

18 February 2018

AP Language Period 1

Mr. Pogreba

Death, disease, famine: this is the future Rachel Carson saw if pesticide use was not addressed in the US. In the 60s, after centuries of having to use costly and time-consuming methods of pest control, a quick and easy way to dispose of unwanted creatures was finally readily available. Pesticides were suddenly everywhere, and they weren't just being used to kill crop killers; they killed anything that was deemed obnoxious, unhelpful, frustrating, or annoying. But the unregulated use of pesticides was starting to have an unwanted effect on the rest of the environment, one that Carson saw and tried to address early. In an excerpt from her 1962 book *Silent Spring*, she condemns the reckless and dangerous use of pesticides in the US and incriminates the humans that participated, encouraged, or allowed the uncontrolled frenzy of pesticide use.

First, Carson decries (lines 1-32) the indiscriminate slaughter of animal life with pesticides. She calls pesticide use a "habit of killing," showing how the use of pesticides has become routine and ordinary, even though it is destroying vast populations of varying species. Farmers also had been "persuaded" to use pesticides instead of any other method of control -- agricultural problems that "could have been solved easily by a slight change" in the type of produce grown had pesticides used instead and killed 65,000 birds. She also talks about how this widespread use of pesticides that are "universal killers" has started to affect animals that were never the target of the poison: "humans, domestic animals, and wildlife" and "rabbits or raccoons

97/

BOLD  
CHANGES

Good Thesis

1  
broadly,  
this  
scoping  
reference  
juxtaposition  
you could  
make  
clearer  
1

or opossums" as well as any animal that they were actually trying to kill. She refers to these deaths as "unnoticed and unrecorded" and describes their deaths as "doomed by a judge and jury who neither knew of their existence nor cared. She uses a war metaphor to highlight the complete destruction of animal life with phrases like "casualty list" and "planes on their mission of death," making the slaughter of the birds seem not like collateral damage but instead genocide against innocent and ignored creatures. She repeatedly refers to pesticides as "poisons" in order to present them as malicious and killing. Carson condemns pesticides as unrestrained killers that are destroying the environment and those who have to live in it.

Next, Carson implicates (lines 33-46) humans not only as the perpetrators of the problem, but also the victims. Using an example involving the very same pesticide used in the earlier paragraph, parathion, she talks about workers going into shock and how they "escaped death" only because of doctors, a privilege none of the helpless animals were ever given. This is a clear comparison to the earlier anecdotes so that the toll that the pesticides are taking is made clear with a human subject. The phrase that she used about escaping death is important because it makes it seem like an even closer call, as though their death was imminent, but by fortune of "skilled medical attention," they lived. She provides other examples of how pesticides could affect humans, next using a child to provide an example of an explorer in a "misguided search for unspoiled nature" but instead only comes to contact with a "lethal film," harkening back to the war analogy in the first paragraphs, this time referencing chemical warfare. She uses many different nature scenes like woods, fields and rivers to not only show the extent of the pesticides but to provide many images of destroyed nature contrasted with the image of a young boy and an "innocent stroller" being affronted with this horror. She uses rhetorical questions to ask "who

build to her biggest claims instead of talking at on a minor point

make this a bit more sharply defined: how does this example

Juxtapose

Be careful that it doesn't feel too much like a list here: make the war metaphor stand out

guarded the poisoned area” and “who kept vigilant watch” which unfortunately have a clear answer: no one. At the end of the paragraph, she blames the farmers, who have “waged a needless war” without any concern for the effects on people or on what seems such an innocent opponent, blackbirds. In this section, Carson expands her analysis of the effect of the pesticides to humans as well, and further incriminates the people who allowed it to happen.

In the final paragraph, Carson poses largely unanswered questions (lines 47-65) about the continued pesticide use as a way to encourage her audience to take action about the continued use of pesticides. Throughout the entire section, she uses very vivid language, some intended to again emphasize the extent and essential randomness of the killing, like “unselective bludgeon” or an “ever-widening wave of death” that “like ripples when a pebble is dropped into a still pond” starts out seemingly isolated but quickly grows and spreads, encompassing everything that surrounds it. Some try to elicit sympathy for the pesticide’s victims, like “pitiful heaps of many-hued feathers” and “lifeless remains” that are being weighed thoughtlessly against the value of the “leaves that might have been eaten by the beetles.” She poses questions that ask “who” -- “who has decided,” “who has the right to decide,” who has valued crops and farms over animal life, and many others, and contrasts an “authoritarian temporarily entrusted with power” who, without the knowledge or consent of “millions to whom beauty and...nature still have a meaning” has destroyed those very things. At the very end of the paragraph though, her language switches, and instead of being graphic and sad, there are phrases of beauty and hope: “curving wind of a bird in flight,” and “beauty and the ordered world of nature” that imply that there is still hope for the situation that the unheard “millions” can help. The entire paragraph turns into a call to action to speak out and address the deaths of all the creatures who have died because of

Great!

(D) this as an example of justice

1:2  
break this into 2 claims -  
first, the author tells us that millions will let you (D)  
how she uses juxtaposition to urge us to act.

this poison. At the end of the excerpt, Carson implores her readers to stop condoning the thoughtless use of pesticides and presents a brief positive view of a better world.

The biologist Rachel Carson was one of the first to speak out against America's rapidly increasing use of pesticides with her book *Silent Spring*. She sees pesticides as needless and far-reaching poisons that were being constantly administered to innocent people and animals of the world. Although her book paints a pretty bleak picture of America's pesticide use, it also provides solutions and the hope for a better world. Eventually, the book did inspire action and it was a huge factor in the banning of DDT, an insecticide with huge environmental consequences. Carson used her book utterly condemning pesticide use to enact change, and make the world safer for the animals and people that came after her.

18 February 2018

AP Language Period I

Mr. Pogreba

Death, disease, famine: this is the future Rachel Carson saw if pesticide use was not addressed in the US. In the 60s, after centuries of having to use costly and time-consuming methods of pest control, a quick and easy way to dispose of unwanted creatures was finally readily available. Pesticides were suddenly everywhere, and they weren't just being used to kill crop killers; they killed anything that was deemed obnoxious, unhelpful, frustrating, or annoying. But the unregulated use of pesticides was starting to have an unwanted effect on the rest of the environment, one that Carson saw and tried to address early. In an excerpt from her 1962 book *Silent Spring*, she condemns the reckless and dangerous use of pesticides in the US, and incriminates the humans that participated, encouraged, or allowed the uncontrolled frenzy of pesticide use.

good intro!

First, Carson decries (lines 1-32) the indiscriminate slaughter of animal life with pesticides. She calls pesticide use a "habit of killing" showing how the use of pesticides has become routine and ordinary, even though it is destroying vast populations of varying species. Farmers also had started to use pesticides instead of any other method of control -- instead of merely changing the crop they were using slightly so it would be safe from birds they used pesticides and killed 65,000 birds. She also talks about how this widespread use of pesticides that are "universal killers" has started to affect animals that were never the target of the poison: "humans, domestic animals, and wildlife" and "rabbits or raccoons or opossums" as well as any

Link to her specific text!



animal that they were actually trying to kill. She refers to these deaths as “unnoticed and unrecorded” and describes their deaths as “doomed by a judge and jury who neither knew of their existence nor cared. She uses a war metaphor to highlight the complete destruction of animal life with phrases like “casualty list” and “planes on their mission of death.” She repeatedly refers to pesticides as “poisons” in order to present them as malicious and killing. Carson condemns pesticides as unrestrained killers that are destroying the environment and those who have to live in it.

I'd really like her use of this war metaphor - it's really essential to her claim.

Next, Carson implicates (lines 33-46) humans not only as the perpetrators of the problem,

but also the victims. Using an example involving the very same pesticide used in the earlier paragraph, parathion, she talks about workers going into shock and how they “escaped death” only because of doctors. This is a clear comparison to the earlier anecdotes so that the toll that the pesticides are taking is made clear with a human subject. The phrase that she used about

the impact of this claim

escaping death is important because it makes it seem like an even closer call, as though their death was imminent, but by fortune of medicine, they lived. She provides other examples of how pesticides could affect humans, next using a child to provide an example of an explorer in a

Be sure to link to as much specific text as you can

“misguided search for unspoiled nature” but instead only comes to contact with a “lethal film.”

She uses many different nature scenes like woods, fields and rivers to not only show the extent of the pesticides but to provide many images of destroyed nature. At the end of the paragraph, she blames the farmers, who have “waged a needless war” on what seems such an innocent opponent, blackbirds. In this section, Carson expands her analysis of the effect of the pesticides to humans as well, and further incriminates the people who allowed it to happen.

I'd like the juxtaposition here a bit more - the young, unspoiled, etc. w/ the horror of pesticides



Shift this  
last (15)  
to her  
purpose

In the final paragraph, Carson poses largely unanswered questions (lines 47-65) about the continued pesticide use. Throughout the entire section, she uses very vivid language, some intended to again emphasize the extent and essential randomness of the killing, like "unselective bludgeon" or "ever-widening wave of death," some trying to elicit sympathy for the pesticide's victims, like "pitiful heaps of many-hued feathers" and "lifeless remains," and some depicting those who use pesticides as an "authoritarian temporarily entrusted with power." The questions ask "who" -- who has decided that pesticide use is ok, who has the right to decide, who has valued crops and farms over animal life, and many others, and they all have the same implied answer: humans, farmers, anyone who has allowed this to occur. At the very end of the paragraph though, her language switches, and instead of being graphic and sad, there are phrases of beauty and hope: "curving wind of a bird in flight," and "beauty and the ordered world of nature." The entire paragraph turns into a call to action to speak out and address the deaths of all the creatures who have died because of this poison. At the end of the excerpt, Carson implores her readers to stop condoning the thoughtless use of pesticides and presents a brief positive view of a better world.

This feels  
like too  
much  
combined  
text -  
some of  
these need  
individual  
analysis

(15) purpose of  
these  
phrases

I'm not  
sure  
that  
you really  
explain  
how  
she does  
this

The biologist Rachel Carson was one of the first to speak out against America's rapidly increasing use of pesticides with her book *Silent Spring*. She sees pesticides as needless and far-reaching poisons that were being constantly administered to innocent people and animals of the world. Although her book paints a pretty bleak picture of America's pesticide use, it also provides solutions and the hope for a better world. Eventually, the book did inspire action and it was a huge factor in the banning of DDT, an insecticide with huge environmental consequences.

Carson used her book utterly condemning pesticide use to enact change, and make the world safer for the animals and people that came after her.