While Americans have the first amendment rights of freedom of speech and expression, within the United States Americans place extraordinary obligations of group conformity upon themselves. This conformity can be seen in three basic areas of American life: education, politics, and media.

Humans are very social beings who want to fit in. To fit in these beings conform to what the larger population wants. Conformity to a group is easily seen in the social arena of an American school. Within the school system, children will automatically divide themselves into groups. Said groups are formed on the basis of social conformity. Within those groups, children feel the obligations to dress certain ways to fit in which is why companies such as American Eagle and Abercrombie and Fitch do so well. Kids think they need to wear those popular, name-brand items to be accepted and cool. In addition, to clothing, kids are very pressured to act certain ways to maintain group conformity. Children now days face the pressure of sex, drugs, and alcohol, depending on which group they conform with. Students are pressured into or away from these items. Another aspect of conformity in American education comes into play when preparing oneself for college. High school students get pummeled with the idea of a college looking for the well-rounded student. What does this mean? This means good grades, a handful of extracurriculars, and some community service for an added punch. Students try desperately to give the colleges and universities what they want students think the
Institutions want them to throw themselves into an extremely stressful situation of balancing academics, extracurricular activities, and the community all at once. Once they have accomplished this task, they fill out the same generic application over and over to prospective schools, hoping to get an acceptance letter in the mail. That's the process that the American educational system has trained the American children to participate in. The social American educational system is a model of conformity within a society.

Politics is another definite area where conformity is witnessed in the American lifestyle. The whole concept of voting breaks down to conforming with one side or the other. Even when registering to vote, Americans are prompted to pick a party to affiliate with. When voting for the office of president, Americans don't elect a man. They vote for the ideas that they have conformed themselves to, and the ideas to which they identify. The American political system relies heavily on group conformity.

Within American society, media is a driving force in conformity. In fashion magazines such as Cosmopolitan, women are constantly being flooded with the generic image of the beautiful and sexy woman. As the pages are turned the same idea of the gorgeous woman is being thrown in women's faces. Within the same magazines, there is an conformity...
Issues for men as well. For all the gorgeous women, there is often a handsome athletic man beside her. This pressure to conform is also seen on TV. Many times in American TV, people are pushed to have the "Leave It to Beaver" perfect family. However, the wholesome idea is not always possible. American media stresses group conformity.

George F. Kennan was correct in this passage, and even though Americans have a lawful right to express themselves, the oppress their own rights and conform. America has become a breeding ground for conformity through education, politics, and media.
Unlike other countries, the United States has its power largely distributed among many different groups. This holds true not only within the government, where power is distributed among three separate branches, but also in the country as a whole. Many groups — who are unassociated with the government hold power, removing the need for a central police authority.

Since our founding fathers established this democracy based on the concept of giving power to the people, it seems appropriate that power is so widespread. Factors which minimize the need for a central authority include morality and conformity of the individual, self-policing done by other citizens, and the use of voting to give Americans a sense of power.

In increasing numbers, people conform to the obligations of society. This is based upon two main factors. The first of these two factors is American's desire to conform, seen distinctively in youths and teens, but also existent in adults. Next of these factors is American's feeling of morality. Citizens believe they must follow certain moral codes, removing the need for a police authority to dictate what should and should not be done. Instead, morality steps in and keeps people in line without the use of force.

Power remains with the people based on American's desires to help others when a problem occurs or report when something is wrong. This form of self-policing, done by citizens upon other citizens, gives them definite power. Whether it be merely...
reporting a spill in a grocery store or giving the police tips on a crime, it keeps power within the people as a whole. Other countries whose citizens have less feeling of responsibility, need officials to perform these tasks.

While voting gives citizens power, its effects lie far deeper. It is voting which gives Americans the deeply rooted belief that they have power and control over their country. Voting leads to protests, campaigns, and special interest groups. Since voting helps people to believe that they have control over the progress of America, it also leads them to the previously mentioned practices in morality and self policing. Citizen voting is the central unit of our country and keeps all other factors together, including power distributions.

Though some countries find all of the power in one central authority, America is much different. Due to citizen’s morality, self-policing, and voting, power is very widely distributed. The founding fathers’ structure of our country as well as America’s sense of national pride and political obligation helps to keep America as a democratic and free nation.

#
The element of power is one of the most dominant and controlling things in the world. Power can survive on many different levels; from politics to social life. According to George F. Kennan, one of the principal architects of US foreign policy after WWII, the element of power exists in many different places of everyday life for Americans.

Great quantities of power can be seen in areas outside of politics in the United States. According to Kennan, power rests in the hands of "informal associations of a vigilante nature" (12). On September 11, 2001, a small group of terrorists had the power to create panic throughout the United States by flying planes into the World Trade Center and the head of US government, the Pentagon. A small group of people have the ability to do major destruction if they have the desire to.

Power also lies in the hands of "criminal gangs" (11), who are known for mass shootings in the United States. Kennan also infers that power rests in our "social life" (15), as well as in the hands of ordinary people. US citizens, who have "extraordinary obligations" (19) to improve upon the country, also have the power to make great changes. It is because of
the citizens that the "national life seems to be growing" (21). A major source of power in the US also lies with "central politics" (5). The US gives an abundant amount of power to our political leaders, including the President. The political leaders hold the power to make necessary changes to benefit the US, including decisions about war, foreign issues, and domestic issues. The element of power exists in a wide range of people in the US.

According to George F. Kennan, power does not exist in a "pure form" (3) in the US, but is rather "diffused" (2) throughout a wide range of areas including political and social aspects of life.
In the face of a rising consumer culture and a subsequent fall of propriety common sense, The Onion uses a satirical tone to draw attention to the public's gullibility and the advertising industry's power. Through subtle, in-the-cheek humor, it mocks the seductive dictum of real advertisements. The article first asserts that through "no fewer than five forms of pseudoscience," the sole inserts will "stimulate and soothe." This plays on the ever-popular more-is-better mindset of the consumer public. "Where one solution may be good, five must be even better" is the ringing cry of an almost greedy consumer. The Onion makes light of the post-WWII "more is more" sentiment that often clouds and misguides human judgement. Further on in the article, The Onion draws attention to another common misconception: the idea that all things Eastern are healthy and wise to do. By replacing "orient" with "practiced in the accident" (emphasis added), the article subtly and humorously underscores this fallacy. The satirical tone continues as the article proceeds to create problems where there were none and propose that magnetic foot soles are the ultimate solution to this plethora of problems.
The Magna Soles promise to "restore" the foot's natural bio-flow, implying a problem with human biomechanics by using mocking buzzwords such as bio-flow, they create a false sense of professionalism, though clearly there is nothing wrong with the population's ambulation. If they suggest hilarious and absurd problems with the consumer, such as one's feet being out of frequency with that of Earth, causing "the entire body [to] suffer." Such humorous assertions cause the audience to step back and re-examine the problems or truly faces and what can actually be done about them. Conversion of one's own bio energy (which is more closely resembled by AE in the gibbs free energy equation) can realistically never be achieved, and thus it is certainly not a legitimate health problem. The Onion even comes up with its own version of scientific diction, mocking that of real advertisements. 

7 (new p.) Here, ketogenic nuclei become "pain-nuclei," neutrons into "comfortrons" poking fun of such silly names as "hydrin-smooth" on wrinkle creams and other marketing ploys. Beyond this satirical diction, the article ventures into the realm of absurdity, promising the impossible and giving case examples of misled patients. The Magna Soles will supposedly "restimulate dead foot cells" in the ultimate
This age-old hallmark of quackery, the Onion dispels real ad's claims of rejuvenation and new life. The article closes with two quotes from users who have used the soles as an "alternative to expensive, effective forms of traditional medicine." This excerpt in and of itself is a warning to consumers about the appeal of ads and how they may lure you away from free, researched treatment. A Geoff DeAngelis proclaims they "really seem like they're working" after rejecting spine realignment through physical therapy. This gullibility is a cryptic warning by the Onion to stop consumers from making foolish and even harmful choices based on smooth advertising.

This article aims to raise awareness, give warning, and create humor about the often-misleading advertisement industry. Through its humor and clever diction, the Onion is effective in its satirical, tongue-in-cheek tone.
While the article from the news announcing new MagnaSoles inserts may seem to be simply explaining a new product out on the market, it actually pokes fun at the techniques marketers use to sell their products. Through its subtle jokes and humorous quotes from users of the product, the author effectively satirizes the way in which products are presented to customers.

This article uses tiny jokes throughout the piece that just barely catch the reader's eye. Halfway into the article, the author declares that "MagnaSoles go several steps further" than other insoles, creating a pun with the actual purpose of the product. It also calls a report on MagnaSoles "scientific-sounding literature" jesting at the "semi-plausible medical technique" of reflexology. These very subtly hidden puns give the entire piece a light-hearted and satirical tone that causes the reader to chuckle at how ridiculous the whole thing is.

The piece also uses a direct quote from a user of MagnaSoles who pokes fun at the fact that doctors use a lot of fancy-sounding names to make consumers believe that what they're buying is very high-tech. So it must work. The quote comes from someone with back pain, who describes the product as being "clearly endorsed by an intelligent-looking man in a white lab coat." In the very first paragraph of the article, the author explains how MagnaSoles use "no fewer than five forms of pseudoscience" to
Satirize how doctors or scientists always exaggerate the quality of a product by claiming that it’s unnecessary with the amount of technology used.

The article also discusses Tenumetery, discovered by Dr. Wayne Frankel. The article shared the absurdity of Tenumetery when Dr. Frankel (who also created Kilofrankel, the famous non-sensical name) claims “if the frequency of one’s foot is out of alignment of the earth, the entire body will suffer.”

The article from the Onion satirizes a new product called Magnesoles by claiming that the doctors use impressive-sounding techniques to make consumers buy the product, inserting a funny quote from a user and pointing out the absurdity of some of the advancements. Through all of these techniques, this article creates a funny and witty portrayal of marketing techniques.

#
With the use of criticism, this press release is used to satirize how advertising is degrading to Americans. By using obvious fictional facts, and somewhat surprisingly thorough persuasive writing skills, this article is humorous and completely irrelevant. However, with the correct use of persuasive writing techniques mixed with irrelevant, and unrealistic factual information, the authors create a humorous satirical scene.

Advertising is completely dependant on one’s persuasive skills. In this piece of writing techniques such as factual information is provided to make the audience more impressed by the product. Although the information is unrelated and obviously fictional, it is used in the correct context. This is how it is made satirical. The definition of satire can be defined as a story or piece of literature that is simply making fun, or criticizing a subject or matter. This press release is criticizing the world of advertising.

In addition to the use of factual information, the personal interviews make the publication more persuasive. Dr. Arthur Blum, not only gives additional factual information, but also, his personal opinion. The "very chronic
back-pain sufferer" gives his personal opinion, therefore adding more reason to purchase the phony product.

Last, the most obvious technique used by the authors can be defined as over-exaggeration. This article contains an immense amount of over-exaggeration, with the excessive amount of fictional information as well as the unbelievable personal interviews, the audience can safely infer that this is a satirical piece of writing. It was written to criticize the world of advertising.

By making fun of an everyday advertisement with the use of persuasive writing techniques, the writers create a thorough and obvious satirical piece of literature. Factual information, personal interviews (phony of course), and major over-exaggeration are what mold this press release in order to make it satirical.

#
To give or not to give? That is the universal question which Peter Singer, a professor of bioethics, has addressed in his piece, "The Singer Solution to World Poverty," published in the New York Times Magazine. Singer says, "The formula is simple: whatever money you're spending on luxuries, not necessities, should be given away." Singer's argument rests on a delicate balance of human morals, natural impulses and decisions, not all of which are plausible or realistic to declare in this day and age; Singer's "solution", though idealistic and noble, is conclusively not bounded closely enough to the world of realism to be a viable choice in the fight against world poverty.

The pros of Singer's theory, although few, are powerful and immediately obvious to all who view his argument. Yes, human nature is generous, it feels good to give and no one should be selfish. It even satisfies an innate sense of justice, fairness and equality—those who have more should give to those who have less. This method would tame the human sin of selfishness and thus even satisfies religious ideology—"help thy neighbor." No matter which way you look at it, Singer's argument is an undeniable, noble undertaking which expands on human generosity and optimistically glorifies human nature. There is nothing morally wrong in what he is suggesting, and it would even please some to act as martyrs and saints, masochistic in their own self-deprivation. Overall, its benefits suggest a rosy future for the human race.

However, while the supporters of Singer's method have righteousness, justice and logical reasoning on their side, those who oppose Singer may draw on the resources of realism,
historical evidence, and their own brand of logical reasoning to support their own argument. In a practical sense, we must look at the consequences of this action and where they would fall—the first road block lies in the murky division between luxury and necessity. How necessary is toilet paper? We need to eat and drink and breathe to keep our bodies alive, but we can still exist without toilet paper, can we not? Yet our noses and a sense of modesty would not appreciate a human race, sans toilet paper. Yet even when this sense of modesty has been abandoned, the effects still linger—what are toilet paper workers to do? If no one buys toilet paper, workers in those factories will be laid off and as a result, lack funds to feed themselves and their families, exacerbating the issue of human poverty. And what of the money given to those charities— in many cases, not 100% of that goes directly to feeding and clothing the impoverished of the world.

When directly observed, “Singer’s solution” is not only a naive plan to undertake what millennia of human history has not helped, but also a misinterpretation of what causes human poverty and what can help to cure it. During World War II, Franklin Delano Roosevelt initiated government deficit spending, and the increase of production and jobs helped America out of the Great Depression. History is behind the critique of “Singer’s solution,” and realism also backs them up. The truth is that money spent on luxuries (or what some may call necessities) do more good than harm. They go towards assisting people; money spent on perfume goes to specialized workers who were at need jobs for their
money but money spent on what singer may call "necessities", like clothing, goes towards large corporations which exploit workers in sweatshops to mass-produce T-shirts. In the end, "Singer's Solution" is not only not a viable answer but a plan in which the efforts outweigh the benefits. (misconstrued)
In the article "The Singer Solution to World Poverty," Singer states that "prosperous people should donate to overseas aid organizations... all money not needed for the basic requirements of life." According to Singer, "whenever money you are spending on luxuries, not necessities, should be given away." This argument has many pros and cons, though not all are equally persuasive.

Singer's argument has numerous pros. It is important to aid those who are suffering due to hunger and poverty. Those who are just deserving of a good, healthy, and prosperous life as those who are already prosperous. Therefore, to give up luxuries so that other less fortunate human beings can actually acquire necessities is a noble, just, and fair request. Humans don't need luxuries such as frivolous electronics and excessive clothes and accessories. However, humans do need food, shelter, and other basic amenities. The fact that so many people have both necessities and luxuries while others have neither is shocking to reality that needs to be changed.

However, Singer's plan to end world hunger has many fundamental flaws. In our materialistic society, many people care more about their own happiness and security than that of others. Many Americans, unless forced, would be reluctant to give up luxuries and give all their money towards organizations previously allocated to frivolous...
expenditures to aid organizations. It is a presumptuous notion to assume that Americans will indeed follow Singer's advice. The plight of their fellow human beings will weigh heavily on the minds of Americans for only a short time after reading this article. Soon after, they will be again caught up in their own materialistic and short-sighted world, presumably forgetting any resolutions they made to give up their luxuries. Unfortunately, this is the more realistic way of looking at America's response to Singer's plan.

Unfortunately, the cons of Singer's plan outweigh the pros. Realistically, Americans will not embrace his proposition with open arms or empty wallets. In theory, Singer's plan is simple and effective. In practice, it falls short of truly capturing the nation's attention and persuading Americans to forego their luxuries in order to give unfortunate people the food and medicine they so desperately need.
In this article, Singer argues that prosperous people should give all money not used on necessities to charity. This bold argument will either persuade or disinterest someone fully. There are many pros and cons of Singer’s argument.

First, there are many pros to this argument. One pro of this argument is that there are generous prosperous people who would be willing to give money not used to charity. By writing this, Singer can persuade the generous prosperous to donate and they will aid these organizations. When this happens people will be helped and these organizations will be aided. Another pro is that people who don’t spend much on luxuries or non necessities will be persuaded to give. The people who don’t have much more money than they need will donate the little extra they do have to organizations. This argument touches these people as well. These are the pros and the people that are positively affected by this argument.

There are also cons that come from Singer’s argument. First, by telling people to give all non necessity money he disinterests a lot of people who are
Panel of some luxuries but also give
some money to charity. Second, he makes
them think that they have to give
all money, not necessary and not just
some and this will not positively affect
the charities. Also, the luxurious prosperous
people who might have been interested
in aiding some organizations are now
no longer because they are fond of
their luxuries and don't agree with
Singer's opinion. By arguing so strongly
and asking people to give all, Singer
has lost the money of more people
instead of gained. These are the cons
of this argument.

Overall, I find the pro position
more persuasive because people sympathize
with the organizations and feel they
need to help no matter how much
Singer says to give. These pros and cons
are used to persuade people to donate
to organizations.

#