Schumacher: Absent

Hanna: People dismissed it at his time. Not serious, joke. (**Source?)**

Kellis: Too shocking… eating babies? Maniac… hard to take seriously…

Carmichael: Assumptions he makes with his audience. Assumes that people are okay with cannibalism (Henry agreed). Executioner selling off the body. Selling this to the wealthy… why would anyone want to eat human? Assuming that people want to eat people.

* Kunkel: Critiquing the richer people… cannibalism = extreme. Why not just eat the babies? If we’re going this far…
* Zac Paz: Ridiculing attempts at the time …
* Chandler Wheat: Not liking women **(topic shift**)… reduced humans to animalistic levels (quantitative viewpoint)
* Jacob Orkwis: Reason for plan—strengthen marriage. Fathers would look down on wives
* Eble: Calls women Breeders…
* Shaffer: Rich / poor (paragraph 12, page 406): “already devoured most of the parents”
* Asgian: Logical…not saying that people should eat kids. Addresses other side of the argument…goes through every bit of the plan (much like Redeker). Unemotional, detached.
* Carmichael: I didn’t catch the cues. This seemed serious. Not enough cues.
* Paul Hanna: Part of what he was going for. Scientific way of going about social building. People are still people. Tries to be as logical as can be.
* Orkwis: Last paragraph—I can’t tell if he comes out and is serious, himself.
  + Paz: Being satirical about what governments do…
  + Eble: Persona? Or Swift?
  + Kincaid: Persona…
  + Eble: Pretending to anticipate objections.
  + Asgian: *World War Z* connection… with humans, the government cannot treat them like animals. People are people.
  + Rumsey: Think of people as game pieces.
  + Shaffer: A lot of people view others as disposable. Objectification…dehumanization… Satire / *World War Z*. People viewed as resources.
  + Orkwis: Apartheid connotations—separation of people as if they were not on the same level.
  + Rumsey: A few notions…
  + Eble: Ironic—Redeker Plan like apartheid, but race / creed aren’t an issue
  + Shaffer: Nelson Mandela guy is okay with this plan.
  + Rumsey: Zombies are still people… bring them back…

Wheat: Read paragraph 10…quantitative evidence.

* Eble: Assumption—Irish = immoral.
* Wheat: Treats men *and* women as breeders. Wealth is the issue here (or lack thereof)
* Strotman: But he is misogynistic. As the persona, he portrays himself as “not liking women.” Explained the connection to Jon Lajoie. Explained parody connection.
* Paz: My plan is the best…100,000 useless mouths. Satire of government here…

Paz: Classifies those against him as not being patriotic.

* Rumsey: Relates to branding… **Scott thought**

Wheat: Read paragraph 5. Didn’t know what to think. How will we fix this? We’ll eat them.

* Eble: What’s he doing here at the start?
* Paz: Setting up the problematic parts… sets up ethos.
* Eble: Read the first line—Swift sets up his persona.
* Wheat: Monty Python & the Holy Grail connection…
* Paz: First paragraph—he could go either way.
* Kunkel: Beggars of the female sex… implying that only females are begging.
* Schaffer: One quick part… maybe children with their fathers. Women as cause of this.
* Paz: After they sell the kid, they’re done with their children
* Wheat: Barbadoes?
* Carmichael: Men would look at women this way… people would have many children, not know who they are. Wealthy point of view. Hard to pick up on sarcasm—there are people that extreme. Many people don’t look at the poor.
* Asgian: Written in a British country. When Swift discusses how to deal with people, it relates to the Holocaust. This would have been seen as a satire of Nazi Germany if written in the 1930’s / 1940’s.
* Carmichael: Comment about Nazis…
* Kunkel: Context is important. Swift = a minister.
* Hanna: If you read the context… this essay is a piece of satire.
* Eble: Purpose of satire, connection to Wink
* Hanna: You’d have to be insane to advocate this publicly.

Eble: Title—Modest Proposal

* Carmichael: Title… not modest. Last cue.
* Eble: Not modest…
* Shaffer: “To Preventing the Children of Poor People in Ireland from Being a Burden to Their Parents or Country, and for Making Them Beneficial to the Publick.” Poor people in Ireland won’t be reading this. He tends to that audience well. Here’s a source of profit…and we get rid of Dirty Irish. Pretender in Spain. Papists…
* Eble: Americans…

Paz: Sexist… towards rich women. Even saying that the rich women who can’t touch their fortunes would … asked about Psalmanazar as a fraud. This allusion shows how gullible his audience is.

Hanna: Pokes fun at England. People in Ireland can’t build their own houses.

* Rumsey: Also says that about laborers. Irishmen can’t work because they’re disabled… accidental hiring.
* Paz: Listing of benefits… “poor tenants have something valuable of their own”
* Asgian: Domestic violence… says that his plan would fix one societal ill.
* Wheat: Men liking wives when they’re pregnant just as much as they’re not…
* Eble: Anecdote about pregnancy…
* Hanna: Competitions…

Eble: Real Swift anywhere?

* Hanna: Paragraph 29
* Carmichael: Less Papists….
* Eble: Religious split.
* Paz: Real Swift—might be himself.

Mrs. Eble showed up…

We watched two *Colbert Report* reports

* Rumsey
* Hanna: Just entertainment…
* Orkwis: One person at a time…
* Pappalardo: Beer-battered lions
* Shaffer: This will get people to think.

Eble talked a ton, as always.

Paz: Cited a quote about salting meat.