**2015 Lang Ques 2 Student Sample Essays (Cesar Chavez) Prose Analysis**

**Sample F**

Everybody has a cause, but it is the way you go about expressing it that gets you heard. There is only but two paths you can follow: a violent or nonviolent path. I believe that Cesar Chavez said it right, in his article, “that nonviolence is more powerful than violence.” Most people find it unattractive and disturbing to be around chaotic and rowdy or even uncontrollable situations. Violent causes tent to bring sadness and anger and almost always someone being caught in the fire. Violence can only bring about 3 things: “the demoralization” of someone’s soul and integrity, the physical harm or death of someone, and then more violence from the people who want to retaliate because of the physical harm or death of a loved one.

In his article, Chavez mentioned a lot of relatable insights and feelings of human beings. In paragraph 5, lines 30-32, Chavez states, “The American people and people everywhere still yearn for justice.” Today’s society we have racial crimes, and we have bias government leaders. We are corrupted into believing that war is always the solution, but “when victory comes through violence, it is a victory with strings attached.” There is a price to pay for everything: violence means the loss for all sides in some way and non-violence gives you a large amount of support and sometimes victory. The choice is yours and you must be able to reap the consequence or reward of what you sew. (244)

**Sample H**

Chavez, a labor union organizer and civil rights leader issued an article for a magazine devout to helping those in need. In this article he speaks of how nonviolence in the activist realm brings forth victories with no strings attached unlike violent movements. Cesar uses appeals, repetition.

The article itself is filled with ethos, pathos, and logos. A religious section appeals to those reading the passage as they are all followers of God (it is a religious magazine) it states that we are sacred and our lives should not be taken or threatened “for any reason or for any cause, however just it may be.” This is a sign of pathos and ethos. It hits a tender spot for followers of God and shows that the author is in touch with his own spirituality. Logos is used along with ethos in the tenth paragraph. Gandhi is referenced for he taught nonviolence through boycott. This shows his vast understanding of peace leaders that aided the field of nonviolent protest it also is a fact so thus there is logos.

There is a chain effect, displaying a sequence of events from line 43-55 trailing those who let themselves become “frustrated”, a repeated term in those three paragraphs. It starts with when people become violent it is because they are frustrated and seemed to have run out of options.

(226)

**Sample I**

Cesar Chavez makes important points and manipulates devices to create a sense of awareness in magazine readers. Starting of with the main accomplishment that he percieves of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s life, he states that “his entire life was an example of power than nonviolence brings to bear in the real world.” Chavez begins the essay with this statement to reenforce the peacefulness of King’s nature, and follows with how individuals were affected by this powerful man.

In the article, Chavez repeats the word “nonviolence” several times, to insure the meaning of the word. Repeating this word over and over is a powerful aspect to constantly remind readers that nonviolence is the goal that we have to strive to accomplish. He goes on to describe and harshly describe the effects that violence has on our society. Lines 15-21 (“If … workers”) and lines 65-68 (“When … death”) describe the impact that violence has on humans.

Chavez then explains the solutions to violence. He states that “demonstrations and marches, strikes and boycotts is our way of avoiding the senseless violence that brings no honor or class to any community.” By using pathos, by making individuals who resort to violence seem unhonorable, Chavez gets his point across that nonviolence is the answer. His tone, though desperate, is profoundly sophisticated and credential. He does not outwright attack violent individuals, but deeply explains how nonviolence is the best answer. Chavez ends by having his readers reflect on “who gets killed in the case of violent revolution?” This question is answered, but makes his audience reflect on the question--What good is violence if people are killed? Chavez does a profound job in using rhetorical devices to describe nonviolent resistance. (286)

**Sample B**

Cesar Chavez wrote a very powerful article arguing about nonviolent resistance. In this article Chavez uses a comparison between the effects of violence and nonviolence, references to God and Gandhi, along with including himself in his statement to establish unity.

Throughout the entire article, Chavez compares the effects of violence and nonviolence to show that the effects of nonviolent resistance is much more beneficial to the cause. Chavez points out things such as “nonviolence is more powerful than violence” and he states, “If, for every violent act committed against us, we respond with nonviolence, we attract people’s support.” Chavez uses these statements to draw people’s attention to how much more beneficial nonviolent resistance is. Chavez uses the comparison between violent and nonviolent resistance’s effects to show the readers that violence does more harm than good and violence doesn’t help their cause, only harms it.

Chavez uses references to God and Gandhi to establish a sense of trustworthiness. By referring to God and Gandhi, Chavez shows that it isn’t only he who thinks this way. This establishes a sense of credibility for Chavez. Chavez points out that even Gandhi taught that boycotting is “the most nearly perfect instrument for nonviolent change.” By stating this Chavez shows readers that Gandhi knows that nonviolence is best and we should follow his lead. Chavez states that we shouldn’t take anyones God given life for any reason. Thus establishing his credibility and strengthening his arguement.

Chavez also includes himself in his statements creating a sense of unity which further strengthens his argument.

In his very powerful article Cesar Chavez uses comparison, credibility, and references to powerful influences to strengthen his arguement that nonviolence is much more effective than violence. (284)

**Sample C**

Chavez takes a stand and argues that nonviolent resistance to oppression and inequality is the best option. He examines the outcomes of both violent and nonviolent resistance to help the reader feel persuaded to agree with his ideas. The most prominent and effective rhetorical devices that Chavez uses to support his argument are repetition, allusion, a rhetorical question, and pathos.

For instance, repetition is found when Chavez passionately claims, “nonviolence supports you if you have a just and moral case. Nonviolence provides to opportunity to stay on the offensive, and that is crucial importance to win any contest.” The repetition of the word nonviolence followed by things that result from it allows him to emphasize the importance of nonviolence.

This argument can sway the reader to agree with him if they have any doubts about the results and effectiveness of nonviolence. Also, repetition is found throughout the passage when he mentions the detrimental effects a violent resistance can produce. This further asserts his opinion that nonviolence is the correct way to go about an issue.

Additionally, Chavez uses an allusion to Ghandi to create ethos and allow the reader to agree more fully with his views. Referencing him Chavez says, “The perfect boycott, as Gandhi taught, is the most nearly perfect instrument of nonviolent change, allowing masses of people to participate actively in a cause.” Not only does this give another benefit of a nonviolent resistance, but it also pulls in another source that supports his beliefs. Therefore, the reader is more likely to agree with Chavez because of the allusion to such a great, influential person in history.

Also, the rhetorical question used towards the end of his article is effective in showing that violence is not worth its consequences. Chavez asks, “Who gets killed in the case of violent revolution?” and then follows up by claiming, “The poor, the workers who give their bodies and don’t really gain that much for it. We believe it is too big a price to pay for not getting anything.” His analysis of history backs up his point that violence does not have any positive consequences. Also, the rhetorical question allows the reader to think about how violence has impacted people in the past. This strategy is important because it adds another reason for someone to support him when they are able to see the other side of the situation.

Lastly, Chavez creates pathos in the beginning of his article when he says, “Our conviction is that human life is a very special possession given by God to man and that no one has the right to take it for any reason or for any cause, however just it may be.” His reference to their lives as a gift from God envokes feelings of self worth and importance. This is used to put the reader in the right mind frame before reading on to how resistance should be accomplished. Emphasizing the importance of human life and stating it is more valuable than winning an argument over ethnical issues helps the reader understand that nonviolence is the only way problems should be resolved. (Violence ends in death and takes away a precious gift from God.)

Therefore, nonviolence is the answer to the social and ethnical issues faced. Not only does it preserve life, it is much more supported by people. Chavez effectively describes why nonviolence is so important through repetition, allusion to Gandhi, a rhetorical question and pathos appeal. All of these strategies help him convince his readers of the goodness of nonviolent resistances. (591)

**Sample E**

The Civil Rights Movement, while tumultuous at times, was one characterized by its sit-ins and peaceful protests as well. As time went on, it is these very non-violent methods that were passed down and sought by civil rights leaders from later times. Cesar Chavez, a Mexican labor union organizer, was one of them, as he tried to spread the same message. In his article, Cesar Chavez tries to promote a nonviolent path through allusion to famous figures, repetition of words and overall appeal to the readers’ feelings.

Martin Luther King was not only someone whose ideas Cesar followed, but rather someone he uses as an example when speaking to the public. While Chavez’s voice had credence, to say that “Dr. King’s entire life” was devoted to the cause Chavez was trying to push forward gave the idea much more weightage. Dr. King stood as a monumental figure for the people not only in the Civil Rights Movement, but all across America. As Chavez used him to back up his ideas, his message held more weight and helped the reader become persuaded more easily. However, Chavez did not stop at the use of the national figure, but even used the international figure Mahatma Gandhi. In his call to action for a boycott, Chavez gave the reasoning that Gandhi was the one who proposed that boycotts were effective in promoting causes. By alluding to famous figures in history, Chavez was able to give his ideas more of a credible backing and as a result could propel them forward in the eyes of the readers.

Furthermore, Chavez was able to make his point heard better by using repetition. In promoting a nonviolent cause Chavez used a form of the work ‘nonviolent’ almost 15 times throughout his article, and about 8 times just in the proposal of his idea from lines 12 to 29. By constantly saying the word he not only drilled it into the minds of the readers, but also was able to connect everything he said back to the idea of “nonviolence”. In constantly seeing the one term over and over again, the targeted audience of Chavez’s was able to really understand the basis of his idea.

Another word which he repeated a lot was the word “we”. However, the effect of saying this word and that too many times, was more than simply allowing it to stick in the readers’ minds. By saying “We” throughout his article, Chavez was able to appeal to the pathos of the reader. By saying “we”, he created a sense of camraderie. He made it seem like this was a fight they were all in together! He also then included phrases such as “if we fall”, and “we have involved masses of people”, adding more weight to the shoulders’ of the readers and making it hard for them to disagree with him. By giving a call to action and then already including individuals and mentioning their struggles together, Chavez appealed to the feelings of his audience.

Overall, through backing his ideas up with famous historical figures, repeating words and appealing to the pathos of his audience, Chavez was able to propel his idea of non-violence. As his readers saw that these were age old ideas proposed by famous historical figures from the Civil Rights Movement, had a constant base idea of nonviolence, and were something they had been a part of and had on their shoulders, Chavez’s ideas were able to develop to pave the path for the future of the Civil Rights Movement. (589)

**Sample KKK**

Labor union organizer and civil rights leader Cezar Chavez argues in his article about the importance of nonviolent resistance. He aims to convince the readers of a magazine of a religious organization devoted to helping those in need that nonviolence is the most powerful and effective form of resistance, stronger than violence. He develops this argument effectively by using religious and historical allusions, parallel structure, and inclusive pronouns.

Chavez begins his essay with an allusion to God: “Our conviction is that human life is a very special possession given by God to man and that no one has the right to take it for any reason or for any cause, however just it might be.” This allusion is particularly effective, not only because of the religious nature of the publication, but also because in this statement Chavez is addressing his opposition and arguing against any reasoning to support violent resistance. Chavez follows this strong statement by identifying why nonviolence is the more powerful form of resistance. “Nonviolence supports you if you have a just and moral cause. Nonviolence provides the opportunity to stay on the offensive, and that is of crucial importance to win any contest.” This parallel structure adds emphasis to his statements of nonviolent action as superior to violent.

Further on in the article, Chavez adds authority to his arguments with allusions. “The boycott, Ghandi taught, is the most nearly perfect instrument of nonviolent change.” This allusion to Ghandi, a well known and respected advocate for peaceful resistance, adds credibility to Chavez’ argument by implying that Ghandi would have agreed with and supported Chavez’ claims. Chavez increases on his credibility by making a historical allusion soon after. “Examine history. Who gets killed in the case of violent revolution? The poor, the workers.” This allusion lets the reader know that Chavez is educated and thoughtful. It also effectively supports his argument against violent resistance by examining the consequences of it in the past.

Finally, throughout the essay and especially in the conclusion, Chavez uses first person plural pronouns such as “we” and “us” to illustrate his inclusion of the audience and his place among them. Chavez repeatedly uses phrases in his conclusion such as “We know,” “For us,” and “We learned.” This language convinces the reader that Chavez is on their side, that he is one of them. This makes the reader more likely to look favorably on Chavez and more likely to agree with his statements.

Chavez presents a well thought out and supported argument. He retains his own original ideas, and supports them with credible examples. He remains dignified throughout the article--passionate but not subjective. He manipulates his audience into agreeing with his argument, but in a clever rather than malicious way. He successfully presents an argument that nonviolent resistance is more powerful than violence. (469)

**Sample D**

The 60’s was the height of the civil rights movement. After King’s assasination, there were many calls for a violent response to the tragedy that had struck them. Cesar Chavez pleads with the people to help them see that the best way, the only way to achieve meaningful and significant change is through nonviolent actions. His use of striking diction, juxtapositions, and appeals to the fundamental beliefs of his readers leave his audience with little doubt as to the proper course of action.

Chavez, less than 10 words into his request, has already tied “nonviolence” to “power”; thus, followed by his claims of “nonviolence provides the opportunity to stay on the offensive” gives his readers the impression that nonviolence is innatly connected with power and importance. He goes on to say that those who are “truly concerned” about the people will not stray from the path of nonviolence, giving his readers no choice but to agree if they want to consider themselves good people. His deliberate contrasts of words such as “freedom” and “democracy” to harsher, unforgiving terms such as “vicious type of oppression” and “no honor” to describe violence envinces to his audience that violence is a horrid thing while nonviolence and peaceful resistance embodys the virtues of America and citizens everywhere. Although he considers possible protest, “we are not blind to feelings of frustration” he emphasizes “balance” and patience through his powerful word choices. His comparisons between a “nearly perfect instrument” of change juxtaposed with “those who espouse violence exploit people” serve the purpose of shaming readers who advocate for violence and strengthen support for nonviolent resistance. Chavez’s coercive diction and juxtaposition delineates the pros of nonviolence and con’s of violence, strengthening support for his cause.

Chavez also juxtaposes the two movements while contrasting historical allusions to give more credibility to his argument while portraying peaceful protest in a favorable light to gain support. Chavez uses Ghandi, a famous and highly respected advocate of nonviolence, to allude to the success peace can bring since Ghandi managed to win India back from an empire. By directly following that example up with one of a violent movement where poor and helpless people are killed he portrays the nonviolent movement as highly effective and successful. To further win the support of his readers Chavez asserts that millions stand behind the cause of nonviolence implying that nonviolence is more successful because they “attract people’s support” as opposed to demoralization and death. By using historical examples and obvious contrasts, Chavez manages to portray peaceful protests in a highly favorable light, encouraging many readers to support his cause--one that seems to be successful, safe, and supported by many.

Chavez also makes full use of the morals of his readers when convincing them to gift him their support. Published in a religious magazine, Chavez’s article appeals to readers’ sense of religious duty by invoking god. By advocating that God has mandated that life is not something that can be taken away he sways many of the deeply religious to his side. He also appeals to readers’ sense of humanity and virtue, portraying nonviolence as something for those who don’t want to exploit the weak or poor and for those who truely care about people. His audience’s morality will not let them be a part of a “vicious type of oppression” or have victory come at the “expense of injury … and death” or even “lose regard for human beings.” By depicting violence as deplorable and vile, he convinces those with even a shred of decency or humanity that nonviolence is the best and most moral way to bring change.

Chavez not only uses powerful contrast and moving diction to portray his cause favorably, but also--cleverly--appeals to his audience’s sense of decency and religion to leave them with the idea that nonviolence is the only truly successful and moral way to achieve their goals. (651)

**Sample G**

In his article, published on the tenth anniversary of the assasination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Cesar Chavez invokes the ideals of Dr. King and advocates for nonviolent resistance. Implementing a resolute tone, he asserts that only nonviolence will be able to achieve the goals of civil rights activists. By using contrasting diction to differentiate violent actions and nonviolent actions he is able to reason for the virtues of the later; likewise his conviction and use of plural pronouns and a rhetorical question help to drive his arguement for nonviolent resistance.

Chavez begins his essay recalling the power of nonviolence as demonstrated through Dr. King, and moving on to compare and contrast violence and nonviolence, through very direct sentences, he indicates that nonviolence is more powerful than violence. While violence leads to “injuries and perhaps deaths on both sides … total demoralization…” (paragraph 4), nonviolence is supportive and crucial. His contrasting diction from images of deaths and injuries as compared to the righteousness of nonviolence helps to convince his listeners on which they would prefer. Likewise, his mentioning of violence as being harmful to “both sides,” help establish an unbiased character, and demonstrates how violence is detrimental to anyone, regardless of his position on civil rights. He later moves on to once again directly stating contrast, “nonviolence has exactly the opposite effect” (paragraph 5. His attachment of words like support, consience and justice to nonviolence has the affect of making it more appealing to the audience and depicting why it is right and effective.

Throughout the passage, Chavez implements the plural pronoun “we.” His repetition of “we are convinced” in his article is appealing in that it is very inclusive. It does not alienate his readers. He contrasts the “we” with “those who will see violence as the shortcut to change” (paragraph 7). He portrays the “we” as a righteous sympathetic people, ones who “know that [struggle] cannot be more important than human life” (paragraph 6) and who “are not blind to frustration, impatience, and anger” (paragraph 7). By contrasting a compassionate nonviolent people, who are able to comprehend the importance of even one life, to the almost heartless people advocating for violence, his use of plural pronouns is in fact an emotional appeal that prompts the audience towards his side of the arguement.

He furthers this towards the end of his article, not only invoking the virtues which Ghandi taught in addition to Dr. King, but also by means of a rhetorical question. He is able to advocate for nonviolence by appealing to authority; his allusions to the teachings of Dr. King and Ghandi work as historical proofs that nonviolence is powerful and effective. Likewise, Chavez pairs this with a logical appeal in the form of, once again, very direct, declaritive sentences short but powerful. He, for example, asserts towards the end of his article, “people suffer from violence. Examine history.” He once again calls upon references to the past to make a logical arguement on why nonviolent resistance is the most successful form of resistance and pairs it with the rhetorical question: “who gets killed in the case of violent revolution?” In an instance of hypophora, he answers the poor, the workers, the people do, logically outlining the detriments of violence.

Chavez is able to present a very effective arguement for nonviolent resistance through countless rhetorical devices. His resolution and conviction polishes off his point nicely and is able to instill the same confidence in his audience. His powerful assertions whether in the form of short sentences or phrases such as “we are convinced”, “we know,” or “we believe,” effectively persuade the reader on the merits of nonviolent resistance. (612)
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