I think that according to our PW/CT models, The “Way Cool” article, by Melinda Walsh, presents a better argument than Georgette Todd’s article titled, “Thou shalt not be a bigot”. The “Way Cool” Article is better organized than Todd’s article because it has a clear thesis, and the arguments logically support the thesis. Todd’s article has two thesis statements, and her arguments don’t support her initial thesis statement.

The “way cool” article is also better developed than the Todd article because the way cool article gives very specific examples in the background that support the arguments and all the examples and arguments fit together. Todd’s article has very bad examples and presents many contradictions.

The “Way Cool” Article by Melinda Walsh is better organized than Georgette Todd’s article because she has a clear thesis and her arguments logically support her thesis. Walsh’s thesis states, we urge all the other regional entities to join forces to make the plan a cool reality.” It is very straightforward. It is very easy to find and it clearly talk about what needs to be done to solve the problem. Her two arguments logically support what she is trying to prove. Her first argument is, “Now if we combine the findings of these three studies, one thing becomes clear: we have the power to significantly cool down our “heat island”—and lower air pollution and save electricity—if we’re willing to make a few simple changes in the way we design our communities.” It relates directly back to the thesis by confirming that solving the heat problem is possible. Her
second argument states, “Thanks to ongoing work by a local “Cool Communities” project, every local government in the Sacramento region has an opportunity to become a partner in the effort to promote these changes by helping to craft an Urban Forest Master Plan for the region.” It talks about the problem like stated in the thesis. It also talks about some on going communities that already participate in a plan to solve the problem and it gives a solution to the problem. All her arguments are set up clearly to support her thesis along with some background information that goes more in depth in explaining the type of problem Sacramento faces. This information makes her arguments stronger since she is talking about the future and she can’t present facts to support her arguments.

Georgette Todd’s article does not have a clear thesis statement and her arguments do not logically match her thesis statement. She starts by giving mixed messages of what she is going to argue. This makes it very difficult to understand what she is going to talk about. She has her initial thesis statement as“ This recent display of force-fed behavior is just another example of how people can abuse the right to practice freedom of speech.” Her thesis has nothing to do with her arguments. She never mentions freedom of speech in her supporting arguments. She starts talking about the methods used by the demonstrators instead. Her second thesis is, “While there’s nothing wrong with that, it’s unfortunate however, that it never occurred to the demonstrators that their hateful approach distracted their attempt to educate about the love of Christ.” This thesis statement is not that strong either. Todd lacks background information to support her arguments. She talks about how this method is so bad. How the demonstrators “should know” it doesn’t work. She
needs to provide us with more information that backs up these facts. Her arguments do not provide enough support due to lack of information. She is never very specific with what she wants to argue. Her first argument is “Yelling at students for being the spawn of Satan just because of (put whatever God forsaken reason here) is not the best way to motivate students to follow and learn more about God.” It is not very clear. The argument doesn’t logically support the thesis. She is never specific on what the demonstrators were yelling at the students. She also gives us the option to fill in a blank as to the reason the demonstrators were yelling at the students. Her second argument states, “These demonstrators should know that their use of the “shock method” usually has an adverse effect.” This argument sounds more like an opinion than a fact she wants to prove. She never specifies why the demonstrators “should know” why this method would have an adverse effect. We don’t know how she knows this. Her third argument is, “The problem with people like the ones in the quad is that their blatant narrow-minded views are not open to discussion.” The argument does not match her second thesis or the rest of her arguments. She drifts away from trying to prove what’s wrong with their method of protest. She brings up that the demonstrators have a problem. While the original argument is that their method was the problem. It also seems more of an opinion than a fact she wants to prove.

Melinda Walsh’s article is better developed than Georgette Todd’s article because she has very specific examples that support her argument and all her points fit together. Walsh gives us enough information to know what kind of problem Sacramento is facing. She gives information about a
study NASA conducted to discover the problem. She sites credible evidence, like an informative web site, to provide more credibility to her argument. In her first argument she explains that we can solve Sacramento’s heat problem. Her example supports this argument as follows, “basically, we’re talking about planting more shade trees, designed with more light-colored asphalt and ditto with rooftops.” It gives a clear alternative to solve the problem. We know this works because she provided us with evidence in her background section that supports her examples. For example, she provides us with a study done in 1998, by the U.S. Forest Service’s Western Center for Urban Forest Research and Education at UC Davis about trees. Her second argument gives us examples on how we can solve the heat problem. She presents this example as, “mounted by the Sacramento Tree Foundation, the plan would simply aim to improve the livability of the greater Sacramento area by reducing summer temperatures using shade trees and reflective surfaces, which in turn reduce energy use and urban ozone levels.” It gives a detail description on the solution. In her background she provides us with a study by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory that was done on rooftops. This credible evidence provides strong support to her argument. Everything fits together and clearly relates back to her thesis statement making her argument better.

Todd’s article lacks this. Todd presents us with very bad examples to support her arguments and her examples are not specific. They’re more of her personal opinion. For example she states that the demonstrators do not care about the students but she never quotes them directly to provide more support to her examples. In her first argument, she states
that yelling at students is not the best way to get through to students. The example she uses to support her argument is, “Let’s face it, the demonstrators’ approach is no different from the abortion activists that invaded our campus last semester, but instead of using horrific pictures to make a statement, they used signs with hateful messages on them.” This does not logically connect with her supporting argument. In her argument she is talking about one method and in her example she sites a different method, both of which we don’t have any type of information on. She never sites any credible information about the demonstrators. She is never specific of the student’s feelings toward the demonstrators, but yet she assumes we should know how students felt toward the demonstrators. Her second argument talks about how the method was going to backfire. The example she uses is, “instead of being looked as “prophets,” they’re seen as fanatics. Almost all fanatics are never taken seriously, and if anything, they’re perceived, as a joke.” This doesn’t relate to her argument. She doesn’t state that the demonstrators wanted us to see them as prophets. Once again she wants us to assume that that’s what they want us to see them as. Her second example is more of her opinion on what the demonstrators want us to see them as. Her third argument is totally off, she discovers a new problem and tries to incorporate it into her past arguments. Her examples are weak. The first example states, “Those demonstrators are not interested in hearing what you have to say; all they care about is that you listen to their gospel and apply it to your life so you can “save yourself.” This seems as though she is putting words into the demonstrator’s mouth. She does a very poor job in providing any information where the demonstrators say this. Her second example is, “one has to question the purpose of the
demonstrators’ visit. They knew and even admitted that they were going to face serious opposition.” It never shows were the demonstrators admitted to this. She also presents a contradiction because in an early statement she states that, “in their choice of mindset, they truly believed that they were on a mission to relay “God’s message.” She later takes that back by saying that the demonstrators did not care what the students had to say. Todd’s arguments are very weak due to lack of credible evidence. Also she does not stay with her initial plan of talking about freedom of speech. Making it very difficult to figure out what she is talking about. This causes her whole argument to fall apart and not be very credible.
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