According to the materials that was given out on the Critical Thinking model and the Paper Writing model, I think Meg Greenfield's essay, "In Defense of the Animals" is better than Lou Marano's essay, "Arms and the Women: Would a Sexually Mixed U.S. Army Lose its Wars." I believe Greenfield's essay is better organized because she has a clear and do-able thesis statement and logically distinct arguments that match the thesis, while Marano has an unclear thesis statement and arguments that lack doability. I also believe that Greenfield's essay is better developed because her paper contains specific background information as well as detailed examples that supports her arguments, while Marano's essay contain insufficient background information and biased examples.

I believe Greenfield wrote a better argumentative paper than Marano in terms of organization. Our CT/PW models state that in order for an essay to be considered to have good organization it must contain two things: a clear thesis statement and logically distinct arguments that matches the thesis. Greenfield succeeded in fulfilling these two requirements. She presented a clear thesis statement in her first paragraph. Her thesis statement was "Although I still don't support all of what animal rights activist stand for, I have to admit that they have begun to get to me and I have changed some of my former belief and prejudices." Because she used "I" in her thesis, this made her thesis less biased and more specific towards the topic that she wants to address. And because she is only expressing her opinions, her essay is do-able. By presenting her thesis statement early in the essay and using clean transitions throughout her paper, she is making apparent the direction that the article will be going so that her audience can easily follow it.
Greenfield also presented logically distinct arguments that match her thesis. Her arguments match her thesis because she gives examples of how the animal right activists succeeded in changing her views on animal testing. For example, her first argument says that as patronizing as it may sound, zealots are required early on in any movement if it is to succeed in altering the sensibility of the leaden masses. For this argument, she explains how the animal right activists have succeeded in getting her attention and begun to affect her previous beliefs. This definitely supports her thesis. Her second argument is that justifiable purposes such as medical research are shamelessly used as a cover for other activities that are wanton. This logically supports her thesis because this is what she believes now after listening to those who are against animals testing. Animals are in fact used for many commercial purposes, not just for the sake of medical research. Her third argument is that people tend to be sentimental toward animals in their fictional form, yet are indifferent to them in reality. In this argument, she tries to explain that though most people are sentimental toward animals, she is not one of them. This supports her thesis in that this is another one of her beliefs. Her fourth argument is that she has the right to hold contradictory views. Though it may sound contradictory, she is arguing that it is okay to believe that it is alright to kill animals for some purposes, but not to hurt them gratuitously or make them suffer horribly for one's own trivial whims. Again, this supports her thesis because this is another one of her opinions. Looking at all of her arguments, it is easy to see that these four arguments are very different from each other and that they do in fact match the thesis. This relationship between the thesis and supporting arguments is what our CT/PW models states as the critical determining factor for good organization. This is the reason why I think Greenfield has the better essay.

In Marano's essay, however, the organization is very poor. First of all, his thesis statement seems a little broad and unclear. His thesis is that he basically thinks
that expanding the role for women in the U.S. armed force is demonstrably a bad idea. Here he fails to indicate what types of women he is talking about. This makes me wonder whether he is discussing women in general or a particular group of women based upon different ages or different ethnic backgrounds. He also failed to define the word "expanded role". I am not sure whether he is talking about an expanded role in all aspect of the army or just when the women are in actual combat. Secondly, he failed to present logically distinct arguments. He mixes his supporting arguments up so badly that it is very hard to tell where one starts and another begins. This caused such a problem for me that it made it even made it hard to tell how many arguments there actually were in his paper. For example, in paragraph seven, he presented his first argument, which was that men fight better than women. He gave an example of how women could have not done better than men in their ability to carry ammunition crates and sandbags. In the sentence that immediately follows, he begins his new argument which is men generally fight better when women are not there to distract them. There was not a hint of a transition where the audience can easily say that here is where a new argument begins. As I said before, the key to good organization according to our CT/PW models is whether or not the arguments match the thesis. Because of Marano's tendency to "run" arguments into one another, it was very difficult to separate his arguments. And if we are not sure of what his arguments are, there is no way possible for us to see if his arguments actually match his thesis statement. Finally, given his thesis and background, his arguments are not do-able. Our models state that arguments should be do-able given the writer's expertise and background as well as time/space available in the essay. Because of the author's lack expertise in this subject matter and because there is limited time and space in the paper, it is clear that there is no way for Marano to "prove" to a degree of factual certainty that an expanded role for women in the U.S. armed forces is a bad idea. For these reasons, Marano
cannot be considered to have a better argumentative paper than Greenfield in terms of organization.

I believe that Greenfield's essay is also better developed than Marano's essay. Our CT/PW models state that development consists of two important components: background information and presentation of evidence. Background information is any information that enables the reader to understand the arguments. Greenfield's essay is well developed because she supplies her audience with information that is necessary to understand her supporting arguments. For example, in her essay she explains her position on the animal rights issue before the animal rights activists had actually began to affect her. She admits that she was a "practicing carnivore and a wearer of shoe leather." She also explicitly describes (in paragraph 4) what finally caused her to change some of her former beliefs. This type of information enables her audience to understand why she changed some of her former beliefs and also lets them know that what she is saying only represents her personal opinion and not for everyone else. And because she is merely stating her opinion, her audience will be less likely to doubt her.

Another reason Greenfield is well developed is because she provides examples that support her supporting arguments. For instance, the example that she provides for argument one is her personal experience. She explains how the photographs of newly skinned baby seals caught her attention and made her reevaluate her stand on the issue. This clearly supports her argument, which was that animal rights activists gained her attention through vivid cringe-inducing photographs, not reason. Another example where her examples support her argument can be seen in her second argument. Her argument is that animal testing for medical research is shamelessly used to cover for other wanton activities. The evidence that she provides here is that she points out how animal
testing is being conducted for "the sake of superrefinements in the cosmetic and other frill industries." The cosmetics that she is talking about are hair sprays, perfumes, and other personal care products. Again, this clearly supports her second argument. Because of Greenfield's appropriate use of background and the fact she did an excellent job of using her examples to support her arguments, I think she has the better essay in terms of development.

On the other hand, the development in Marano's essay is very weak. First of all, his background information is weak in that he does not provide sufficient information about himself to allow his readers to accept his credibility. For example, he mentioned that he was a Vietnam veteran, a social scientist, and a journalist that has done some reporting on the military. He does not, however, explain what type of reporting he has done and whether or not this reporting related to women in the army. Due to the fact that his credentials are almost non-existent, this makes his arguments lack do-ability. Another reason why his paper was so poorly developed is that his examples were very biased. Our models state that the audience should-be given reasons for why the author believes in what he believes. Marano, however, merely states his example as a fact and expects the readers to take his word for it. He gives the impression that his readers have already accepted his thesis as being true. For example, when he was trying to argue that men fight better than women do he did not include in his example any evidence such as actual verified studies that led him to this conclusion. His only reasoning is that young men fight better than older men; therefore, an army of men will beat an army of women. And that is all the proof he gives. Because Marano had insufficient background information and very weak examples, there is no way his development could exceed that of Greenfield.