
Where Sweatshops Are a Dream: Critical Analysis Of The Article

In his essay titled "Where Sweatshops Are a Dream," feature writer for the New York Times Nicholas D. Kristof handles the controversial theme of sweatshops that are utilized, and frequently misused, in our overwhelmed economy today. Kristof starts his exposition by painting us an image of what his town Cambodia looks like outside of the sweatshop. Kristof addresses the endeavors being made to improve or expel sweatshops while exhibiting a contention for the need of these offices in certain pieces of the world. Even though the controversy is deficient in information, it is no under circumstances, new point of view on the theme. Be that as it may, he leaves the group of public hanging by neglecting to expound on any substitute answers for the issues he introduces.

The issue he recognizes is that despite the fact that Americans need to battle back with these sweatshops for 'abusing an excessive number of individuals' extremely these individuals simply dream for an occupation in the sweatshops. These individuals see these occupations as an exit from neediness. He utilizes stunning language and symbolism to reel the readers in and delineate the gravity of the circumstance, "This is a Dante-like version of hell. It's a mountain of festering refuse, a half-hour hike across, emitting clouds of smoke from a subterranean fire" (Kristof page#1). By looking at the setting of the spot called Phnom Penh that he is utilizing for instance in his paper to that of Dante's outstanding Divine Comedy, Kristof makes a reasonable mental image of the conditions these individuals are living with, evoking a solid introductory response from his group of onlookers. He expects that the readers are individuals who need to end sweatshops, however, that they don't understand that by closure these shops they are finishing individuals' deepest desires.

His motivation in this exposition is to demonstrate the opposite side to this story. He is demonstrating to us that regardless of what we figure these sweatshops do, these individuals are grateful for them. To achieve this, he claims to our feelings. As an example, Kristof uses the image of a 13-year-old girl who is dressed in clothes like she is just got out of the garbage and she says, "It's dirty and smelly here, a factory is better" (Kristof page#2). 13-year-old young girl said she earns every day under a \$1 per day by searching in the dump area, who is tarnished in appearance, and fears for her sister who lost her hand when she got run over by a waste vehicle. This young girl is utilized on the grounds that it demonstrates to us that despite the fact that we might want to think we are helping these individuals by closing down these industrial facilities or improving them deal with their workers, we aren't.

We are simply making these individuals' lives harder claiming all they need is a job to earn some money and on the off chance that you push rules onto these sweatshops they will simply close down and move to all the more likely off pieces of the nation. Kristof additionally claims to ethos by endeavoring to demonstrate his believability regarding this matter, He states, "my views on sweatshops are shaped by years of living in East Asia watching as living standards soar because of sweatshop jobs." This demonstrates to us that Kristof isn't a pariah expecting what these individuals need, yet that he has been inside this wreckage and he knows precisely what these individuals feel. In Kristof's exposition he tends to the principle contention against "labor standards can improve wages and working conditions, without greatly affecting the

eventual retail cost of goods” (Kristof page#1). Kristof invalidates this contention by saying this is valid, yet by doing this we cause processing huge plants to simply move and work in happier nations rather than more unfortunate nations. In the end he states that “the best way to help people isn’t to campaign against sweatshops but to promote manufacturing there” (Kristof page#2). Kristof’s contention is powerful since it is clear and upheld by certainties.

edubirdie.com