Essays:
1. https://www.thenation.com/article/new-abolitionism/
2. http://www.wired.com/2009/06/mf-freer/?currentPage=all

Essay #1:

In this article, the author, Christopher Hayes, engages the reader on the topic of oil companies' potential economic loss in the face of environmental regulations to hinder global warming. He begins by talking about the reaction by the South to the proposition that slavery was illegal, and the core causes to their reaction, showing that it would be the equivalent of a $10 trillion loss in value today. Moving on, he brings that perspective to modern-day relevance, showing the economic side of the oft-debated issue of climate change. The Carbon Tracker Initiative estimates that roughly five times the amount of carbon that we can safely release into the atmosphere (burn). In other words, in a similar vein to the $10 trillion loss expected of slave owners in the South in the abolitionist south, it must be required for oil companies to forfeit more than 80% of their profits, estimated to be roughly $20 trillion. Furthering this point, Hayes goes into detail about the struggle for abolition in the civil war era, continuing to make parallels to the modern day, mentioning the blatant climate change denial and push for more oil production by the conservative right in the US. Overall, Hayes is arguing that despite the great economic ramifications in moving to clean energy and preventing climate change, it is fully worth the effort required.

What separates Hayes's arguments from similar anti-oil and pro-environmentalism points, however, is his rationalization of the opposing side's arguments. While constantly maintaining a strong environmentalist and pro-change mentality, he shows the implicit challenges in convincing large

companies. Using direct quotes as well, he shows how dire the metaphorical straits are on this topic, and how denialism has become all too rampant among the climate change argument.

Overall, Hayes makes a very well put-together and articulate argument. In probably one of the better uses of tone among argumentative articles, he slowly changes the general mood to one of despair towards the end of the argument, showing the ignorance on the pro-oil side of the debate. However, he rapidly and intentionally pulls it back around, doing an effective job of further drawing in readers when some might be dissuaded due to the depressive tone. He switches to a more direct tone, choosing semantically simpler statements to get his point across, an effective move.

Essay #2:

1. What argument are they making

2. How they made it

3. Criticism of point 2

      Chris Anderson, in the *Wired* article *Tech is too Cheap to Meter: it's Time to Manage for Abundance, not Scarcity*, argues that the general attitude behind modern technology should start moving away from a paradigm of minimizing waste to one that maximized utility. He talks about the staggering increase in affordability in technology and how people overlook it in day-to-day tasks. A personal anecdote from him was him and his editing staff at *Wired* being told to delete unnecessary files from the internal network servers. After years of periodic reminders, he decided to look at the numbers, discovering that for the past two years, it would've cost under $200 to double or triple the digital storage available to him and his colleagues. It's argued additionally that people should move to an exponential paradigm in computing power, as per Moore's Law — the rule of thumb that transistor count per square inch of silicon doubles roughly every 18-24 months — which is also followed in mediums such as physical storage e.g. hard drives. He also speaks of non-mammalian creatures, which have a staggering waste of life from our perspective — bluefin tuna eggs have a 0.0006% survival rate — but follow the idea that filling every potential niche is the most effective strategy, arguing that even if it means inefficient use of

resources, it's most effective to manage resources in such a way that every possible niche could be filled.

Anderson relied heavily on nature analogies and anecdotes in his article, building more of a personal, casual feel in the article. He focused most heavily on supporting his arguments through pathos and logos, showing common examples that people are likely to have had experience with: nagging sysadmins, the seemingly miraculous cheapening of computers over time, as well as demonstrating how minimizing waste isn't necessarily the optimal path when dealing with distributed problems, with finding niches more effective.

Generally, Anderson made a solid argument, but is frequently interrupted by himself going off on various tangents. They do manage to turn around and relate to the central point, but in the end it does more harm than good, especially from a perspective of ethos, his credibility as a speaker.