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 **Ravisankar begins his essay by** mentioning college students, as acknowledging their low budgets and to what extent they try to save their money. He does this in the way of appealing to his audience, which is college students. **The problem he identifies is** centralized on the poor working conditions as well as the low incomes of the workers that are employed at “Sweatshops." **Ravisankar assumes his readers are2** mainly comprised of college students that are "poor." **His purpose in this essay is to** shed light on the conditions of Sweatshops and employees working there**. In order to accomplish this purpose, he appeals mainly to** the people that consume the produced that are produced in certain conditions which apparently include “poor” college students. **He also appeals to** the brands and organizations that tend to support such practices. He also provides a way to attract the moral and ethical sense of the readers, by mentioning the attitudes of people, who do not help these workers by paying slightly more for their services.**1 In his essay, Ravisankar addresses the main argument against his thesis, the idea that** organizations and companies where these conditions are prevailing should accept that the fact, that it is happening because of their unrealistic demand of high production of the high with minimum wages.**1** **He refutes this argument by saying** that these companies and sweatshops serve as a job providing entity mainly in the areas where there are minimum job opportunities. Hence, shutting them would bring a negative effect on the workers. **Finally, he concludes by making the point that** “poor”college students can help such workers by opting for the products of companies that provide respect to their workers along with allowing them to have unions. **Overall, the argument Ravisankar makes is ineffective because** at the one edge he provides us with the conditions of such organization and their poor worker, however, on the other hand, he supports 5the idea that if such companies do not exist, poor will be in worst conditions.
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