

Main assertion: *This paragraph begins with a straightforward thesis that recycling is not cost-efficient—that it costs too much.*

Support: *Relying primarily on the Tierney article, this writer goes through a series of reasons for the extra expense: extra city officials, public education programs, reduced efficiency of recycling pickup, and minimal market value for recyclables.*

Direct quotations: *Notice that this writer quotes two pithy phrases from Tierney's articles, quotations that carry some of the attitude and personality of the original*

## Persuasive Technical Writing

---

### Recycling—Not Worth It

One of the biggest problems with recycling is that it is not cost-efficient. In fact, recycling is a serious financial drain on all but a very few municipalities. As John Tierney pointed out in his 1996 *New York Times Magazine* article, collecting and handling a ton of recyclable materials is three times more expensive than putting them directly into a landfill.

Why is that? Recycling programs require extra bureaucrats to manage them and enforcement officers to inspect people's recycling efforts and fine them if they are not complying. They require expensive public education campaigns to train people in the arduous process of sorting and storing their garbage correctly. (According to Tierney, "New Yorkers still don't know the rules.") Recycling programs are also more expensive because less garbage can be picked up at each stop. Tierney, in his aptly titled article, "Recycling Is Garbage," estimated that in 1996 New York City was spending more than \$200 to recycle a ton of glass, plastic and metal than it would spend to bury the material in a landfill.

Tierney points out that market prices for recyclables has "rarely risen as high as zero." In fact, the city has to pay an additional \$40 [per ton] to get rid of valueless recyclables.