**Section 1:** “The enormous, pungent…the touristic midcoast.”

* **Primary Claim:** The Maine Lobster Festival attracts thousands of tourists every year and offers various activities and attractions.
* **Evidence and Support:**
  + “Total paid attendance was over 80,000… 2003 Festival highlights: concerts by Lee Ann Womack and Orleans, annual Maine Sea Goddess beauty pageant, Saturday’s big parade, Sunday’s William G. Atwood Memorial Crate Race, annual Amateur Cooking Competition, carnival rides and midway attractions and food booths, and the MLF’s Main Eating Tent,”
  + “Also available are lobster rolls, lobster turnovers, lobster sauté, Down East lobster salad, lobster bisque, lobster ravioli, and deep-fried lobster dumplings.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Wallace exemplifies the various activities at the MLF to showcase how the festival caters to a diverse range of people. He also overwhelms the reader by extensively listing lobster dishes and toys, which makes the MLF seem like not your everyday festival. But he implicitly warns the audience that the MLF may not be as enjoyable as it seems, by using critical words like, “pungent” and “well marketed.” In addition to the extensive list of lobster-themed goods, he introduces himself to the audience and connects with readers by using a relatable example- summer traffic. He concludes with a journalistic tone with the phrase, “Your assigned correspondent saw it all,” which establishes his trustworthiness and experience with the MLF.
* **Overall Purpose:** The purpose is to introduce what the MLF is and offers and set up what the audience should consider about the festival.

**Section 2**: “For practical purposes… chewable fuel”

* **Primary Claim:** Lobsters are unique animals that have been historically disregarded as “peasant” food.
* **Evidence and Support:**
  + “Like most arthropods, they date from the Jurassic period, biologically so much older than mammalia that they might as well be from another planet.”
  + “Or so we think now. Up until sometime in the 1800s, though, lobster was literally low-class food, eaten only by the poor and institutionalized.”
  + “As usual, though, there’s much more to know than most of us care about—it’s all a matter of what your interests are.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Mini research paper on modern lobster facts. Creates lists of lobster features and exemplification with other arthropods to provide the audience extra context if there are unfamiliar with lobsters. The history talks about a changed perspective of the lobster. Since giving inmates lobsters were considered cruel in the 1800s, there is a comparison to present day as lobster is widely eaten today. To the common folk, lobster knowledge isn’t all that important, yet Wallace writes a lot of information describing its history, signifying its significance.
* **Overall Purpose:** Engages the reader with information at a large magnitude. Calls it practical purposes but lists some impractical unnecessary information. Talk about change in perspective of the value of lobster, perhaps trying to get the audience to acknowledge lobster’s journey.

**Section 3:** “Now, of course, lobster… supper at McDonald’s.”

* **Primary Claim:** To convince people to choose lobster over other common foods.
  + **Secondary Claim:** How lobster is viewed currently (posh, luxurious) may change over time.
* **Evidence and Support:** 
  + “The meat is richer and more substantial than most fish, its taste subtle compared to the marine-gaminess of mussels and clams.”
  + “It is emphasized over and over in presentations and pamphlets at the Festival that Maine lobster meat has fewer calories, less cholesterol, and less saturated fat than chicken.”
  + “And in the Main Eating Tent, you can get a “quarter” (industry shorthand for a 1/2-pound lobster), a 4-ounce cup of melted butter, a bag of chips, and a soft roll w/ butter-pat for around $12.00, which is only slightly more expensive than supper at McDonald’s.”
  + “To counter the idea that lobster is unusually luxe or rich or unhealthy or expensive, suitable only for effete palates or the occasional blow-the-diet treat.”
* **Stylistic Features:** There is a comparison of lobster to other seafood as it is “richer” compared to most fish. Wallace talks about a “seafood variant” to steak (landfood?). Also compares lobsters to fast food, talking about something many people buy is similar in costs of lobster.
* **Overall Purpose:** Provide the audience with why lobster may be appealing to budgeters and health nuts.

**Section 4:** “Be apprised… terrify their children.”

* **Primary Claim:** The MLF may have diverse events, but it isn’t for everyone.
  + **Secondary Claim:** The MLF may seem like a grand organized festival, but it’s not so different from other county fairs.
* **Evidence and Support:** 
  + “Nor do they give you near enough napkins, considering how messy lobster is to eat, especially when you’re squeezed onto benches alongside children of various ages and vastly different levels of fine-motor development—not to mention the people who’ve somehow smuggled in their own beer in enormous aisle-blocking coolers, or who all of a sudden produce their own plastic tablecloths and try to spread them over large portions of tables to try to reserve them (the tables) for their little groups.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Wallace illustrates irritating moments at the MLF to underscore how underneath all the grandiose attractions, the festival may prove to be unsatisfactory. He packs these paragraphs with examples and witty but critical phrases, such as, “NyQuil-cup-size samples,” “excruciatingly long [pageant finals]” consisting of “endless thanks and tributes to local sponsors.” He intentionally brings down the hype he established for the MLF to prove MLF is just another commercial event. By doing this, it allows Wallace to conclude that the MLF does not cater to everyone despite their multitude of events.
* **Overall Purpose:** He ultimately aims to warn foodies that the MLF is not as enjoyable as it seems.

**Section 5:** “Lobster is essentially… Main Eating Tent.”

* **Primary Claim:** Lobsters are often cooked in a process with emphasis on having the lobster alive while cooked.
  + **Secondary Claim:** Modern lobster information: weight and soft/hard shell.
* **Evidence and Support:** 
  + “You need a large kettle w/ cover, which you fill about half full with water (the standard advice is that you want 2.5 quarts of water per lobster). Seawater is optimal, or you can add two tbsp salt per quart from the tap.”
  + “You get the water boiling, put in the lobsters one at a time, cover the kettle, and bring it back up to a boil.”
  + “If you want an easy test of whether the lobsters are done, you try pulling on one of their antennae—if it comes out of the head with minimal effort, you’re ready to eat.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Wallace structures this section mostly by using process analysis. This allows the audience to understand the process behind choosing a lobster and cooking it. By establishing the reasoning behind the importance of the types of lobster and the steps necessary to cook it, Wallace is able to build up to his main point: Lobsters are cooked alive. He uses facts to explain why and how lobsters are kept alive until they meet their fate to underscore why this is vital to the overall freshness of the dish.
* **Overall Purpose:** Wallace wants the audience to understand the process behind the preparation of lobster dishes to introduce the audience to the fact that lobsters are cooked alive to set up the issues of the morality of cooking animals alive.

**Section 6:** “So then here is a question… very unpleasant, unbearable, and so on.”

* **Primary Claim:** Cooking lobsters could be seen as unethical and inhumane.
  + **Secondary Claim:** The question of whether cooking an animal alive just for gustatory purposes is a controversial subject.
* **Evidence and Support:**
  + “You have to line up for an ungodly long time to get your lobsters, and meanwhile there are all these ex–flower children coming up and down along the line handing out pamphlets that say the lobsters die in terrible pain and you shouldn’t eat them.”
  + “There were no PETA people in obvious view at the 2003 MLF,**10** but they’ve been conspicuous at many of the recent Festivals.”
  + “The consultant and cabdriver are responding to informal journalistic probes about how people who live in the midcoast region actually view the MLF, as in is the Festival just a big-dollar tourist thing or is it something local residents look forward to attending, take genuine civic pride in, etc.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Wallace recounts his experience meeting Dick, the corespondents’ rental-car guy, to put in perspective what a local thinks of the MLF. He depicts this exchange as if this local knows the entire scope of lobster biology and the MLF by stating his connections to his son, a professional lobsterman and one of the MLF’s suppliers, and his explanation on how lobsters cannot feel pain. Immediately after this, Wallace abruptly debunks his statement by saying, “besides the fact that it’s incorrect in about 11 different ways,” which gives a comedic effect. This lightheartedly eases the audience into the fact it’s possible that lobsters can feel pain, which helps them accept the fact that their previous knowledge may be incorrect or help them cope with this information. This anecdote also contrasts what Wallace says about PETA, which allows the audience to consider both moral sides of the argument.
* **Overall Purpose:** The purpose of this section is to set the stage for a conversation about the ethics of cooking animals live.

**Section 7:** “Before we go any further… avoid certain moral questions.”

* **Primary Claim:** There are difficulties in deciding general morality of living beings.
* **Evidence and Support:** 
  + “The fact that even the most highly evolved nonhuman mammals can’t use language to communicate with us about their subjective mental experience is only the first layer of additional complication in trying to extend our reasoning about pain and morality to animals.”
  + “Since, however, the assigned subject of this article is what it was like to attend the 2003 MLF, and thus to spend several days in the midst of a great mass of Americans all eating lobster, and thus to be more or less impelled to think hard about lobster and the experience of buying and eating lobster, it turns out that there is no honest way to avoid certain moral questions.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Wallace mentions “highly evolved nonhuman mammals” to give us a better perspective when bringing up the idea of morality when killing animals to eat since we are also highly evolved mammals.
* **Overall Purpose:** To bring attention to the morality of buying and eating lobster.

**Section 8:** “There are several reasons for this… one rather hopes it’s faster.”

* **Primary Claim:** Killing lobsters is often uncomfortable because of the intimacy (cooking the lobster yourself).
  + **Secondary Claim:** There is a set of criteria for whether an entity is sufferable (neurological, behavioral association with pain).
* **Evidence and Support:**
  + “The intimacy of the whole thing is maximized at home, which of course is where most lobster gets prepared and eaten (although note already the semiconscious euphemism “prepared,” which in the case of lobsters really means killing them right there in our kitchens).”
  + “If you’re tilting it from a container into the steaming kettle, the lobster will sometimes try to cling to the container’s sides or even to hook its claws over the kettle’s rim like a person trying to keep from going over the edge of a roof.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Comparison of Nebraska Beef Festival talks about the killing of cattle, which is something more people are familiar with especially with words like “driven” and “slaughtered”. Contains a description of the lobsters’ movements while being cooked, having the audience sympathize with a dying lobster. While a lobster is being cooked, Wallace uses a smile to talk about a person on the edge of the roof, which is a dangerous situation that the audience can dip their toes in without actually being cooked.
* **Overall Purpose:** Put the audience in the lobsters’ shoes.

**Section 9:** “There are, of course, other fairly common… toss only these parts in the pot.”

* **Primary Claim:** There are other alternatives to killing lobsters for cooking to avoid boiling the lobster straight, such as midpoint eyestalk method.
  + **Secondary Claim:** For people who don’t like lobsters to suffer by quick boiling may be inclined to use less hurtful methods.
* **Evidence and Support:**
  + “This is alleged either to kill the lobster instantly or to render it insensate—and is said at least to eliminate the cowardice involved in throwing a creature into boiling water and then fleeing the room.”
  + “Ultimately, the only certain virtues of the home-lobotomy and slow-heating methods are comparative, because there are even worse/crueler ways people prepare lobster.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Wallace shows different methods but compares methods that are both more/less sufferable to the lobsters compared to traditional boiling. Two sides of lobster cooking are shown, providing numerous examples.
* **Overall Purpose:** The audience can’t help but wonder the methods people use for other animals, especially common meats such as chicken and pork. Although only lobster is being discussed, wouldn’t other animals share a similar fate?

**Section 10:** “And there’s more unhappy news… fear/dislike/want to avoid.”

* **Primary Claim:** There is a possibility that killing lobsters may cause the lobster intense pain.
  + **Secondary Claim:**
* **Evidence and Support:** 
  + **“**Lobsters do not, on the other hand, appear to have the equipment for making or absorbing natural opioids like endorphins and enkephalins, which are what more advanced nervous systems use to try to handle intense pain. From this fact, though, one could conclude either that lobsters are maybe even *more* vulnerable to pain,”
  + “Lobsters don’t have much in the way of eyesight or hearing, but they do have an exquisite tactile sense, one facilitated by hundreds of thousands of tiny hairs that protrude through their carapace.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Wallace mentions the possibility that since lobsters do not have a nervous system that is used to handle intense pain, he mentions the conclusion that they might be more sensitive to pain. Pain is understood to be unpleasant to us so it almost humanizes the lobster to bring up the fact that the pain it may be going through may be even worse.
* **Overall Purpose:** We as humans won’t understand lobsters however, we can understand common experience of pain which can help us relate to the lobster.

**Section 11:** “Still, after all the abstract intellection… close-quarter storage.”

* **Primary Claim:** Lobsters can feel changes in their environment quite easily.
  + **Secondary Claim:**
* **Evidence and Support:** 
  + “Lobsters, however, are known to exhibit preferences. Experiments have shown that they can detect changes of only a degree or two in water temperature.”
* **Stylistic Features:** First shows an example about worms, which have little reaction to being cut in half. However, for lobsters (and humans), cutting them in half is a different story. If lobsters can easily detect degree changes, that says a lot about the nervous system in general. Humans have a decent nervous system, but dropping/raising just 1 or 2 degrees are not significant to make a change compared to lobsters. Compared to humans, lobsters are likely to feel pain much more.
* **Overall Purpose:** To prove lobsters, like humans, are physically quite sensitive.

**Section 12:** “In any event, at the Festival… what even interested persons can ask of each other.”

* **Primary Claim:** We must ask ourselves why we do/should care about the morality of killing animals for gustatory pleasure.
  + **Secondary Claim:** Some might be reluctant to consider the ethical side of culinary.
* **Evidence and Support:**
  + “Given the (possible) moral status and (very possible) physical suffering of the animals involved, what ethical convictions do gourmets evolve that allow them not just to eat but to savor and enjoy flesh-based viands (since of course refined enjoyment, rather than just ingestion, is the whole point of gastronomy)?”
  + “The truth is that if you, the Festival attendee, permit yourself to think that lobsters can suffer and would rather not, the MLF can begin to take on aspects of something like a Roman circus or medieval torture-fest.”
* **Stylistic Features:** Wallace asks us rhetorical questions while describing lobsters as afraid, “wave their hobbles claws impotently,” “huddle,” and “scramble frantically as you approach.” This invokes sympathy for lobsters, as if we were in such a situation, would feel frightened as well. This makes the audience begin to think about their feelings on animals being killed just for cuisine. He asks questions directly to the readers and compares the festival to human sufferings that are similar to what lobsters feel such as a “Roman circus or medieval torture-fest.” While Wallace does acknowledge that he eats meat and has no intention of giving up meat, this gives the audience an example of how one should approach working out the ethics behind meat eating. He also takes a risk by calling himself selfish by saying he hasn’t worked out a system where he can support his belief as “truly defensible instead of just selfishly convenient.” This allows him to highlight the difficulty of the subject and how it is acceptable not to have a concrete answer.
* **Overall Purpose:** Provides a reasonable provoking thought initially about lobsters.
* Wallace urges the audience to think about the ethical side of gastronomy and to reflect on whether they have a reluctance to consider the feelings of animals.