

Annelise Dutcher

Instructor Sean Bottai

English 109H

11 October 2015

Like a Relationship: Effective Until Defiant Emotions Get Involved

(questionable Title but I thought it was funny)

Good, trusted relationships can be hard to form. I, for one, am personally experiencing this as a new college student in a completely different state than where I grew up. Today, trusting someone you know nothing about is not only scary but unlikely without some background stalking of every social media site this new person owns. Even after discovering all their information is in fact true, it is now time to get a better understanding of the real them by understanding their personality. Although someone may have a fantastic personality, the way they project their emotions can really affect the way others view their overall being. This can make or break relationships just as the relationship between an author and audience can be influenced by the way the author conveys a certain topic. In her article, “Apple’s Appalling Ethics”, Fran Hawthorne, award winning author, captures the attention of her audience with her use of unbeatable facts and sly sarcasm describing Apple’s poor ethics which create a cry for change in businesses’ ethics and social responsibilities. However, it is questionable whether her passion is translated too much into anger, ultimately losing the audience and any hope of informing them on a commonly misunderstood topic.

Hawthorne effectively informs her audience on the incorrect assumption of a positive correlation between social responsibility and popularity of companies such as Apple. By

providing statistics and direct quotations from professionals, Hawthorne enforces this argument's credibility. Hawthorne introduces this misconception with a quote from Wood Turner, an executive at an environmentally concerned non-profit. Turner informs the audience of the common attribution between Apple as a "current, leading-edge brand" and the consumer's assumption of Apple's overall positive social responsibility. The use of this quote provides credibility to Hawthorne's argument. She is not the only person talking and directing her attention to the issue of false business ethics. There are, in fact, other professionals bringing the issue forward attempting to inform consumers. Furthermore, Hawthorne lists shocking data that enforce her point of not just trusting a company's social responsibility due to their popularity. Apple's "undeserved green halo" is backed by their low standing on the list for lowest carbon-emissions via the organization ClimateCounts as well as their lack of standings in *Newsweek's* "100 Greenest Companies in America" list (Hawthorne). Consumers are often not looking into data such as this because they believe that companies are required to openly disclose any and all of their ethical information. However, this is false and investors even criticize Apple and their lack of openness about their environmental responsibilities (Hawthorne). These facts help Hawthorne to discredit Apple. An audience can no longer withstand the facts that although Apple is one of the leading tech companies and a household name, it is not doing all it can to give back. Additionally, Hawthorne brings up the point that Apple blinds its consumers with clever advertising featuring some of the most socially responsible people the world knows. Her use of big names such as Gandhi and Al Gore followed by the statement, "all the hippest, smartest, most socially concerned people you know probably have Macs and iPods, and *they* care about the environment," suggests just how easy it is for consumers to be manipulated by the sly

marketeers catering to what they want. Hawthorne diminishes any hope Apple has for appearing socially responsible. Her facts and direct quotations make her argument impossible to deviate.

The slightly sarcastic tone used by Hawthorne when defining Apple's public image adds personality to her article, allowing it to become more of a conversation for the reader than an act of public speech. This use of diction provides a relationship with the audience that lacks formality and makes the article more personable and relatable. Hawthorne satirizes the ability of Apple to form inauthentic trust with their customers by saying, “for Apple customers with their heads buried in their iPads, the stories were a shock,” when referring to her abundance of true and shocking facts. (Still figuring this one out)

Hawthorne's clear passion toward the issue of business ethics is evident, however as the article nears its close, Hawthorne loses herself to her emotion which translates to anger to her audience. She does a fantastic job of relating to the audience and providing credibility to her argument until she gets too caught up in her emotion and appears in an aggressive manor. This issue arises when she begins to explain the poor effects of Apple's clear secrecy regarding anything about their company. Secrecy and not fully disclosing certain information within a company is a valid issue, however it is the way tone she uses and the way she words this argument of her article that loses the audience and even slightly discredits her article.

Hawthorne's first use of aggressive wording is when she refers to Apple's “phony packaging” and the fact that Steve Jobs did not like a certain book written about him and therefore banned the author from Apple stores (Hawthorne). The use of the word “phony” is not a descriptive word, it is a spiteful word. Hawthorne's choice of adjective is based completely on the anger she feels for the company and does not appeal to her audience. It is a very general assumption that

Hawthorne makes in thinking her audience will agree with her. Also, the added information she uses about the banned author is unnecessary and again, a spiteful act. The fact, although strange, has no support for her argument about Apple's secrecy or their social responsibility. It is completely random and only used to bash Apple (**need a different way to explain**). Hawthorne goes on to label the officers of Apple as "close-mouthed." Although it may be true that Apple likes to keep their information on the down low, the term "close-mouthed" is yet again aggressive and questionable. The tone that this word choice puts off is argumentative and upset which is unappealing to any audience. Finally, Hawthorne closes her article with the statement, "Perhaps, we should use our MacBooks and iPhones to contact Apple, over and over, and demand more information." Rather than end using a strong and final statistic which supported her argument so well in the beginning, Hawthorne finalizes her argument with a weak suggestion. "Demanding more information" is not a useful suggestion in fixing the issue her passion so overtly takes over. Actual ways of improving consumer knowledge about social responsibility and how they can make purchases accordingly would have been a better way to end than leaving the audience without a solution and feeling slightly attacked. Hawthorne provided a credible argument toward the importance on the disclosure of businesses' ethics, however her overall word choice and the tone that her choices create fail to support her article at the end.

Hawthorne is a well versed author who clearly understands the importance of credibility and logic within her work. However, she falls short in her appeals to emotion with her audience by coming off overpowering and defiant in her feelings toward Apple. Being able to trust what

you read is important. Supporting an argument with facts and quotes is a great persuasive strategy. (struggling to find a solid conclusion but i do want to relate it to my title)