Recent debate over the "Big Question" of whether tourists should be allowed to climb Uluru, along with the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, and deciding to officially ban the climbing of Uluru, has resulted in multiple opinion pieces being published in Australian newspapers. Firstly, in The Australian on the 27th of November 2017, Marcus Hersey published an opinion piece stating that Uluru should be open for all to share the experience, using a direct and confident tone. On the other hand, in The Age newspaper, Nikki Gemmell published an opinion piece stating that Uluru is not a theme park like Disney and arguing with a similar direct tone that Uluru is sacred and should not be climbed. There was also a photograph published in The Herald Sun taken by Victoria Smith on November 30th, 2017, depicting a sign requiring tourists do not climb Uluru, only to see in the background a family on their way to climb the rock.

Marcus Hersey titled his opinion piece "Uluru shall be open for all to share the experience." Making his contention clear to his audience and using a direct concise tone to convey his confidence to them. He states that the closure of the ban to climb Uluru could be "the death of the national park," saying that if you haven't climbed it, or can't climb it, it's not worth going. This direct, hard-tone conveying his reality, makes readers believe that if they can't climb, they shouldn't go. Hersey also addresses an opposition argument that "White Australians love climbing over Uluru." Referencing Flinders respected "journalist Phillip Adams" article's anti-climb stance, he follows this up by grounding his audience with his first argument against the "anti-climb stance." Keeping it as an exhilarating, extremely satisfying, physical and mental experience. By addressing an opposition argument, Hersey decreases its legitimacy and its impact on readers, by acknowledging it and providing an rebuttal against it.
Throughout his whole article, Hendry uses repetition to emphasise his argument and overall conclusion to readers. Firstly, he repeats the idea of referring to the climb as a "Physical", "Spiritual", and "emotional" task repeatedly, describing the climber using three adjectives he reinforces its positivity and all the benefits which not only as exercise but as an emotional and spiritual experience. Providing readers with multiple benefits of being able to climb alone, thereby positioning them to agree to what it opens. He also continuously refers to the "sharing of the experience", he wants to "share the experience again with my family and friends" this appeals to a sense of community and adventure to families and friendship groups by repeatedly emphasising it as an experience worth sharing. The audience is made to believe that it is exactly that, and it further encouraged to be in favour of his content. Hendry also makes an appeal to the audience to want to comprehend and learn by describing the climb as "scientifically enlightening" and clearly arguing that "such a deep appreciation is not possible from the ground or even" stating you must climb to understand the science. By providing the audience with this dilemma, that you either climb for the full experience or try as well not even go, they are positioned to take a stance in favour of climbing.

In the second half of Hendry's article, he makes an appeal to what's behind a climb by describing Uluru as "a great Australian tradition" also stating it "holds a special place for all Australians who complete it" by making this appeal, the audience is made to feel that as Australians, they have to complete the walk, positively driven to stand with Hendry's contention. He also goes on to provide another reason for an opposing argument that the traditional complaint is to responsible for the people who have died climbing Uluru, suggesting they go through counselling to accept they are never to blame for any death or injuries.
This not only reduces legitimacy of opposition argument, but also reduces goodwill by readers about the effect of deaths on Aboriginal owners. Further, reducing the effect of that opposing argument, Thiessen provides a fact that 25% of people visit Uluru each year, arguing that it is clearly of benefit. It will cost the Northern Territory economy millions of dollars. This position, the audience to believe it is an overall good thing to keep climbing Uluru, as it will provide jobs and contribute to the economy. Lastly, Thiessen links his overarching theme that Uluru is to be shared, appealing to the audience to "share it with the world," this reinforces his main argument, and leaves the audience in a position to agree and reflect on his conclusion.

In contrast, Nikki Creemwell's article in The Age is strongly in favour of banning the climbing of Uluru. She uses a similar, direct tone to open her piece, declaring that Uluru is sacred, not a "theme park like Disney Land." Immediately gaining the audience's attention, demonstrating that her opinion is validated and respected. Creemwell uses resonating amounts of emotive and descriptive language throughout her whole article, washing over all negative arguments and attempting to encourage the audience to imagine Uluru, making them feel as though they don't need to climb it to experience it. She uses similars such as "washed over you like a long, long, cold, wet, a heart washed day," as well as adjectives such as "glorious" and other devices such as alliteration to enhance the description and evoke emotions, painting a picture of Uluru in the readers' head. She also states that "you feel it when you see it," suggesting that you don't need to climb it to feel its spiritual essence, connectedness, positively readers in favour of her argument. Creemwell also uses back-to-back rhetorical questions related to people sound cloud
on Uluru and tourists littering and leaving faeces on the rock. She asks the question, "Who has the right to remove these people?" and "What else is there on the rock that shouldn't be?" This evokes anger as well as dignity and embarrassment in her audience that the Aboriginal people have to clean up after tourists and aboriginal dead bodies. She then positions them to feel angry at those who think Uluru is a "place" and encouraging them to agree with Geenwell. She also emphasizes that it was a "monument" to have climbers on Uluru, so readers are positioned to feel they actually are getting what they重大项目, that coupled with Geenwell describing Uluru as a "milestone" in relation to our relationship with aboriginal people, people are more ready to believe it is progress to have climbers, that we can only go forward. Lastly, Geenwell ends their article by stating that the law won't "make a long or different to tourism" but will only make people think of the attitudes of others. Northern Territory highlighting the opposition argument for the reality of her contribution.

The photograph is also interesting with the stance that climbing Uluru should be banned. It depicts a sign requesting that visitors "please do not climb," with a message from the Anangu traditional owner, explaining Uluru's sacredness, pleading for the respect of Uluru, to the mid-ground, a family is seen climbing Uluru despite the sign, providing a contrast between the plead for respect and complete disregard of it. The message explaining Uluru's sacredness is in orange, bold letters, compared to plain black for the rest of the sign. Their golden people's attention, and the urging them to read and also highlighting its significance. The entire message is also written as though it is a letter to those reading it, providing a personal
probably feels be wished to respect the culture that climbing is disallowed, this would make everyone who sees the sign feel as if they personally are being spoken to. Phrases such as “Too many people have died or been hurt causing great sadness,” and “We worry for you and we worry for your family’s not only emphasize the personal basis of the sign, but also appeal to the fear of readers to death in a scenario where a family or individual dies. As a result, the audience is positioned in a way to believe that climbing Uluru is not a good idea, or should be banned or nothing else, because it is dangerous. This picture also shows at least six other languages in which the same message is printed, highlighting that not only white Australians are being requested to stop, but all others, also. Emphasizing the importance both to the Anangu people that climbing stops. Lastly, the image of the sign in the one of the Aboriginal people respectfully requesting visitors of to climb, is juxtaposed with the family in the mid-ground of climbing the rock. This juxtaposition of an idea of respect next to the complete opposite evokes anger or guilt in the audience, encouraging them to be against the climbing of Uluru.

The issue of the climbing of Uluru and its banning will continue to be debated despite the decision by the Uluru-Torres Strait National Park to ban it. Although it seems those in favour of its ban have gained the majority, The article by Marcus Herdy is an example of one against the ban, stating that Uluru is a shared experience, and should continue to be, preserving a direct and valuable time with the people of his idea of it being a shared experience, and its benefits to not only physical health but also mental and emotional. Along with making appeals to patriotism, evoking opposition arguments and
Highlighting its importance to the Northern learning economy to convince the audience of his view. In response to this, Nikki Gemmell argued the contrary, although using a similar direct tone. She used resonating amounts of evocative and descriptive language, with devices such as similes, alliteration, and adjectives to describe Uluru’s beauty, to convince the audience of her contention that Uluru does not have to be climbed to be experienced.

Lastly, the photograph taken by Victoria Breakswell, depicting a sign pleading visitors not to climb, with a family behind it can (climbing) Uluru uses personal, letter-like language, along with an appeal to hear and see, together with an idea of respect; in fact to a complete disregard for it and utter disrespect to position the audience, similarly, to the Berring's article, in favour of the ban on climbing Uluru.

Excellent!

Well done.