

## Section 1:

### #1 (First paragraph) Strengths:

- Strong opening imagery that creates a vivid picture of potential destruction
- Clear thesis statement presenting the main arguments against destroying monuments

Weaknesses: Underdeveloped reasoning → Your opening paragraph jumps between different ideas without fully developing them. The connection between tourists wanting to see artifacts and the preservation of history needs more thorough explanation. For instance, when you write "The monuments attract many tourists," you could strengthen this by explaining the specific historical significance that draws these visitors.

Exemplar: "Historical monuments stand as irreplaceable windows into our past, drawing millions of visitors each year who come to witness firsthand the architectural brilliance and cultural treasures housed within these ancient walls."

### #2 (Third paragraph) Strengths:

- Clear topic sentence establishing the historical significance
- Good use of rhetorical questions to engage readers

Weaknesses: Circular reasoning → Your argument about history being forgotten relies too heavily on repetition rather than substantive evidence. When you write "if part of history is destroyed the looks will be forgotten," you could enhance this by providing specific examples of how monuments preserve historical knowledge.

Exemplar: "Each monument serves as a living textbook, preserving not only architectural styles but also the stories, customs, and achievements of our ancestors."

### #3 (Fourth paragraph) Strengths:

- Practical solution offered through modernisation
- Good cost-benefit analysis approach

Weaknesses: Lack of specific examples → Your discussion about modernising the inside remains abstract. When you mention "changing the inside," you could strengthen this by providing concrete examples of successful modernisation projects.

Exemplar: "By carefully modernising the interior facilities while preserving the historical facades, we can create spaces that honour our heritage whilst meeting contemporary needs."

Actionable Task: Rewrite your second paragraph focusing specifically on one monument as a case study to demonstrate the economic benefits of tourism, including specific details about visitor numbers and local economic impact.

---

**Overall Score: 42/50**

---

Section 2:

#1 Imagine a world covered with dust and ruins from the ancient structures of history and all the pictures of the royal people colourless, dirty and ripped into shreds. Do you want to destroy all the monuments of history? Obviously not. ~~The monuments attract many tourists as the tourists want to see the priceless artifacts inside and see the famous buildings.~~ [These monuments attract countless tourists who come to marvel at the priceless artifacts housed within these famous buildings.] It also can show times of history so destroying the monuments will most probably cause the whole of history to be forgotten as one piece of history that disappears causes the whole of history to disappear. Plus, you can just make the monuments more modern on the inside so people can still see the original and see the artworks but only the fashion of the inside changes.

Primally, it provides tourists with a place to admire. The tourist will want to see the priceless artifacts that are inside the monument but when you destroy the monuments the artifacts will become damaged and dirty so it will become useless and yucky. ~~And with more tourists it can help with the taxes as taxes are going up as the government isn't getting enough money.~~ [Moreover, increased tourism generates substantial revenue, helping to offset rising government expenses and potentially reducing the tax burden on citizens.] But with all those people coming in, the money will help lower the taxes and the government will still be getting the same amounts of money. So don't destroy the monuments.

#2 Secondly, the place is a part of history. If the monuments are all destroyed history will be forgotten. Why? ~~The monuments are part of history and if part of history is destroyed the looks will be forgotten and why the monument will be built will be forgotten and eventually the whole of history will be forgotten.~~ [These monuments embody our history, and their destruction would erase not only their physical presence but also the stories, purposes, and cultural significance they represent.] And when history is forgotten the whole country will be in a mess as they don't know how they came to be and what famous olden day people are. So don't destroy the monuments.

#3 Last but not least, you can make the inside more modern. ~~You can make the inside more modern and not touch the picture, art works and outside.~~ [We can modernise the interior whilst carefully preserving the original artwork, paintings, and exterior architecture.] This can help

people still remember what it was like in the olden days and famous people. When you leave the outside, the people can still see what the building looks like, which won't make people say, "What is that building?". Also destroying the monuments cost money. Changing the inside also costs money but changing the inside will earn money in the future as the tourist will visit the monument so its [it's] a lose and earn so it's worth it but destroying it is only lose, lose, lose.

In conclusion, we shouldn't destroy the monuments as the monuments attract many tourists as the tourists want to see the priceless artifacts inside and see the famous buildings. It also can show times of history so destroying the monuments will most probably cause the whole of history to be forgotten as one piece of history that disappears causes the whole of history to disappear. Plus, you can just make the monuments more modern on the inside so people can still see the original and see the artworks but only the fashion of the inside changes.