Abstract

An analysis of any public discourse is not complete without addressing the basic task of distinguishing between the kinds of opinions expressed by the speakers. There are opinions about what is factual and what is feasible both in terms of events, and in terms of human actions, about the value of the factual and the feasible, and about the decision-making process. This distinction is important because every type of opinion requires different kinds of arguments. It is also necessary to weigh the rhetorical importance and pertinence of these opinions in the debate. These elementary responsibilities in rhetorical analysis are illustrated in this article using the public discourse about migration between Mexico and the United States.
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