Kaedan Maxfield

Though I agree with the points you made, you didn’t note anything relating to the assignment itself. You simply gave your opinion on the subjects of the papers themselves. The point of the assignment was to dissect the arguments and quality of each author. They were each lacking in argument strategies and had major issues. The first was with the author’s political bias bleeding through throughout the paper, while the second’s was with a lack of evidence supporting very bold claims.

[**Jonathon Lau**](https://lms.neumont.edu/courses/2438419/users/8406177)

I also disagreed with the premise of the first paper. I disagree with your first point, however. It isn’t something that can’t be changed, though I wouldn’t want it to be changed. The author didn’t put a lot of emotion into the paper, it’s true, but I don’t think it was needed. The subject of the paper was one based on the author’s logic (faulty or otherwise), and not an emotional topic. Emotion had no stance in the argument they presented, and would have only hindered the paper, in my perspective. It seems a lot like you only mentioned this because the paper wasn’t fun for you to read, as you keep referring to the papers as “stories”, which they weren’t. There was no story to be told in either paper, only arguments. Also, the brain does not stop developing at the age of 18, but around 25 or so. The author got that much right.

To be direct, your analysis of the second paper was almost 100% just stating your opinion. There was no analysis of the author’s argument, which was quite flawed. I think your bias of agreement with the premise (which I also do) overshadowed any criticism you could have developed for it. The only assignment-relevant point you made about it was the last sentence, which seems like you just tacked it onto the end as a side though. This is made more apparent by the fact that it was separated from the second paper’s initial paragraph.

## [Jason Christensen](https://lms.neumont.edu/courses/2438419/users/8406167)

I agree with a lot of what you said in your response to the two papers. Many classmates really only stated what they thought of the authors’ opinions and didn’t respond in any way relating to the assignment topic. So, reading your analysis was very refreshing – thank you for that!

I think it’s worth the effort of pointing out the first author’s very obvious political bias. It shone through the most when discussing the nature of the American government, and using Obama as a point, as it didn’t fit well with the rest of the paper. The paragraph on the extended childhood of Americans also seemed a bit iffy to me, and it came across as a bit whiney. I’m glad that someone agrees with me that emotion didn’t really have a place in this paper.

As for the second paper, I agree with all your comments on it. Though you made no mention of the inaccurate, dramatic language that was used a couple of times, such as the claim that homosexual couples were “ostracized”. The word was extremely dramatic and had no evidence to back it up. I feel that the biggest failure of the second paper was just the author making bold claims with no evidence given to support them.