

Valorie K Ruiz

ITC

WK 3

2/7/17

Hari's personal connection to the subject of addiction enables him to create an argument that creates a strong emotional appeal through the use of narration and identification. Hari uses these strategies effectively in supporting his claim that addiction can be caused by a lack of connection to people versus being solely based on chemical dependency. As the audience progresses through the argument, they are faced with more than just the abstract view of an addict, instead they are told a story about Hari's family member along with the mention of his partner. Though Hari does succeed in creating a strong emotional appeal, much of his logical evidence fails in providing clear proof of his theory. This is where his argument begins to fall flat. One example of an area where Hari could have strengthened his argument was by omitting the study surrounding the nicotine patch and cigarettes. This survey was far reaching, and seemed to do little in supporting his main argument or sub claims. Different evidence, such as that of the Icelandic approach to teen drug abuse, could have further strengthened his article. Overall, Hari is able to create an argument that appeals to the emotions of the readers, and perhaps supports his overall goal of increasing sales of his book. Hari may also have succeeded in getting the audience to at least consider an alternative view, but the argument can easily be challenged because of a lack of enough relatable evidence.