After evaluating the two essays based on our PW/CT models, I strongly believe that Meg Greenfield's essay entitled "In defense of the animals," is a better essay than Lou Marano's essay entitled "Arms and the women. Would a sexually mixed U.S. army lose its wars?" I believe that Meg Greenfield's essay is better organized because she presents a clear and concise thesis statement with logically supported objective arguments whereas Lou Marano's essay has a vague thesis statement with supporting arguments that are biased and lack do-ability. I also believe that Greenfield's essay is better developed because it contains neutral background information as well as specific examples proving each supporting argument whereas Marano's essay contains biased background information along with very weak, biased and undocumented evidence.

Greenfield does a better job in organization according to our PW/CT models. Greenfield gives a clear and concise thesis statement letting the reader establish her position on the issue. Her thesis statement is as follows: "Although I still don't support all of what animal rights activists stand for, I have to admit that they have begun to get to me and I have changed some of my former beliefs and prejudices." This thesis statement left me knowing exactly what she would be talking about in her essay. Greenfield's essay also contains logically supported objective arguments. Our PW/CT model states that the most important area of organization of a paper is the relationship between the thesis statement
and supporting arguments. Greenfield does a great job of accomplishing this task. Her first argument states that animal rights activists get the audience to weigh their arguments by means of vivid cringe-inducing photographs, not by an appeal to reason or value. This clearly supports her thesis that she doesn't agree with all of what animal rights activists stand for. Her second argument states that the more justifiable purposes, such as medical research on animals, are shamelessly used as cover for other activities that are wanton. This argument supports her thesis by explaining that animal rights activists have changed her former belief that medical research on animals was used only for improvement in human life. Her third argument states that we tend to be very sentimental about animals in their idealized, fictional form and largely indifferent to them in realms where our lives actually touch. This also links back to her thesis by saying that animal rights activists have made her aware that our society does indeed ignore the brutal things we do to animals in the name of "the almighty hair spray." Her final argument states that if she doesn't believe she has to buy into the whole absolutist, extreme position just be "reasonable." This supports her thesis by describing an "in-between" position where a person may not totally agree with animal rights activists but is not against all of what they have to say. Greenfield's arguments are both objective and neutral: two agreeing with animal rights activists and two disagreeing.

In Marano's essay, I believe his organization is weak. His thesis statement describes what he will be trying to prove, but his supporting arguments
are weak, biased and lack do-ability. His first argument is actually directly in front of his second argument. It states that men generally fight better than women do, and men generally fight better when women aren't around. Our PW/CT models say that a good argument takes into consideration other points of view. The two arguments that he has presented here do not even consider other points of view. Marano forces the reader to accept these arguments because they are true according to him. His third argument states that in a crisis, the country that puts women in the field at the expense of men will lose. This argument is again one of Marano's predictions. He lets his own attitude and opinion stray him away from presenting objective factual arguments. Our PW/CT models also state that the arguments should be do-able given the writer's expertise as well as the time/space available in the essay. Marano fails in this category. I do not believe that he could possibly "prove" to a degree of factual certainty that an expanded role for women in the U.S. armed forces is a bad idea. He has neither the expertise nor the available time/space to do so.

I also think Greenfield does a better job of development according to our PW/CT models. According to the PW/CT models, a well-developed essay must include background facts or information necessary for the reader to understand the supporting arguments. Greenfield presents background information that is totally neutral and objective. She addresses a question that is based on the "facts" as she perceives or interprets them and few if any of these are of a scientific nature. She never claims to be a
scientist and she never claims her beliefs are based on any kind of hard evidence or research. Our PW/CT model also states that each argument should be supported by different kinds of evidence or proof. Greenfield gives specific examples that support each of her arguments. For example, she supports her first argument by referring back to specific 1970's photographs of newly skinned baby seals as well as videos of animals being raised to become our dinner. These are not an appeal to reason but rather an assault on squeamishness. Her second argument is supported when she states that animals are suffering not for the sake of medical research but for the sake of adding to our obscene store of luxuries, super refinements in the cosmetic and frill industries, and vanity items. Her third argument is supported when she describes how we fictionalize animals through movies and cartoons to simulate a cross-species kinship while at the same time ignoring the brutish things done for our own personal uses. Finally she supports her fourth argument by describing that she is not the only person stuck in the "in-between position." There are many others who share her same beliefs.

On the other hand, Marano's development is very poor. First of all, the background information he presents is totally biased. He informs the reader that he is a Vietnam Veteran, yet he has no combat experience. Since he states that he is a veteran, social scientist, and journalist, I expected him to present facts and statistics for his argument. With such credentials he has the burden of proof on his shoulder. However, Marano failed to deliver. He gave insignificant background information along with
nothing but his own point of view on the matter. For example, he states that however well one woman may have performed in a firefight in Panama, it doesn't change the fact that men, as a group, fight better than women. This is not a proven statistic, but one of his many opinions. He also states that every society of which he is aware has had a taboo against sending women to fight. A taboo doesn't make anything a truth. A taboo is a belief not a proven statistic. Marano's background information is completely biased and did not help me better understand his supportive arguments.

Marano's essay also lacked strong supportive evidence. Our PW/CT models state that the examples must match the arguments. I believe that his examples were as biased as his arguments. He supports his first argument that men generally fight better than women by describing an occasion where he grew faint after manhandling ammunition crates or sandbags for hours in the heat. He says that it is not that some women could have done better, but that most women could not have done as well. This is an overgeneralization based on one event that happened to him that did not even relate to combat. He supports his second argument that men generally fight better when women aren't around by describing how frustration, heartbreak, and jealousy were present among sexually mixed camps. However, he also states that it was not a problem for the army reservists and National Guard members. These two statements contradict each other. His third argument, that in a crisis, a country that puts women in the field at the expense of men will lose, is supported by
his personal opinion once again. He states that human nature doesn't change, and we are violating the most basic principles of military leadership. The evidence he uses is neither statistical nor factual information. Our PW/CT models state that the best examples are objective facts while the least effective are personal opinions and judgments that you and only you can account for. Stating what you believe to be a fact is not the same as presenting evidence.
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