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**Oregon Should Fight for Net Neutrality**

**Conclusion:**

* That is why we are going to pass a ballot measure that will restore net neutrality in Oregon.

**Premises:**

* + P1: [Internet provider’s] pricing is arbitrary.
  + P2: With [AT&T] attempted merger with Timer Warner, AT&T needs to be regulated more than ever to protect consumers, especially in the face of net neutrality repeal.
  + P3: On so many levels, net neutrality included, President Donald Trump’s government has abandoned all leadership.
  + P4: If the federal government is not willing to stand for our collective right to internet free of pricing controls and favoritism, shouldn’t we expect our state leaders to stand up for our rights?
  + P5: Should we let the prospect of legal battles allow corporations like AT&T to steamroll our right to open internet?

**Strength of Argument:**

I believe that this argument by Rachel Novick is not a strong argument. The first and foremost mistake the author made is that even though the topic is about Oregon fight against net neutrality, she focuses too much on proving AT&T and its plans are unbeneficial to the community. Also, though it is true that AT&T is one of the internet providers, I believe concentrating on only one specific example and its weaknesses to appeal against a significant matter involving multiple companies is not very efficient. Consequently, it may lead to the fallacy of generalization. Moreover, because of such reason, the conclusion to her argument can’t be quickly identified. Should it be a conclusion that is against AT&T, or should it be the conclusion that is for net neutrality? Secondly, I believe the cohesion level of her premises is not very high. For instance, Ms. Rachel said that “Oregon’s role is limited in fighting for net neutrality,” but she never explained what limitation it is and at which level is it at. On the other hand, she skipped to mentioned about Trump’s non-supportive action and demanded our state leaders to stand up for our rights instead. Lastly, the author only used her perspective to prove that net neutrality is good without considering others’ point of views or any benefits that the current system brings us. For instance, even though, with net neutrality, our prices will be lower, where would the motivation for services improvement come from if there is only one provider, the government, fighting in the arena? With that said, I believe her argument is not strong enough to support the cause of the article.