

PAPER 2 BLUE FEEDBACK

These topics were very difficult so I am giving you a chance to redo your papers before I grade them.

Your next paper should be in the required Blue format with disks and the working draft. You need to do this.

You may switch topics if you like.

BLUE 1

PURPOSE: THE PURPOSE OF BLUE 1 IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT YOU KNOW HOW TO USE "FACTUAL EVIDENCE" TO SUPPORT AN ARGUMENT BASED UPON THE MATERIAL IN OUR MODELS, PARTICULARLY CT 3. IT IS ALSO AN EXERCISE IN ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION, SINCE YOU ALSO HAVE TO ANALYZE THE ESSAYS AS FILMS AND DECIDE HOW TO CREATE A SET OF PREDICTIONS FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE ARGUMENTS.

THE FIRST POINT IS DEMONSTRATED BY HOW YOU SET UP YOUR ARGUMENTS AND THE KINDS OF EXAMPLES YOU USE TO SUPPORT THEM.

THE SECOND POINT IS COVERED IN THE FIRST PART OF YOUR BACKGROUND. IN GENERAL, DUBIK IS THE MORE DIFFICULT OF THE TWO BECAUSE HE IS TRYING TO BE CAREFUL NOT TO OVER-GENERALIZE. HENCE, HE DOESN'T MAKE SPECIFIC PREDICTIONS COVERING WOMEN IN COMBAT. MARANO, ON THE OTHER HAND, EXPLICITLY FOCUSES ON WHAT HE PREDICTS WILL BE THE RESULT OF ALLOWING WOMEN IN COMBAT.

HOWEVER, MARANO'S ARGUMENTS ARE MORE CONFUSING THAN DUBIK'S, SO THEY STILL NEED SOME TWEAKING. FOR EXAMPLE, HE GOES BACK AND FORTH BETWEEN DISCUSSING WOMEN IN COMBAT (AIR/SEA/GROUND/), WOMEN IN GROUND COMBAT AND WOMEN IN THE MILITARY IN GENERAL.

REMEMBER THAT IT IS CRITICAL TO ALLOW WOMEN IN COMBAT IF WOMEN ARE TO BE CONSIDERED PART OF THE STANDARD PROMOTION TRACK, SINCE

SOME COMBAT EXPERIENCE IS USUALLY REQUIRED OF MOST OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION INTO THE HIGHER RANKS.

YOU ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO GIVE YOUR OPINIONS AS TO THE CONCLUSIONS MARANO OR DUBIK DRAW, BUT YOU CAN POINT OUT THE DIFFICULTY OF ANALYZING THEM FOR THE PURPOSES OF DERIVING SUITABLE PREDICTIONS.

The two essays present slightly different problems but since most of you did Marano, I will start with him.

1) IF YOU SELECTED MARANO

First of all, even though you did not have to critique Marano in your essay, you should have seen that his entire argument was weak on many different levels. One of most serious problems he had was over-generalization. He did not have the evidence he needed to support his universal claims about women and their unsuitability for combat.

Therefore, you should avoid doing what he does. However, many of you tried to argue that his predictions were wrong or invalid based upon two examples—Walden and O’Neil.

Now you have the right to say that in your opinion, you think the facts do not support his predictions, but unless you provide a lot more than two or three examples, you can’t claim that his claims are wrong or invalid.

On the other hand, you can argue that the reason that the essays by Zwick and Scott carry so much weight with you is that the two heroines exemplify the military’s own recognition of the value of women. When dealing with Zwick, you do not need to discuss any issues other than the parts that deal with Karen Walden.

Lt. O’Neil qualified to be a SEAL, and this training is considered to be the most rigorous in the military. So it was the US Navy that asserted her fitness to lead.

Capt. Karen Walden, on the other hand, was awarded the Medal of Honor, the highest distinction that the military can award any service person for combat.

So these two stories are very important. But you must state why they are important.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND 1

Marano's Predictions.

BACKGROUND 2

Scott and Zwick

You can assume that everything in the film is true. For example, you can say that Sgt. Monfriez so resented Walden that he disobeyed an order, used sexist language, shot her and then lied about her condition, which resulted in her death. This would be an example of a male who resented the fact that he was being commanded by a woman.

ARGUMENTS

CONCLUSION

2) IF YOU SELECTED DUBIK

Dubik was more difficult because his arguments were more carefully constructed and so he did not make the extravagant claims that Marano did so that is why you have to tweak his arguments to turn them into "predictions" like Marano's.

Part of your grade will be on how you translate D's arguments into predictions.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND 1A

Dubik Arguments

BACKGROUND 1B

Here you turn his arguments into predictions about women in combat. The Marcos Breton articles would be relevant here. You don't have to use them, but they relate to Dubik much more than to Marano.

BACKGROUND 2

Scott and Zwick

ARGUMENTS