Using our PW and CT models, I concluded that Meg Greenfield's essay "In Defense of the Animals" is better than Ron Kline's "A Scientist: I am the enemy". Although both the essays had the similar structure of one thesis statement followed by supporting arguments, Greenfield's essay defeated Kline on organization and development. After reading both the essays, I noticed that the writers were giving out two different messages. Kline in general talked about animal testing and the consequences of stopping these tests while Greenfield speaks of her personal opinion. She discusses how and why she started to believe the overzealous animal rights activists. So, in their messages, the writers vary the most. Greenfield's arguments were consistent all the way through whereas one of Kline's arguments was clearly inconsistent. As a result, I concluded that Greenfield had a better organization of her essay in comparison to Kline's paper. When it came to the development of the two papers, Greenfield's evidence was complete and she gave out two sides of the story. Kline, on the other hand, was clearly biased and his examples were insufficient. In addition, Kline's subject was too general and broad to prove in two pages whereas Greenfield's thesis did not have such a high degree of difficulty. As a result, she had a thesis that was doable.

Following our PW model, I concluded that Greenfield's essay was better organized in comparison to Kline's essay. Both had clear thesis statements but Greenfield's arguments were more consistent and logical to her thesis statement. Greenfield clearly follows our PW model as her supporting arguments were matched to her thesis. Her four supporting arguments were directed to answering the question that was asked in the thesis, as to why and how she had changed her mind about the animal rights activists. In each and every argument, she talks about the different points of answering this simple question. Kline on the other hand, fails to have arguments that are as organized as Greenfield's and ends up having incomplete ones. For example, Kline's thesis was about the impacts of stopping
animal testing, but his first (some experiments on humans will succeed, most will fail) and third (life saving drugs such as antibiotics, insulin and vaccines have been based on animal testing) arguments did not logically fit his thesis and as result did not answer the questions completely. Because of these reasons, I concluded that Greenfield was more accurate organized, followed completely our PW model while Kline was vague in his arguments.

When it came to organization using the CT model, I concluded that Greenfield's essay was better organized than Kline's essay. Greenfield followed all the rules of the CT model 1. Her four arguments were consistent and relevant with her thesis statement (following rules 1 and 2) and she was aware of objections against animal rights people and addressed them within her arguments (follows rule 3). She does not use biased language in her arguments, for example she does not say negative things about the masses when she is talking about her shift towards the activists. Also, her arguments were doable (follows rule 6) because of the fact that her thesis was more focused on her personal beliefs. As a result, I felt that she was always in control when talking about her arguments.

After analyzing Kline's essay, I concluded that the author did not follow most of out CT organization rules. Although Kline had a clear thesis, saying what he was going to prove, one of his arguments were not consistent with his thesis statement. In his thesis, he tries to prove how animal testing has and will be good for humans and argues that if they are stopped, human health will be in jeopardy. But when it came to his third argument, he said that life saving drugs such as antibiotics, insulin and vaccines have been based on animal testing and then, abruptly concludes that if testing is stopped, in future we won't see life saving drugs like these. Now, I believe that this is argument has internal flaws in it. Just because something happened in the past, does not mean that it will reap the same type of success in the future (e.g.: more new drugs based on animal testing). And he does not also take into consideration the technological advancements, which have altered quite significantly since those discoveries. Technology has opened up a lot of other options for medical science. So, I felt that Kline tried to use an argument that was inconsistent to his
thesis. Moreover, he is trying to draw a conclusion out of a very general picture. The inconsistency of the argument and the conclusion that he is trying to force out of clearly violates our CT model (rule 1) and thus fails the rules of inference. This argument is not lying in what is said but it does lie in the implications of what is being said here. I also thought that Kline used biased language in both his arguments (some experiments on humans will succeed, most will fail) and (One of the terrifying effects of the effort to restrict animal testing). This violated rule 4 of our CT model.

In addition, Kline's second (terrifying effects of stopping testing) and third argument (These studies will effectively end if animal testing is stopped) are not logically separated. Kline's essay also violated rule 6 of our CT model, which states that arguments should be "doable". Kline talks about animals testing for medicine in general and this is a huge subject, which cannot be covered in three arguments. If he had been more specific, then he probably would have avoided the problem of losing his focus.

When it came to the development of the two essays, I came to the conclusion that Greenfield was again the winner, following our CT model. It was because Greenfield, in her essay "In defense of the Animals" conveys her message to the audience in a clear and concise manner. She does this by using examples/evidence that are consistent with her arguments and follow the general rules of inference. In her arguments one to four, she uses examples that are directly related to the arguments and she is always objective. Her examples were objective in concluding how emotionally charged propaganda, testing in the make-up industries and phony kinship towards animals had affected and changed her stance in support the activists. Her examples were not self-contradictory and as a whole proved what she said on the arguments. Although she does not use a lot of "objective sources (facts and figures)", her supporting arguments are consistent with the background information in which she explains how her opinion had changed (follows rule A). Furthermore, Greenfield's examples were presented with sufficient detail and explanation (follows rule C), and she does not abruptly jump to conclusions. As a result, I believe that
the examples she used with her arguments were good ones because they lead the reader to the answer concerning the thesis statement.

On the contrary, Kline lacked the examples and arguments that were necessary in order to develop of his essay. Although he claimed to be a specialist in the field of animal testing he used personal experience as evidence in most of his arguments. Personal experience first of all makes any argument a weak one because it was presents the writers side, not the neutral view. As a result, when I read the essay, I excepted that he would actually use some factual data with objective sources that would strongly support his arguments. Unfortunately, he did not take that path, and depended upon his personal opinions and hypothetical situations. Moreover, all of his examples were presented in a vague and general manner and many of them were not sufficient enough. As a result, his examples lead to more questions rather than drawing the answers. These weak and insufficient personal examples (violating rule C of our CT model) made Kline's essay weaker in development.

I also felt the Greenfield presented his evidence and background in an objective and unbiased manner. In this particular part of development, Her essay "In Defense of the Animals" was the biggest gainer against Kline's essay. Kline in his essay did not want the readers to think, but to simply come to the conclusion of what he himself was pressing onto. It can be understood from his given background that he is directly related to the industry that uses animal testing and that he is trying to protect a group interest. For this reason alone, when he talks about examples, he skips talking about animal testing in general and goes to one specific but general issue that is the medical area. Animal testing is used in the fields other than the medical area. For instance, they are used in the cosmetics industry that does not have anything to do with saving lives of humans. However, Kline avoids this area, simply because this will put most of his arguments into jeopardy. He does not want his readers to compare arguments and reach a judgment. As a result, I believe that
Kline's evidence base was not broad, and he did not want to give the readers credit for thinking (violating rule D).

Greenfield on the other hand did a great job dealing with this particular phase of development. Her examples related to arguments that were presented in an unbiased manner. She started her case with her background. In her background, she did not claim to be an expert on testing and animal rights but said that she was one of the leaden masses. Therefore, her position to begin with was neutral. Furthermore, she did not press her readers to reach an abrupt conclusion by just looking at her arguments. She did put up opposing arguments against animal rights activists including her own prejudices in the beginning. As a result, Greenfield presents two arguments, tells her reader to weigh these conflicting arguments and then reach a solution. And even in her conclusion, she gives the readers more space to think. She says that readers did not have to agree to everything that she was saying and they could stick to their own beliefs. For these reasons, I concluded that Greenfield cared more about the reader’s intelligence, their ability to think, weigh the arguments and reach a conclusion. Her background and examples in development were excellent and I concluded from this part alone that she had a clear lead from Kline's essay.

In general, Kline's paper had some serious flaws that need to be mentioned. He used biased language and background that puts his credibility on the line. One of his arguments is clearly inconsistent, somewhat irrelevant and his language is also biased. These do not follow our CT and PW models of both organization and development. Greenfield's essay managed to evade all these problems in general and used out the PW and CT model to a large extent. As a result, her examples proved what she was arguing for. Although her actual message was hard to find at first, the reasons mentioned above gave Greenfield an advantage over Kline and hers was clearly a well-written article.