Just to get it out of the way, there were a couple of grammar errors, though nothing that distracted from the work. Despite disagreeing with this piece, and agreeing with the point of the second one, I find the first work to have a far better argument. It had me considering each point made, at the very least. I thought it was better, but that doesn’t mean that the argument and structure were without flaws. The author tries to give a disclaimer of non-bias, but their political bias shone through a few times, especially when writing about choosing government officials as being “locked in a pitched battle over who we want to take our money and control both the economy and society – and who should decide how that is done”. I agree with the sentiment, but the statement shows a clear conservative bias, which hinders any argument. The point of the neurological studies was the clear strong-horse of their argument, so it would have served best as the last point pushed. As it was, the argument seemed to taper off towards the end in a rant about politics. The point about Obama’s tactics in the 2008 election didn’t make a lot of sense until the very end, where it was tied very loosely into the maturity argument. The argument about the extending childhood of Americans also seemed extremely weak and came across as a middle-aged person complaining about “kids these days”. It pulled me away from their point a bit. My last criticism is about just that – the point. Though the author’s opinion can be easily inferred throughout the work, the thesis isn’t stated until rather late in the paper.

The first thing to note about the second paper: the argument is outdated. Second note: despite agreeing with the premise, the aggressive tone of the paper and a few bad points drive me to prefer the first paper. This paper’s author makes some good points, such as how marriage, in this context, does not affect anyone else’s life, and therefore others should not be allowed to infringe on the rights of any couple. These points do well for the argument presented, and appeal to both logic and emotion. There are some points, however, that work against the author. The first is the statement that civil unions are less in quality than marriage. This can be argued either way, but there is no evidence put forth supporting the claim. The reader is expected to either know about the differences, which most don’t, or blindly assume the author is correct. The second negative point is about one statement. The author claims that homosexual couples are being “ostracized” for their way of life, but there is no evidence to support this claim at all. The only example of inequality mentioned in the paper is of marriage rights, so to push the broad statement of ostracism comes across as dishonest and manipulating the readers by using a strong, emotional word.

All in all, I agree more with the thesis of the second paper. Despite this, the first gave a far better argument for their point.