

The Critical Analysis: Argumentative Essay #1

1. Read Nicholas Carr's argumentative essay, "[Is Google Making Us Stupid?](#)" .
2. For comparison, read two student briefs about the same article:
 1. [Katelyn Rielly](#)
 2. [Julian Velez](#)
3. Consider the following questions to prepare you for your essay response:
 1. Before considering the scientific and sociological research supporting each of his claims, Carr relays his personal experience of the ways his reading habits have changed. What does he achieve in doing so? What effect does this strategy have on the persuasiveness of his argument? Comment on the specific ways in which this strategy was or was not effective in drawing you in as a reader.
 2. Examine carefully each of the various sources Carr draws on to support his response to the question he asks. What are the different areas of study represented in his argument? What do you notice about the way Carr transitions from one source to the next? Comment on the effectiveness of these transitions.
 3. Overall: Analyze Carr's argument and explain if you agree or disagree with it. Stating specific examples from your own experience may support your reasoning.

Critical Analysis: Argumentative Essay #2

1. Read Vicki Hearne's argumentative essay, "[What's Wrong with Animal Rights?](#)" as published in Harper's Magazine in 1991.
2. Consider the following questions when writing about that essay and the issue(s) that it illustrates.
 1. Hearne writes from an "expert" perspective as an animal trainer. Suppose she were not an expert. How would that change your reading of her argument?
 2. Hearne takes issue both with the common definition of "animal," protesting that not all animals are alike and with the common notion of "happiness" as comfort (paragraphs 1 and 2). How do questions about these definitions form the basis of Hearne's argument? Is it possible to disagree with her definitions and still support her overall argument or vice versa? Why or why not?
3. The opposing point of view: read Jeff Ward's response to Hearne's essay. Is his analysis valid or invalid? Why or why not? What gives his response credibility or removes it (specifically)?