I have A LOT of issues with the first example. Though I agree with the declaration that teen pregnancy is an issue, I disagree with nearly every other point in the paper. This is not based entirely on my opinion, but on the factual inaccuracies and intellectual dishonesty used in the paper. For a start, the author asserted that the idea of girls being looser with getting pregnant when abortion is an availability was completely unfounded, but then gave no evidence to back up that claim. They just said it was wrong and moved on. They then asserted that many of the women’s clinics in Indiana didn’t offer abortion services, but then doesn’t elaborate that Planned Parenthood clinics almost always do now, giving no concession that many people, religious or otherwise, are morally against those practices. It is implied that it’s just crazy Christians who wanted to shut the clinics down for no real reason. It is then stated that “Scott County, Indiana was, and still is, suffering a massive HIV outbreak that can be directly correlated to the loss of open access clinics.” No evidence is given for this, other than one happening after the other. The author also asserts that after a Texas cut to state funding to Planned Parenthood, there was a sharp increase in birth rates among low-income women. Two things: 1- This is a statement about low-income people, not necessarily pregnant teens. 2- Yes, the birthrates increased. This was because the women could no longer kill their babies after getting pregnant. It’s dishonest, because the author implies that this increased teen pregnancy rates, when it was about overall birth rates.

As for the proposed solutions, they’re also nonsense. The first half of the proposal was to increase funds to education and mandate sex-ed classes. The author says it would be easy to continually fund this idea, but that makes no sense from an economic point of view. The country is already trillions of dollars in debt, with that increasing every second. The federal government is spending exponentially more money than it has. We are BEYOND broke. This would in no way be sustainable. The second point was to increase federal funding to Planned Parenthood. This isn’t feasible, as the majority of Americans are either Christian or Catholic and wouldn’t support funding any company that provides abortions, much less the countless others like myself that aren’t religious, but still oppose killing babies.

The 4-page paper had 4 paragraphs. That’s in issue in and of itself. There are several declarations made by the author with no evidence to back them up, and the author obviously doesn’t know much about economics.

As for the second example, though there are issues with the proposal, it is much more convincing than the first paper. The different talking points (stress, animals, ect) are a bit spaced apart until the end. Between the first few paragraphs, I felt a bit like I was reading different papers. It just felt a little blocky to read. I agree with the proposal very much, and would even suggest extending it to other places, such as hospitals, rehabilitation centers, and high-tension workplaces. The author made a strong effort to support the financial issue of the proposal, and though it would be possible, it wouldn’t be completely feasible in lower-income areas. I believe that if the financial side was a bit stronger, the argument would be much more compelling.