

Peer Review

Juliana Torres

I really enjoyed reading the abstract for this paper, it was intriguing and provided what the essay would explore and argue. A potential improvement to help create a more clear abstract would be that when discussing the way in which the popularization of the rubber tire devastated the global South, it may be helpful to provide specific examples of exactly what the major impacts were. For example, it is touched on that there were social, economic, and environmental impacts, but it may be helpful to readers for you to include a few specific examples of these that you wish to address in your argument. Later in the outline, you touch on social changes in Northern Brazil, labor conditions and human rights violations, and environmental costs of experiments such as Fordlandia. Within the abstract, you should clarify exactly which specific areas or concerns in the global South you wish to present within the paper, as it was not entirely clear.

Within your outline, it was very clear what you want to argue in each section of the paper due to the topic sentences that you provided. In regards to the working thesis that you provided, I think it would be helpful to make it longer and provide more clarity and specific examples that you want to use when creating your argument. Perhaps the thesis statement can be two sentences instead of one, with one sentence focusing on what you wish to argue about the Western world, and one sentence about what you wish to argue about the global South. Moving forward, in regards to section I, I am not sure if it is completely essential to include the entire history of the first pneumatic tire. Because the paper is only meant to be 8 pages in length, perhaps you can just focus on the emergence and impact of the tire that is specific to the period that you wish to address. I also noticed that you include the popularization of the bike in both section I and II, I

think that the presentation of this material would work better in part II in that it is a part of your topic sentence and seems to be essential to the argument in this part of your paper. I also think that section III and IV can be combined, as they seem a bit similar in what they are trying to address. Your topic sentences for both of these sections seem very similar, as they both points out that Western consumption was occurring at the expense of the global South. Overall, I think that your outline was very insightful and provided great points about your argument, the only changes that I suggest are organizational as some sections could be combined and simplified.

Mason McBride

I really enjoyed reading this abstract and I think that the information presented offers valuable insight regarding DARPA, and what you wish to explore. It is made clear that you wish to present ARPA as its own entity separate from the military, as well as the ways that it can be used by individuals outside of the realm of the military. In regards to section I, I found the mention of there being no heirarchy within DARPA to be very interesting. Since the military has a heirarchy, in which ways does DARPA maintain no heirarchy system even while working with such a hierarchical institution? In section II, you bring to light the discussion of the university and that the university provides “labor” within DARPA. What are some specific examples that you will use to portray this? Are there certain cases or studies that you want to focus on within the paper? Furthermore, the discussion of prize money and competition within DARPA sounds very interesting. I think it would be helpful to clarify who you are referring to when you say “push each other to their limits”. Next, I think you should expand more on what you mean when you say that DARPA is “soaked in imperialist and warmongering philosophy”. The reason I say this is because it seems that this is a part of your argument that presents your opinion on the topic

very clearly, and it would be helpful to readers to understand exactly what leads you to this train of thought within your argument.

In regards to the outline for the paper, I think that the order in which you want to organize your paper and the information that you present is made to be very clear. However, I think that the outline could benefit from more detail. Within each section, it would be helpful if you included specific examples of what you would like to present, as well as how this information is vital to creating your argument. Why did you choose to structure your paper in this particular order? How will these sections flow together in order to create your completed argument? Overall, I think that your abstract and outline clearly portray what it is that you want to argue. My notes are mostly in regards to providing specific examples and explaining your reasoning in a bit more detail so that readers who are not experts within this area can easily understand what it is you want to say.

Nathan Moore

I enjoyed reading the abstract for this paper and thought that the main points of what you wish to present in the paper are stated. I think that in regards to your abstract, more details and further clarification can help to portray your argument. For example, in the start of the paper you mention “two different periods” when presenting what it is that you want to explore within the paper. What exactly are the dates and time scopes of these periods? By providing this, it can be helpful to readers so that they may understand what time in history you want to explore. Next, you mention Admiral Rickover as being a key part of your paper and argument. Is this the only military leader that you want to present? Since you wish to explore the relationship between top leaders in the military and Congress, I think that you can strengthen your argument and convince

readers more proficiently by providing more than one example of a leader. By doing this, you can show that there are patterns as well as validity in your statement that weapon systems create costly and harmful relationships between military leaders and Congress.

Your outline is organized and represents all of the areas that you discussed within your abstract. I think it may be helpful to break up the background information section from that of the section regarding the naval nuclear program. I think that since the program is so essential to your argument, it could benefit from having an entire section to present an argument regarding its impact. Furthermore, towards the end of your abstract you did mention the V-22 Osprey aircraft in the same sentence as the Coast Guard and new ice breaking ships example. It was not clear if these two are related, but if they are, it may make sense to include the two in one section. I also think that you should clarify what you mean by “slight counter example” in regards to the Coast Guard example, as that was not really portrayed clearly in the abstract. Overall, I think that your abstract and outline offer great insight into what it is you want to present in your paper, but could benefit from some structural changes and more clarification of some ideas.