

Section 1:

#1 Opening Paragraph Strengths:

- Effective dramatic opening that establishes the historical significance of Three Mile Island
- Clear thesis statement outlining three main arguments against the proposal

Weaknesses: Unclear Position Focus → Your writing begins by referring to "nuclear fusion" but then shifts to discussing nuclear power plants more generally, creating confusion about whether you're specifically addressing fusion or fission. "NUCLEAR FUSION, the deadly weapon of the future" contradicts later discussion of traditional nuclear power plants.

Exemplar: "Three Mile Island, site of America's most severe nuclear accident, now faces a controversial proposal: its transformation into a fusion power facility. While fusion technology promises cleaner energy, this location's troubled history raises serious concerns about public safety, waste management, and environmental impact."

#2 Second Paragraph Strengths:

- Strong topic sentence establishing public health concerns
- Effective comparison to Chernobyl to provide context

Weaknesses: Imprecise Risk Assessment → Your statement "A single mistake would erase ourselves from existence" lacks technical accuracy and relies on hyperbole. The risks of fusion differ significantly from those of fission, but your writing doesn't distinguish between them.

Exemplar: "While fusion technology's safety profile differs from traditional nuclear fission, placing such a facility at Three Mile Island could revive public anxieties and potentially expose the community to new, albeit different, safety considerations."

#3 Counter-argument Paragraph Strengths:

- Demonstrates awareness of opposing viewpoints
- Addresses multiple counter-arguments systematically

Weaknesses: Conflation of Technologies → Your discussion mixes aspects of fusion and fission power, particularly when discussing radioactive waste and water usage. "Nuclear fusion creates radioactive waste" shows a misunderstanding of fusion technology's waste profile compared to fission.

Exemplar: "While fusion power could potentially offer cleaner energy production with minimal radioactive waste compared to traditional nuclear fission, the proposed location at Three Mile Island raises legitimate concerns about water resource management and public trust."

Actionable Task: Rewrite your opening paragraph and thesis statement, clearly distinguishing between fusion and fission technology, and ensure this distinction remains consistent throughout your argument.

Section 2:

#1 NUCLEAR FUSION, the deadly weapon of the future. Today, I am standing on the very island where it happened. Three Mile Island. It experienced the most severe nuclear accident in the United States, yet people are now trying to bring it back. In this meeting, ~~Dr Sarah Thompson has~~ [Dr Sarah Thompson had] proposed a plan to restart the Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant, to begin what not only seems like, but is ~~foreshadowing~~ [foreshadowing of] the impending doom of a horrific accident ahead. In this speech ~~I will give you~~ [I shall present] two reasons and a counter argument on why we should halt this proposal, due to public health hazards, radioactive waste disposal and the reality of its effect on the environment.

#2 First of all, the nuclear power plant would be a public health hazard. The reason Three Mile Island has so much fame is because of the worst nuclear accident that happened in the US. Although it wasn't as serious as ~~Ukraine's Cherobyl~~ [Ukraine's Chernobyl] accident, it still poses a threat to the public's health. It may not have contaminated air, but the redemption of the nuclear plant would be extremely risky. A single mistake would erase ourselves from existence. It is simply too dangerous and inconsiderate for people to resurrect the reason why Three Mile Island can be considered unsafe. The community should not be exposed to such rash risks for innovation of technology. Hence a nuclear power plant would pose a threat to the local community.

In addition, it is difficult to responsibly dispose of radioactive waste. Unfortunately, not only do nuclear power plants have a public health risk, ~~it produces~~ [they produce] radioactive waste as a by-product, like uranium contaminated ~~millings~~ [tailings]. This is very hard to dispose of, and if we don't dispose of it, it will build up and once again pose another threat to the environment and the public. There are no current ways to dispose of it responsibly, and because of this, many countries like Japan are dumping their radioactive waste into the ocean, which is bound to cause many environmental issues. We need to be more responsible and sustainable, therefore without nuclear power plants, there is much less radioactive waste that is difficult to dispose of. Hence, nuclear power plants produce radioactive waste with challenging disposal.

#3 Furthermore, there are many counter-arguments I would like to present to you. I acknowledge that yes, creating a nuclear power plant creates little to ~~none~~ [no] greenhouse gases, which is why some environmentalists look at it as a possible solution as a renewable energy source. In fact, it is NOT considered renewable energy in many ways. As mentioned in the paragraph above, nuclear fusion creates radioactive waste that harms the environment, and since it is difficult to dispose of, it can bring a long lasting effect on the environment. Also, nuclear power plants need a water source nearby to cool the plant. There is a depleting number of countries in the world that have sufficient water and are not in danger of droughts. As climate change ~~drinks~~ [depletes] up the earth's freshwater sources, nuclear plants are simply accelerating the depletion of our natural resources, which is therefore, NOT sustainable at all. I also acknowledge that it may produce a higher power output than solar panels and wind farms, but its tremendous negative impact on the environment simply outweighs the slim benefits of nuclear fusion as a power source.

Ultimately, nuclear fusion is not the way of the future. Although it produces near to ~~none~~ [no] greenhouse gases and has a higher power output, its impacts on the environment and also the public prove it to be an unsuitable and unsustainable way of creating energy.