

In his foreword to a wildlife photography book, former U.S. President Jimmy Carter provides a stalwart defense of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska, which is the unique home to a precious northern ecosystem of animals and plants. Carter uses **logical reasoning, appeals to ethics and emotion, personal anecdotes, specific references and helpful data** to help make his case for urgent action to the wildlife aficionados who read this book.

In the first paragraph, Carter **introduces his readers** to the Arctic Refuge, calling it “great, magnificent, windswept”¹ terrain, where majestic animals roam scenic landscapes². The **vivid imagery** in this paragraph draws in the audience and makes us feel as if we³ are there ourselves, taking in the spectacular scenery, landscapes and wildlife.

The author continues with this **theme** in the second and third paragraphs, recounting a **personal anecdote** about a trip he and his wife Rosalynn took to the refuge, over 10 years⁴ before this essay was written. In this anecdote Carter reminds us of the beauty of the area by **recounting** the migration of “tens of thousands of caribou with their newborn calves.” Using **evocative, descriptive and colorful language**, Carter draws us into his story, and through the careful **use of emotion**, he makes us, the readers, more invested in the fates of these animals.

In the fourth paragraph, Carter **shifts focus** to the pressing issue that was his main concern all along: the precarious fate of the refuge itself, under threat by developers in the region who wish to take advantage of the area to build pipelines and drill for oil. Again Carter introduces **emotional language**, using words and phrases such as⁵ “I was saddened,” “tragedy” and “destroy” to **illustrate** the urgency of the issue to his readers.

By the time the reader arrives at paragraph five, the author has strategically moved away from **appeals to emotion** and toward **appeals to logic and ethics**, explaining to us that the unique value of the Arctic Refuge “has long been recognized by both Republican and Democratic presidents.” Carter recognizes the power of emotion, as well as its ineffectualness when overused, so he wisely **pivots** to a new strategy by citing facts and figures rather than opinions. He “reaches across both sides of the aisle” by explaining that the continued effort to protect the refuge should be and has been a bipartisan process.

Paragraph number six is part factual, part ethical. Carter explains that since his term in office, there have been multiple attempts to begin oil drilling in the refuge, but they have been resisted by the indigenous Americans such as the Gwich'in Athabascan Indians, “people whose culture has depended on the Porcupine herd for thousands of years.” Here, the former president shifts his focus from his primary emphasis on nature and animals, and toward the actual people who live in the area, in order to turn this environmental issue into something more: a “precious human rights” issue important to anyone who cares about the treatment of all humans.

¹ Feel free to quote from the passages here and there for effect, but try to keep your quotations short and sweet, and don't quote long passages.

² Paraphrase the passage in order to balance out your direct quotations.

³ Try not to use the 1st-person perspective “I” in an essay such as this. 1st person is often interpreted as too informal. Instead, 1st person plural “we” is my preferred term because of its inclusiveness. (I find 3rd person “one” to be too clinical.)

⁴ Again, paraphrase whenever possible to avoid quotation fatigue--in the essay it said “more than a decade.”

⁵ Careful: lots of people say “like” when they mean “such as.”

In paragraph number seven, Carter bestows upon us the argumentative essay trifecta: **logos, ethos, and pathos**. First, he breaks it down for us from a logical standpoint, using data to support his assertions: “at best, the Arctic Refuge might provide 1 to 2 percent of the oil our country consumes each day,” which illustrates to the reader the relative unimportance of the Refuge from an economic perspective. Then, he shifts to ethics, telling us that this difference can be easily made up for through a modicum of mindful conservation on the part of American citizens. Finally, he gives us one more burst of emotion, a warning against “tearing open the heart” of the refuge, an expression that pulls no punches in terms of its emotive content.

The final two, shorter paragraphs are Carter’s summary paragraphs. In them, he reminds us of the issue at hand and makes his own opinion on the issue crystal clear. The brief paragraphs convey confidence in his opinion while reminding the reader of his most salient points.

Word Count: 634