

## Check for Persuasive Techniques

Analyze the persuasive text. What techniques does the author use to try to persuade you? Decide whether the author used any of these strategies. If you check “yes” in the second column, explain how the author used that strategy.

<b>Persuasive Technique</b>	<b>Yes/ No</b>	<b>How the Author Used It</b>
<p><b>Testimonial</b> – Famous people, or someone you respect or like, claims that something is good or advertises or promotes a product or idea, even though they are not experts – and may even be getting paid to recommend a product or endorse an idea.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A professional football player claims a particular deodorant is the best.</li> <li>• A famous actress claims she uses a particular hair color brand.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Citing Authority</b> - An author may mention or quote an expert person to lend importance or credibility to his/her argument.</p>		
<p><b>Citing Statistics</b> – An author may list statistics or scientific facts to lend importance or credibility to his/her argument.</p>		
<p><b>Bandwagon</b> - Persuades people to do or believe something by letting them know others are all doing it and if they don't, they'll be left out. This technique makes use of ones desire to be part of the crowd.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everybody's going to the game Friday night.</li> <li>• Nobody likes having a curfew.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Glittering Generalities</b> – Uses words that have favorable meanings (or fancy-sounding/scientific words) to make a product sound better than it is or an idea sound like a fact when it isn't.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Snack food is described as “wholesome and nutritious.”</li> <li>• “Many people believe...” (How many people? Who are these people?)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Emotional Appeals</b> - Words or images that appeal to the audience's emotions are used such as fear, anger, joy, desire for success, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buying a <i>Smith Brand Smoke Detector</i> could save your life.</li> <li>• <i>Max's Money-Making Secrets</i> will make you rich.</li> </ul>		

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Period: \_\_\_\_\_

## FACT VS. OPINION

Directions: Understanding text often involves being able to tell the difference between fact and opinion. Often writers will mix fact and opinion, and it becomes the job of the reader to sort them out. Facts are objective (i.e., they can be proven); opinions are subjective (i.e., they express a preference or bias). Use the chart below to identify both facts and opinions in a text and be sure to explain how you know the details you write down are either facts or opinions.

	TEXT DETAILS & DIRECT QUOTES FROM THE TEXT	EXPLAIN HOW YOU KNOW THE DETAILS ARE FACTS OR OPINIONS
FACTS		
OPINIONS		

## What is Propaganda?

While most persons who give the matter a thought make distinctions between an objectively written news report and propaganda, they encounter difficulty when they try to define propaganda. It is one of the most troublesome words in the English language. To define it clearly and precisely, so that whenever it is used it will mean the same thing to everybody, is like trying to get your hands on an eel. You think you've got it—then it slips away.

When you say “policeman” or “house,” everybody has a pretty clear idea of what you mean. There's nothing vague about these terms. But when you try to mark off the exact boundaries of “propaganda,” you wrinkle the brows even of the men who spend their lives studying the origin and history of words. And the problem of defining propaganda is all the more tangled because in the first World War it acquired certain popular meanings that stick to it like burrs to a cocker spaniel.

To some speakers and writers, propaganda is an instrument of the devil. They look on the propagandist as a person who is deliberately trying to hoodwink us, who uses half-truths, who lies, who suppresses, conceals, and distorts the facts. According to this idea of the word, the propagandist plays us for suckers.

Others think especially of techniques, of slogans, catchwords, and other devices, when they talk about propaganda. Still others define propaganda as a narrowly selfish attempt to get people to accept ideas and beliefs, always in the interest of a particular person or group and with little or no advantage to the public. According to this view, propaganda is promotion that seeks “bad” ends, whereas similar effort on behalf of the public and for “good” ends isn't propaganda, but is something else. Under this definition, for example, the writings of the patriotic Sam Adams on behalf of the American Revolution could not be regarded by American historians as propaganda.

The difficulty with such a view is that welfare groups and governments themselves secure benefits for a people through propaganda. Moreover, national propaganda in the throes of a war is aimed to bolster the security of the nonaggressor state and to assure the eventual well-being and safety of its citizens. No one would deny that this kind of propaganda, intelligently administered, benefits every man, woman, and child in the land.

The experts have plenty of trouble in agreeing upon a satisfactory definition of propaganda, but they are agreed that the term can't be limited to the type of propaganda that seeks to achieve bad ends or to the form that makes use of deceitful methods.

Can you distinguish propaganda from other forms of expression or promotion by saying that it is something that depends upon “concealment”—on hiding either the goals men are working for, or the means that they use, or the identity of the people behind the propaganda? A few authorities say “yes” to this question, but most of them say “no.” Most analysts of propaganda do not limit the term propaganda to “veiled” promotion. Nor do they think it accurate to describe propaganda as an activity that resorts only to half-truths and downright falsehood. They say simply that some propaganda hinges on deceit and some does not. As a matter of fact, they recognize that a shrewd propagandist prefers to deal above the table, knowing just what the reaction of a propaganda-conscious public will be to dishonest trickery when it is exposed.

Some people limit the term propaganda to efforts that make use of emotional appeals, but others will differ about this idea. In a campaign to capture public opinion, a propagandist may rely heavily upon emotional symbols—but he may appeal to logical thinking as well.

Some people assert that propaganda is present only in controversial situations. One writer, for example, says, “Propaganda is an instrument of conflict or controversy, deliberately used.” And another says, “If the

report is deliberately circulated to influence attitudes on controversial issues it is propaganda.” When existing loyalties, customs, and institutions are attacked, there is controversy. In a democratic system, propaganda replaces violence and censorship as a method of bringing about change. All this may be granted, and yet the question can be raised whether the word “propaganda” should be limited to efforts to influence attitudes on controversial matters only.

Take, for example, the campaign in the United States, conducted under the direction of the Surgeon General, for the control, cure, and eradication of venereal disease. This systematically organized campaign tried to gain its ends by direct appeals to the people. Those who handled it considered carefully just what agencies to use in reaching the people—whether newspapers or magazines, the radio or the public platform, or a combination of these. They used both emotional and logical appeals. They planned the campaign to persuade diseased persons to decide to visit a physician to get cured. Their campaign used the techniques of propaganda, persuaded persons to a course of conduct, and promised a reward—good health. It used, as has been said, both emotional and logical appeals.

Unless “controversy” is interpreted to include minor debates and the making of choices in matters that command general social approval, a definition of “propaganda” that insists on stressing controversy hampers one’s approach to an understanding of the subject.

All this will indicate that there is a lot of difficulty in working out any formal definition of propaganda. Most students of the subject agree that propaganda has to do with any ideas and beliefs that are intentionally propagated. They agree also that it attempts to reach a goal by making use of words and word substitutes (pictures, drawings, graphs, exhibits, parades, songs, and similar devices). Moreover, although it is used in controversial situations, most experts agree that it is also used to promote noncontroversial, or generally acceptable, ideas. Types of propaganda range from the selfish, deceitful, and subversive to the honest and aboveboard promotional effort. It can be concealed or open, emotional or containing appeals to reason, or a combination of emotional and logical appeals.

While propaganda influences the behavior of individuals, it is important to bear in mind that it is only one of the means by which man’s behavior is influenced. There are other forms of inducement employed in winning assent or compliance. In limited or wholesale degree, depending upon the political organization of a given country, men have used force or violence to control people. They have resorted to boycott, bribery, passive resistance, and other techniques. Bribes, bullets, and bread have been called symbols of some of the actions that men have taken to force people into particular patterns of behavior.

Whatever propaganda may be, it differs from such techniques because it resorts to suggestion and persuasion.

#### Discussion Questions:

- 1.) In your own words, what is propaganda?
- 2.) Besides wartime, give three specific example of where you may have seen propaganda used.
- 3.) What effects does propaganda have on you? Give three examples.
- 4.) What are the reasons leaders and organizations often employ the use of propaganda?
- 5.) How is propaganda a powerful tool when combined with mass media?
- 6.) Is propaganda basically a “benefit” or “dishonest trickery” for society? A little of both? Explain your answer in 5-6 sentences.

[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/19/opinion/19romney.html?\\_r=1&em](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/19/opinion/19romney.html?_r=1&em)

# Let Detroit Go Bankrupt

By Mitt Romney, the former governor of Massachusetts; a candidate for this year's Republican presidential nomination.

Published: November 18, 2008

IF General Motors, Ford and Chrysler get the bailout that their chief executives asked for yesterday, you can kiss the American automotive industry goodbye. It won't go overnight, but its demise will be virtually guaranteed.

Without that bailout, Detroit will need to drastically restructure itself. With it, the automakers will stay the course — the suicidal course of declining market shares, insurmountable labor and retiree burdens, technology atrophy, product inferiority and never-ending job losses. Detroit needs a turnaround, not a check.

I love cars, American cars. I was born in Detroit, the son of an auto chief executive. In 1954, my dad, George Romney, was tapped to run American Motors when its president suddenly died. The company itself was on life support — banks were threatening to deal it a death blow. The stock collapsed. I watched Dad work to turn the company around — and years later at business school, they were still talking about it. From the lessons of that turnaround, and from my own experiences, I have several prescriptions for Detroit's automakers.

First, their huge disadvantage in costs relative to foreign brands must be eliminated. That means new labor agreements to align pay and benefits to match those of workers at competitors like BMW, Honda, Nissan and Toyota. Furthermore, retiree benefits must be reduced so that the total burden per auto for domestic makers is not higher than that of foreign producers.

That extra burden is estimated to be more than \$2,000 per car. Think what that means: Ford, for example, needs to cut \$2,000 worth of features and quality out of its Taurus to compete with Toyota's Avalon. Of course the Avalon feels like a better product — it has \$2,000 more put into it. Considering this disadvantage, Detroit has done a remarkable job

of designing and engineering its cars. But if this cost penalty persists, any bailout will only delay the inevitable.

Second, management as is must go. New faces should be recruited from unrelated industries — from companies widely respected for excellence in marketing, innovation, creativity and labor relations.

The new management must work with labor leaders to see that the enmity between labor and management comes to an end. This division is a holdover from the early years of the last century, when unions brought workers job security and better wages and benefits. But as Walter Reuther, the former head of the United Automobile Workers, said to my father, “Getting more and more pay for less and less work is a dead-end street.”

You don’t have to look far for industries with unions that went down that road. Companies in the 21st century cannot perpetuate the destructive labor relations of the 20th. This will mean a new direction for the U.A.W., profit sharing or stock grants to all employees and a change in Big Three management culture.

The need for collaboration will mean accepting sanity in salaries and perks. At American Motors, my dad cut his pay and that of his executive team, he bought stock in the company, and he went out to factories to talk to workers directly. Get rid of the planes, the executive dining rooms — all the symbols that breed resentment among the hundreds of thousands who will also be sacrificing to keep the companies afloat.

Investments must be made for the future. No more focus on quarterly earnings or the kind of short-term stock appreciation that means quick riches for executives with options. Manage with an eye on cash flow, balance sheets and long-term appreciation. Invest in truly competitive products and innovative technologies — especially fuel-saving designs — that may not arrive for years. Starving research and development is like eating the seed corn.

Just as important to the future of American carmakers is the sales force. When sales are down, you don’t want to lose the only people who can get them to grow. So don’t fire the best dealers, and don’t crush them with new financial or performance demands they can’t meet.

It is not wrong to ask for government help, but the automakers should come up with a win-win proposition. I believe the federal government should invest substantially more in basic research — on new energy sources, fuel-economy technology, materials science and the like — that will ultimately benefit the automotive industry, along with many others. I believe Washington should raise energy research spending to \$20 billion a year, from the \$4 billion that is spent today. The research could be done at universities, at research labs and even through public-private collaboration. The federal government should also rectify the imbedded tax penalties that favor foreign carmakers.

But don't ask Washington to give shareholders and bondholders a free pass — they bet on management and they lost.

The American auto industry is vital to our national interest as an employer and as a hub for manufacturing. A managed bankruptcy may be the only path to the fundamental restructuring the industry needs. It would permit the companies to shed excess labor, pension and real estate costs. The federal government should provide guarantees for post-bankruptcy financing and assure car buyers that their warranties are not at risk.

In a managed bankruptcy, the federal government would propel newly competitive and viable automakers, rather than seal their fate with a bailout check.

# Where Sweatshops Are a Dream

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/15/opinion/15kristof.html?em>

Before Barack Obama and his team act on their talk about “labor standards,” I’d like to offer them a tour of the vast garbage dump here in Phnom Penh.

This is a Dante-like vision of hell. It’s a mountain of festering refuse, a half-hour hike across, emitting clouds of smoke from subterranean fires.

The miasma of toxic stink leaves you gasping, breezes batter you with filth, and even the rats look forlorn. Then the smoke parts and you come across a child ambling barefoot, searching for old plastic cups that recyclers will buy for five cents a pound. Many families actually live in shacks on this smoking garbage.

Mr. Obama and the Democrats who favor labor standards in trade agreements mean well, for they intend to fight back at oppressive sweatshops abroad. But while it shocks Americans to hear it, the central challenge in the poorest countries is not that sweatshops exploit too many people, but that they don’t exploit enough.

Talk to these families in the dump, and a job in a sweatshop is a cherished dream, an escalator out of poverty, the kind of gauzy if probably unrealistic ambition that parents everywhere often have for their children.

“I’d love to get a job in a factory,” said Pim Srey Rath, a 19-year-old woman scavenging for plastic. “At least that work is in the shade. Here is where it’s hot.”

Another woman, Vath Sam Oeun, hopes her 10-year-old boy, scavenging beside her, grows up to get a factory job, partly because she has seen other children run over by garbage trucks. Her boy has

never been to a doctor or a dentist, and last bathed when he was 2, so a sweatshop job by comparison would be far more pleasant and less dangerous.

I'm glad that many Americans are repulsed by the idea of importing products made by barely paid, barely legal workers in dangerous factories. Yet sweatshops are only a symptom of poverty, not a cause, and banning them closes off one route out of poverty. At a time of tremendous economic distress and protectionist pressures, there's a special danger that tighter labor standards will be used as an excuse to curb trade.

When I defend sweatshops, people always ask me: But would you want to work in a sweatshop? No, of course not. But I would want even less to pull a rickshaw. In the hierarchy of jobs in poor countries, sweltering at a sewing machine isn't the bottom.

My views on sweatshops are shaped by years living in East Asia, watching as living standards soared — including those in my wife's ancestral village in southern China — because of sweatshop jobs.

Manufacturing is one sector that can provide millions of jobs. Yet sweatshops usually go not to the poorest nations but to better-off countries with more reliable electricity and ports.

I often hear the argument: Labor standards can improve wages and working conditions, without greatly affecting the eventual retail cost of goods. That's true. But labor standards and "living wages" have a larger impact on production costs that companies are always trying to pare. The result is to push companies to operate more capital-intensive factories in better-off nations like Malaysia, rather than labor-intensive factories in poorer countries like Ghana or Cambodia.

Cambodia has, in fact, pursued an interesting experiment by working with factories to establish decent labor standards and wages. It's a worthwhile idea, but one result of paying above-market wages is that those in charge of hiring often demand bribes — sometimes a month's

salary — in exchange for a job. In addition, these standards add to production costs, so some factories have closed because of the global economic crisis and the difficulty of competing internationally.

The best way to help people in the poorest countries isn't to campaign against sweatshops but to promote manufacturing there. One of the best things America could do for Africa would be to strengthen our program to encourage African imports, called AGOA, and nudge Europe to match it.

Among people who work in development, many strongly believe (but few dare say very loudly) that one of the best hopes for the poorest countries would be to build their manufacturing industries. But global campaigns against sweatshops make that less likely.

Look, I know that Americans have a hard time accepting that sweatshops can help people. But take it from 13-year-old Neuo Chanthou, who earns a bit less than \$1 a day scavenging in the dump. She's wearing a "Playboy" shirt and hat that she found amid the filth, and she worries about her sister, who lost part of her hand when a garbage truck ran over her.

"It's dirty, hot and smelly here," she said wistfully. "A factory is better."

•

# Fashion Police

**Bans on sagging jeans raise the question:  
What happens when fashion moves from  
being merely objectionable to illegal?**

*By Niko Koppel*



The New York Times  
**upfront**

Jamarcus Marshall, a 17-year-old high school sophomore in Mansfield, Louisiana, believes that no one should be able to tell him how low to wear his jeans. "It's up to the person who's wearing the pants," he says. Marshall's sagging pants, a style popularized in the early 1990s by hip-hop artists, are becoming a legal issue in a growing number of communities, including his own.

Lawmakers in at least three states—Louisiana, Georgia, and New Jersey—have decided that pants worn low enough to expose underwear pose a threat to the public, and they are trying to enact indecency ordinances to stop it.

Since June, sagging pants have been against the law in Delcambre, Louisiana, a town of 2,200 that is 80 miles southwest of Baton Rouge. Offenders face a fine of as much as \$500 or up to a six-month jail sentence. A law that took effect last month in Mansfield, a town of 5,500 near Shreveport, also mandates a fine or jail time for sagging pants. Similar measures are being considered in Atlanta and New Jersey.

But when fashion moves from being merely objectionable to illegal, constitutional questions about freedom of expression arise: Can the government tell you what to wear?

The American Civil Liberties Union doesn't think so. "This style may be distasteful to some, but do we really think it should be legislated?" says Benetta Standly of the A.C.L.U. of Georgia. "Our answer is no. We don't think this is in the realm of public policy. We don't think it's the government's role."

In fact, efforts to outlaw sagging pants in Virginia and statewide in Louisiana in 2004, failed because of such concerns. In August, the Town Council of Stratford, Conn., rejected a baggy-pants ban, deciding it was unconstitutional and would unjustly encourage racial profiling.

## School Dress Codes

Roger Pilon of the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, is even more blunt in his opposition: "This is the kind of officious meddling in personal behavior that makes a laughing stock of the officials who do it."

But advocates of the laws say these measures are about enforcing public decency.

"It's a fad like hot pants; however, I think it crosses the line when a person shows their backside," says Councilwoman Annette Lartigue, who is drafting a sagging pants ordinance in Trenton, N.J., the state capital. "You can't legislate how people dress, but you can legislate when people begin to become indecent by exposing their body parts."

While some communities are trying to crack down on what they see as indecency, school districts have become more aggressive in enforcing dress codes, as the courts have given them greater latitude in this area. Schools have placed restrictions on miniskirts, long hair, piercings, logos with drug references, and gang-related clothing, including hats, jewelry, and particular colors.

Public outrage at particular fashions is nothing new—especially when the fashions are popular among young people. In the past, there have been outcries against fashions when they "challenge the conservative morality of a society," says Andrew Bolton, the curator at the Costume Institute of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

Lurking behind the sagging-jeans laws in Louisiana and the various proposals for similar measures elsewhere may be the real issue—hip-hop style itself, which critics say is worn as a badge of delinquency, with its distinctive walk conveying thuggish swagger and a disrespect for authority.

Sagging pants began in prison, where oversize uniforms were issued without belts to prevent suicide and their use as weapons. The style spread through rappers and music videos, from the ghetto to the suburbs and around the world.

Some see the recent sagging prohibitions as racially motivated, because those who wear the style are young, predominantly black men. "We think this is part of a national trend that is criminalizing youth, and specifically African American male youth," says Standly of the A.C.L.U.

## **"The 'In' Thing"**

Ironically, much of this legislation has been proposed by black public officials. In Atlanta, for example, Councilman C. T. Martin is the force behind the proposed ban.

"Little children see it and want to adopt it, thinking it's the 'in' thing," Martin told the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*. "I didn't want young people thinking that half-dressing is the way to go. I want them to think about their future."

But Benjamin Chavis, the former executive director of the N.A.A.C.P., says, "I think to criminalize how a person wears their clothing is more offensive than what the remedy is trying to do."

Chavis, who is often pictured in an impeccable suit among the baggy outfits of the hip-hop elite, is a chairman of the Hip Hop Summit Action Network, a coalition he founded with the music mogul Russell Simmons. He says the coalition will challenge the ordinances in court.

"The focus should be on cleaning up the social conditions that the sagging pants come out of," says Chavis. "That they wear their pants the way they do is a statement of the reality that they're struggling with on a day-to-day basis."

# Guilt by The Bottleful

**Bottled water is being portrayed as an environmental villain. But is it any different from bottled soda or juice?**

By Alex Williams

Those bottles of water always seemed so harmless tucked into everyone's backpacks. In fact, when some schools banned soda and other sugary drinks from cafeterias and vending machines, they sold bottled water as a healthy alternative. But now, environmentalists are saying that water that comes in plastic bottles is not so healthy for the planet.



The debate centers not on the water, but on oil—the oil that's used to make the bottles, and the oil that's used to get them to consumers. According to the Earth Policy Institute in Washington, D.C., it takes 1.5 million barrels of oil a year to make the plastic water bottles Americans use—plus countless barrels to transport the water from as far away as Fiji and refrigerate it. Plastic bottles that are not being recycled are piling up in landfills. (Of course, plenty of those bottles once contained drinks other than water.)

Julia Duch, 17, a senior at Staten Island Academy in New York, says that after reading a magazine article on the environmental impact of bottled water, she decided that "there was no use for carrying around a bottle of Poland Spring."

As head of her school's Environmental Club, Julia thought she should set an example: She now carries water in a reusable plastic bottle. The club plans to submit a proposal that the school stop selling bottled water and give each student a reusable water bottle.

The issue took on a higher profile this past summer when the mayors of San Francisco, Salt Lake City, Minneapolis, and New York began urging people to opt for tap water instead of bottled. This added momentum to efforts by environmental groups like Corporate Accountability International and Food & Water Watch.

Over the last 15 years, the bottled water industry has turned a product that once seemed an indulgence into a daily necessity. Bottled water has now overtaken coffee and milk in sales nationally.

## Turning to The Tap

An August editorial in *The New York Times*—"In Praise of Tap Water"—argued against bottled water on the ground that "this country has some of the best public water supplies in the world." Many restaurants have pulled bottled water from their menus.

The industry is feeling the heat, and is taking steps to address these concerns. Nestlé, which sells Perrier and Poland Spring, and Coca-Cola, which sells Dasani, have reduced package weight, tried to become more energy efficient, and launched conservation and recycling projects.

According to *The Wall Street Journal*, Coca-Cola is planning to build a plant capable of recycling up to 2 billion 20-ounce bottles a year. Beverage companies are also looking at ways to encourage more consumers to recycle.

The Fiji Water Company says it intends to become carbon negative—that is, to more than make up for the greenhouse gases released in the bottling, transportation, and sales of its product. The company says it will install a windmill in 2009 to provide energy to its bottling plant in Fiji, which is in the South Pacific. It will also ship water intended for sale on the East Coast to Philadelphia, rather than trucking it from Los Angeles.

In August, the International Bottled Water Association took out full-page ads in newspapers, urging consumers to recycle, not abandon, their bottles and arguing that "when we drink any beverage, it's likely to come out of a bottle or a can."

Paul Pentel, a physician in Minneapolis, sees this as two separate issues. "One is water, the other is plastic bottles," he says. "We have been trying to steer people away from the liquid candy—juices, pop, and everything else. From that standpoint, water is good, and I'm very hesitant to demonize bottled water."

## Bring Your Own

Indeed, some people wonder why environmentalists have singled out bottled water, and not dish detergent or Wiffle Ball bats. Jessica Retan, 22, a nanny who lives in New York, says the waste issue is "concerning, but there's Coke, shampoo—a lot of other things in addition to water that are bottled in plastic. So I'm curious. Why just focus on bottled water?"

Gigi Kellett of Corporate Accountability International's Think Outside the Bottle campaign says that targeting bottled water is a good starting point because water "is something people have access to right out of the tap."

Then there's the cost to the consumer of all that bottled water. Bringing your own, says Kellett, is "a way to protect the environment and protect your pocketbook."



## Propaganda Techniques Used in Literature

Complete the chart below to help you draw conclusions about the propaganda techniques used in the novel that we've read. The example here is from Huxley's *Brave New World*.

Example of Propaganda technique used in <i>Brave New World</i>	Type of Propaganda technique	Goal the propaganda technique is trying to accomplish
<p><u>Example:</u>  <i>"Cleanliness is next to Fordliness" page 111</i></p>	<p><i>Transference</i></p>	<p><i>This slogan connects respect for Ford with the saying traditionally associated with the Christian church, "Cleanliness is next to Godliness". This helps establish Ford as a divine power in the minds of the people in the society of <u>Brave New World</u>.</i></p>

# A Fair Compromise

By Jorge Romero



The requirements for high school graduation have just changed in my community. As a result, all students must complete sixty hours of service learning, or they will not receive a diploma. Service learning is academic learning that also helps the community. Examples of service learning include cleaning up a polluted river, working in a soup kitchen, or tutoring a student. During a service experience, students must keep a journal and then write a report about what they have learned.

Supporters claim that there are many benefits of service learning. Perhaps most important, students are forced to think beyond their own interests and become aware of the needs of others. Students are also able to learn real-life skills that include responsibility, problem-solving, and working as part of a team. Finally, students can explore possible careers through service learning. For example, if a student wonders what teaching is like, he or she can choose to work in an elementary school classroom a few afternoons each month.

While there are many benefits, opponents point out problems with the new requirement. First, they argue that the

main reason students go to school is to learn core subjects and skills. Because service learning is time-consuming, students spend less time studying the core subjects. Second, they believe that forcing students to work without pay goes against the Thirteenth Amendment, which protects people from forced servitude, or slavery. By requiring service, the school takes away an individual's freedom to choose.

In my view, service learning is a great way to contribute to the community, learn new skills, and explore different careers. However, I don't believe you should force people to help others—the desire to help must come from the heart. I think the best solution is one that gives students choices: a student should be able to choose sixty hours of independent study or sixty hours of service. Choice encourages both freedom and responsibility, and as young adults we must learn to handle both wisely.

Expos  
Description

Pers  
Pros

Pers.  
Opposing  
View

cause/effect

Pers. opposing  
view

cons

Pers  
problem/sol

.VE TIME | GLOBE EDITORIAL

The Boston Globe

# Driven to distraction

January 4, 2006

*(One in a series of editorials about America's car culture.)*

BICYCLISTS SAY THESE motorists are indistinguishable from drunk drivers. Truckers honk when they stray from their lanes. Regular drivers watch for their last-minute swerves down a side street or onto an exit ramp.

They -- it will come as no surprise -- are drivers using cellphones.

Everyone has personal stories of accidents or near misses, but studies are now coming in that make it clear: Cellphone use by drivers in motion is a menace, and a growing one.

*emotional appeal*

Motorists using cellphones are four times as likely to be in an accident as those who aren't, according to a study last year in Australia. A Harvard study estimates that 6 percent of US accidents, and 2,600 deaths a year, are linked to cellphones. Even so, the number of drivers using a cellphone at any given time rose from 5 to 6 percent nationally between 2004 and 2005, according to a report last month from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Among drivers 16 to 24 years old, frighteningly, it was up to 10 percent.

It is time for Massachusetts to put a stop to the practice. It is not a matter of personal freedom when distracted drivers endanger others' lives and limbs, or even when they bang a few thousand fenders, driving up everyone's insurance premiums.

Last year, Connecticut and the city of Chicago joined New York state, New Jersey, and Washington, D.C., in banning the use of hand-held phones by motorists. Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, and Tennessee barred their use by young drivers. But the United States is only catching up with global trends. Some 40 countries, including most of Europe, restrict cellphone use by drivers.

*bandwagon*

A bill has been filed in Massachusetts that would outlaw only the use of hand-held phones, and another that would apply only to young drivers. But it has been shown that hands-free phones are just as hazardous. And mature drivers who are not paying attention can be as dangerous as young ones.

*appeal to reason*

Representative James Marzilli, an Arlington Democrat who is pushing for an outright ban of all devices, says he fears that the lack of restrictions has given drivers a sense that the use of cellphones "is a birthright -- like cars themselves." But that must change.

*appeal to emotion*

Increasingly, Americans are making multitasking a way of life. But when one of those tasks is piloting a ton of steel, or more, at 100 feet per second, public safety requires a focus on that task alone.

*appeal to emotion*

Cellphones are great for emergencies; a driver can pull over and dial 911. But their use should be banned for motorists while in motion. They have proven to be a dangerous distraction. Far too often, 911 is being called because someone was on a cellphone.

*appeal to emotion*

**Next: Real auto insurance reform ■**

*bandwagon emotional appeal*

*copying statistics*

# Guilt by The Bottleful

**Bottled water is being portrayed as an environmental villain. But is it any different from bottled soda or juice?**

By Alex Williams

Those bottles of water always seemed so harmless tucked into everyone's backpacks. In fact, when some schools banned soda and other sugary drinks from cafeterias and vending machines, they sold bottled water as a healthy alternative. But now, environmentalists are saying that water that comes in plastic bottles is not so healthy for the planet.



The debate centers not on the water, but on oil—the oil that's used to make the bottles, and the oil that's used to get them to consumers. According to the Earth Policy Institute in Washington, D.C., it takes 1.5 million barrels of oil a year to make the plastic water bottles Americans use—plus countless barrels to transport the water from as far away as Fiji and refrigerate it. Plastic bottles that are not being recycled are piling up in landfills. (Of course, plenty of those bottles once contained drinks other than water.)

Julia Duch, 17, a senior at Staten Island Academy in New York, says that after reading a magazine article on the environmental impact of bottled water, she decided that "there was no use for carrying around a bottle of Poland Spring."

As head of her school's Environmental Club, Julia thought she should set an example: She now carries water in a reusable plastic bottle. The club plans to submit a proposal that the school stop selling bottled water and give each student a reusable water bottle.

The issue took on a higher profile this past summer when the mayors of San Francisco, Salt Lake City, Minneapolis, and New York began urging people to opt for tap water instead of bottled. This added momentum to efforts by environmental groups like Corporate Accountability International and Food & Water Watch.

Over the last 15 years, the bottled water industry has turned a product that once seemed an indulgence into a daily necessity. Bottled water has now overtaken coffee and milk in sales nationally.

## Turning to The Tap

An August editorial in The New York Times—"In Praise of Tap Water"—argued against bottled water on the ground that "this country has some of the best public water supplies in the world." Many restaurants have pulled bottled water from their menus.

The industry is feeling the heat, and is taking steps to address these concerns. Nestlé, which sells Perrier and Poland Spring, and Coca-Cola, which sells Dasani, have reduced package weight, tried to become more energy efficient, and launched conservation and recycling projects.

According to The Wall Street Journal, Coca-Cola is planning to build a plant capable of recycling up to 2 billion 20-ounce bottles a year. Beverage companies are also looking at ways to encourage more consumers to recycle.

The Fiji Water Company says it intends to become carbon negative—that is, to more than make up for the greenhouse gases released in the bottling, transportation, and sales of its product. The company says it will install a windmill in 2009 to provide energy to its bottling plant in Fiji, which is in the South Pacific. It will also ship water intended for sale on the East Coast to Philadelphia, rather than trucking it from Los Angeles.

In August, the International Bottled Water Association took out full-page ads in newspapers, urging consumers to recycle, not abandon, their bottles and arguing that "when we drink any beverage, it's likely to come out of a bottle or a can."

Paul Pentel, a physician in Minneapolis, sees this as two separate issues. "One is water, the other is plastic bottles," he says. "We have been trying to steer people away from the liquid candy—juices, pop, and everything else. From that standpoint, water is good, and I'm very hesitant to demonize bottled water."

## Bring Your Own

Indeed, some people wonder why environmentalists have singled out bottled water, and not dish detergent or Wiffle Ball bats. Jessica Retan, 22, a nanny who lives in New York, says the waste issue is "concerning, but there's Coke, shampoo—a lot of other things in addition to water that are bottled in plastic. So I'm curious. Why just focus on bottled water?"

Gigi Kellett of Corporate Accountability International's Think Outside the Bottle campaign says that targeting bottled water is a good starting point because water "is something people have access to right out of the tap."

Then there's the cost to the consumer of all that bottled water. Bringing your own, says Kellett, is "a way to protect the environment and protect your pocketbook."



[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/19/opinion/19romney.html?\\_r=1&em](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/19/opinion/19romney.html?_r=1&em)

# Let Detroit Go Bankrupt

By Mitt Romney, the former governor of Massachusetts; a candidate for this year's Republican presidential nomination.

Published: November 18, 2008

IF General Motors, Ford and Chrysler get the bailout that their chief executives asked for yesterday, you can kiss the American automotive industry goodbye. It won't go overnight, but its demise will be virtually guaranteed.

Without that bailout, Detroit will need to drastically restructure itself. With it, the automakers will stay the course — the suicidal course of declining market shares, insurmountable labor and retiree burdens, technology atrophy, product inferiority and never-ending job losses. Detroit needs a turnaround, not a check.

I love cars, American cars. I was born in Detroit, the son of an auto chief executive. In 1954, my dad, George Romney, was tapped to run American Motors when its president suddenly died. The company itself was on life support — banks were threatening to deal it a death blow. The stock collapsed. I watched Dad work to turn the company around — and years later at business school, they were still talking about it. From the lessons of that turnaround, and from my own experiences, I have several prescriptions for Detroit's automakers.

First, their huge disadvantage in costs relative to foreign brands must be eliminated. That means new labor agreements to align pay and benefits to match those of workers at competitors like BMW, Honda, Nissan and Toyota. Furthermore, retiree benefits must be reduced so that the total burden per auto for domestic makers is not higher than that of foreign producers.

That extra burden is estimated to be more than \$2,000 per car. Think what that means: Ford, for example, needs to cut \$2,000 worth of features and quality out of its Taurus to compete with Toyota's Avalon. Of course the Avalon feels like a better product — it has \$2,000 more put into it. Considering this disadvantage, Detroit has done a remarkable job

of designing and engineering its cars. But if this cost penalty persists, any bailout will only delay the inevitable.

Second, management as is must go. New faces should be recruited from unrelated industries — from companies widely respected for excellence in marketing, innovation, creativity and labor relations.

The new management must work with labor leaders to see that the enmity between labor and management comes to an end. This division is a holdover from the early years of the last century, when unions brought workers job security and better wages and benefits. But as Walter Reuther, the former head of the United Automobile Workers, said to my father, “Getting more and more pay for less and less work is a dead-end street.”

You don’t have to look far for industries with unions that went down that road. Companies in the 21st century cannot perpetuate the destructive labor relations of the 20th. This will mean a new direction for the U.A.W., profit sharing or stock grants to all employees and a change in Big Three management culture.

The need for collaboration will mean accepting sanity in salaries and perks. At American Motors, my dad cut his pay and that of his executive team, he bought stock in the company, and he went out to factories to talk to workers directly. Get rid of the planes, the executive dining rooms — all the symbols that breed resentment among the hundreds of thousands who will also be sacrificing to keep the companies afloat.

Investments must be made for the future. No more focus on quarterly earnings or the kind of short-term stock appreciation that means quick riches for executives with options. Manage with an eye on cash flow, balance sheets and long-term appreciation. Invest in truly competitive products and innovative technologies — especially fuel-saving designs — that may not arrive for years. Starving research and development is like eating the seed corn.

Just as important to the future of American carmakers is the sales force. When sales are down, you don’t want to lose the only people who can get them to grow. So don’t fire the best dealers, and don’t crush them with new financial or performance demands they can’t meet.

It is not wrong to ask for government help, but the automakers should come up with a win-win proposition. I believe the federal government should invest substantially more in basic research — on new energy sources, fuel-economy technology, materials science and the like — that will ultimately benefit the automotive industry, along with many others. I believe Washington should raise energy research spending to \$20 billion a year, from the \$4 billion that is spent today. The research could be done at universities, at research labs and even through public-private collaboration. The federal government should also rectify the imbedded tax penalties that favor foreign carmakers.

But don't ask Washington to give shareholders and bondholders a free pass — they bet on management and they lost.

The American auto industry is vital to our national interest as an employer and as a hub for manufacturing. A managed bankruptcy may be the only path to the fundamental restructuring the industry needs. It would permit the companies to shed excess labor, pension and real estate costs. The federal government should provide guarantees for post-bankruptcy financing and assure car buyers that their warranties are not at risk.

In a managed bankruptcy, the federal government would propel newly competitive and viable automakers, rather than seal their fate with a bailout check.

# Where Sweatshops Are a Dream

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/15/opinion/15kristof.html?em>

Before Barack Obama and his team act on their talk about “labor standards,” I’d like to offer them a tour of the vast garbage dump here in Phnom Penh.

This is a Dante-like vision of hell. It’s a mountain of festering refuse, a half-hour hike across, emitting clouds of smoke from subterranean fires.

The miasma of toxic stink leaves you gasping, breezes batter you with filth, and even the rats look forlorn. Then the smoke parts and you come across a child ambling barefoot, searching for old plastic cups that recyclers will buy for five cents a pound. Many families actually live in shacks on this smoking garbage.

Mr. Obama and the Democrats who favor labor standards in trade agreements mean well, for they intend to fight back at oppressive sweatshops abroad. But while it shocks Americans to hear it, the central challenge in the poorest countries is not that sweatshops exploit too many people, but that they don’t exploit enough.

Talk to these families in the dump, and a job in a sweatshop is a cherished dream, an escalator out of poverty, the kind of gauzy if probably unrealistic ambition that parents everywhere often have for their children.

“I’d love to get a job in a factory,” said Pim Srey Rath, a 19-year-old woman scavenging for plastic. “At least that work is in the shade. Here is where it’s hot.”

Another woman, Vath Sam Oeun, hopes her 10-year-old boy, scavenging beside her, grows up to get a factory job, partly because she has seen other children run over by garbage trucks. Her boy has

never been to a doctor or a dentist, and last bathed when he was 2, so a sweatshop job by comparison would be far more pleasant and less dangerous.

I'm glad that many Americans are repulsed by the idea of importing products made by barely paid, barely legal workers in dangerous factories. Yet sweatshops are only a symptom of poverty, not a cause, and banning them closes off one route out of poverty. At a time of tremendous economic distress and protectionist pressures, there's a special danger that tighter labor standards will be used as an excuse to curb trade.

When I defend sweatshops, people always ask me: But would you want to work in a sweatshop? No, of course not. But I would want even less to pull a rickshaw. In the hierarchy of jobs in poor countries, sweltering at a sewing machine isn't the bottom.

My views on sweatshops are shaped by years living in East Asia, watching as living standards soared — including those in my wife's ancestral village in southern China — because of sweatshop jobs.

Manufacturing is one sector that can provide millions of jobs. Yet sweatshops usually go not to the poorest nations but to better-off countries with more reliable electricity and ports.

I often hear the argument: Labor standards can improve wages and working conditions, without greatly affecting the eventual retail cost of goods. That's true. But labor standards and "living wages" have a larger impact on production costs that companies are always trying to pare. The result is to push companies to operate more capital-intensive factories in better-off nations like Malaysia, rather than labor-intensive factories in poorer countries like Ghana or Cambodia.

Cambodia has, in fact, pursued an interesting experiment by working with factories to establish decent labor standards and wages. It's a worthwhile idea, but one result of paying above-market wages is that those in charge of hiring often demand bribes — sometimes a month's

salary — in exchange for a job. In addition, these standards add to production costs, so some factories have closed because of the global economic crisis and the difficulty of competing internationally.

The best way to help people in the poorest countries isn't to campaign against sweatshops but to promote manufacturing there. One of the best things America could do for Africa would be to strengthen our program to encourage African imports, called AGOA, and nudge Europe to match it.

Among people who work in development, many strongly believe (but few dare say very loudly) that one of the best hopes for the poorest countries would be to build their manufacturing industries. But global campaigns against sweatshops make that less likely.

Look, I know that Americans have a hard time accepting that sweatshops can help people. But take it from 13-year-old Neuo Chanthou, who earns a bit less than \$1 a day scavenging in the dump. She's wearing a "Playboy" shirt and hat that she found amid the filth, and she worries about her sister, who lost part of her hand when a garbage truck ran over her.

"It's dirty, hot and smelly here," she said wistfully. "A factory is better."

•