* Eble: What’s her purpose here?
* Geyer: Providing guidelines…
* Eble:
* Callahan: Presents hers in a neutral light…
* Menke: Harsh language… sentimental appeal…
* Eble: Good—attacking on the “appeals” level…where else?
* Poch: 107—race as a fallible argument. Appeal to pity…
* Eble: Where?
* Geyer: Looked at her diction…
* Eble: How is this wrong? Are we not feeling, thinking individuals…?
* Poch: Using emotions to push this idea that downward mobility is due to race…
* Menke: Trying to make it seem like whites are trying to dominate.
* Callahan / Menke: Challenge to statistics… challenging ethos / background of Pew Hispanic…
* Eble:
* Geyer: Anecdotes are bad for arguments…
* Eble: Why an anecdote?
* Fendinger: Providing a more personal face…
* Menke: No statistics there…
* Fendinger: Racial hierarchy…
* Weber: Kids being kids…
* Mitch Poch: 1940’s… racism was accepted for the most part. Today, not as socially accepted as then…
* Eble: What evidence do you have to support that claim?
* Poch: Not as blatant…
* Eble: Talked a lot about types of evidence.
* Menke: Hasty generalization… that one kid’s experience…
* Eble challenged… essays, pathos at the start.
* Menke: I’m just trying to challenge anecdotes.
* Geyer: Opening with a racist story… common motif… sought examples of things not changing.
* Weber: Highest poverty of Puerto Ricans, Mexicans… putting blame… putting too much blame on the U.S?
* Geyer: Mexicans / Puerto Ricans the most assimilated? Is that to slam the U.S.?
* Marshall: Assimilation has changed. One of her big arguments—assimilating into the U.S…. you’re agreeing to downward mobility…
* Alex Johnson: Social hierarchy is already present.
* Connor Peed: Racial order—present… claim about assimilation, downward mobility.
* Geyer: Harmful to identity, socioeconomic status.
* Marshall: They shouldn’t assimilate.
* Eble: Who is her audience?
* Marshall: Well, us… and she’s trying to provide the immigrant experience…
* Geyer: Surprised that she didn’t try to disprove the first part—that they threaten the national culture. Mr. Naumann—not a national culture.
* Spuzzillo: Religion… we’re the mutt of the world…
* Eble: What’s the culture into which we assimilate?
* Menke: Upbeat, fast-paced society that wants things now
* Fendinger: Supersized, consume a ton…
* Spuzzillo: Individualistic
* Poch:
* Alex Johnson: White suburbia… generic, go-to thing…
* Callahan: Off-pace, but… generalization of color: She never talks about Asians. Pulled up the case study… intentionally leaves out the one statistic that would disprove that.
* Herriott: Friend, Seagate Industries. One, maybe two are white. Supported Callahan’s ideas…
* Geyer: Asians should be included under color?
* Callahan: She continuously references color… only when it helps her pint…
* Harper: More of a research paper… more opposition, the weaker your argument is… clarified what is a Straw Man
* Herriott: It’s where she makes an outlandish argument…
* Eble: Strategies?
	+ Harper: Include the opposition
* Marshall: She omits Asians… the outliers…
* Geyer: Assimilation for Asians is not assimilation for Puerto Ricans, other Latinos… Asians assimilate up…
* Marshall: Asians / downward mobility
* Geyer: Challenged… she spent the whole chapter talking about people of color.

Eble: Step back… other areas?

* Menke: Some of her arguments—the myths—aren’t really myths that have people much…
* Eble: Page 114-117…
* Geyer: Take what’s around her, put it into words…
* Menke: But some people don’t believe in these issues… these
* Diesslin: Not an entire nation… different tribes… we have a 300 million person government.
* Eble: Isn’t that her point?
* Herriott: Common misconception about the Irish.
* Geyer: Not a fan of putting “illegal” immigration into quotations… Mrs. Raymond’s talk, immigration policies being bad.
* Spuzzillo: We should follow our conscience, not our law. Laws are unjust… maybe immigration is one of those areas.
* Poch: Law, legality doesn’t make something right, wrong…
* Peed: Myth #8—unauthorized migrant…
* Geyer: The belief itself is okay… she’s saying that that standpoint is a cop-out…
* Spuzzillo: What if I don’t believe in that?
* Geyer: You wouldn’t have said that…she’s attacking the standpoint, not the statement…

Diesslin: Unauthorized migrants versus illegal immigrants.

* Herriott: Dumbs it down… “undocumented”
* Diesslin: Other extreme with drugs, underground tunnels…
* Marshall: Tough part of this… how do you create a policy that helps one immigrant…
* Diesslin: Nothing will help everyone…
* Hank Woodard: Appeal to pathos…
* Geyer: An aspect..

My computer died…