

Section 1:

#1

Strengths:

- Your emotional language effectively conveys your passion for the library
- Your use of figurative language creates vivid imagery of the demolition

Weaknesses: Melodramatic tone → Your writing in this section uses overly dramatic language that might reduce credibility. Phrases like "excruciating dejection," "divine scriptures," and "immoral, unethical wastelands" create an exaggerated tone that might distract from your main argument.

"I'm deeply concerned about the library demolition plans. This building isn't just a structure—it's a vital community resource that has shaped my education and countless others."

#2

Strengths:

- Your descriptive imagery helps readers visualise the demolition
- Your writing shows strong emotional connection to the library

Weaknesses: Excessive figurative language → The paragraph contains too many metaphors and dramatic descriptions that overwhelm your message. Phrases like "cacophonies of destruction," "discoordinated elegy of somber," and "militant knife" create an unrealistic picture that might lose your reader's attention.

"Imagine the community's distress watching bulldozers tear down our library. The noise of construction, the sight of books being removed, and the sad faces of local children would show the real impact of this decision."

#3

Strengths:

- Your counterargument acknowledges opposing viewpoints
- Your supporting evidence strengthens your position

Weaknesses: Underdeveloped reasoning → Your counterargument starts well but needs more development. You mention misinformation online and rural accessibility but don't fully explain how these connect to your specific local library. The 84% statistic needs more context about how it directly relates to your community's needs.

"While digital resources are valuable, our library offers verified information that 84% of Australians trust more than internet sources. For many locals without reliable internet access, our library remains their primary source of knowledge."

■ Your persuasive letter shows strong feelings about saving the library, but it would be more effective with a calmer tone. Try using more straightforward language instead of very dramatic words. Your first paragraph jumps right into emotional arguments without clearly stating your main point first. You could improve this by starting with a clear statement about why you're writing. Also, try connecting your examples more directly to your community. When you mention how libraries help test scores, explain how this affects local students. You use good evidence in some places, but your letter would be stronger if you explained exactly how the library benefits different groups in your community. You could also make your closing paragraph more specific about what action you want the councillor to take.

Score: 42/50

Section 2:

Dear Councillor Mary Goodsman,

#1 I write to you to express my ~~excruciating dejection~~ [deep concern] upon sight of the library demolition contracts, ~~to see these divine scriptures~~ [seeing these valuable resources] be replaced by ~~immoral, unethical wastelands~~ [commercial developments] that sacrifice wisdom for wealth. As a student who has attained all of his knowledge through ~~blessings from these very corridors~~ [resources provided by this facility], I implore you to reconsider your plans. "These sacred shelves that hold humanity's greatest conquests cannot be diminished into ashes, to be replaced by yet another mirage of a commercial abomination.", a concerned parent argues, prioritising her child's education over anything else." "By destroying the library, we are essentially destroying education, shown by the severe plummet of an average of 24% literary rates, between 3 neighbouring districts that removed libraries from their neighbourhoods.", news reporter Joseph Feninger proclaims. The destruction of the library would be an ~~eternal laceration through the communities collective consciousness~~ [significant loss to our community's

identity], ~~torrents of nostalgic anguish eroding our world~~ [affecting generations to come]. How can we abolish our finest teacher in trade for a shadowed, profit seeking corporation?

#2 Envision the ~~agonizing~~ [distressing] scene of cranes tearing apart the library, its ~~monstrous claws chewing away at the begging foundations~~ [mechanical arms dismantling the building's foundation]. The ~~cacophonies of destruction would be played alongside this chaos; the screech of metal creating a discoordinated elegy of somber~~ [sounds of construction would disturb our peaceful neighbourhood], the shattering of glass as the ~~library's assassiators~~ [demolition crew] tear through the walls, the ripping of pages as the ~~worshipped books are stabbed by a militant knife~~ [valuable books are carelessly handled]. Children will weep ~~tears of melancholy~~ [in sadness], and adults will watch in ~~grave despondence~~ [dismay] as the bulldozers come out for their paycheck.

Our library is a bastion guarding the knowledge it holds, whilst sharing the wisdom with countless minds, letting us take apart its very body to receive gems of insight. Research has even highlighted a direct correlation with children visiting libraries and test scores, showing that children that go to libraries regularly score 21% higher than those who do not. But who is there to guard the library? Who is there to thank the being for the receipt of intelligence? Who is there to save the creature from extinction? The library has whispered immeasurable secrets, and yet we repay it like this. This is beyond inhumane. The wooden shelves, time-worn and caressed with all of our fingerprints, humbly ~~stores~~ [store] manifestations of intellect, its very grains breathing phrases that are unfathomable to the human mind. The stone exterior, scarred and scratched, is a war stained sentinel that protects the delicate acumen that lies inside. The frayed pages of the books, producing a perfume of vanilla essence, ~~sacrifices~~ [sacrifice] ~~its~~ [their] life for the gift of knowledge. It is absolutely immoral to execute this ally.

#3 Proponents for the idea that the library should be demolished may argue that the library is outdated with the current era, and that all information is digitally accessible, making libraries now unrealistic. I completely acknowledge and respect this point of view, as it questions the fundamental importance of the library, and the overall reason why the library even exists. However, I disagree due to the fact that misinformation is extremely common online, though not seen in books, and that rural areas will in fact have more accessibility to this quintessence of knowledge. A recent survey has shown that 84% of Australians find that public libraries provide trustworthy and reliable information, opposed to searching on the internet. By demolishing this library, you will be removing the only viable source of information that the neighbourhood is entitled to.

I entreat you, with the heart of the community beating along my side, to deny approval of the demolition proposal, that would leave an ~~indelible blood stain~~ [lasting negative impact] in the centre of the neighbourhood. Have we truly become ~~immoral~~ [misguided] enough to value economic growth over pure intellectual havens? The community will either see you with bitter resentment, or honourable reverence, with the decision that you have at your hand. You will either be seen as a ~~gravedigger who commanded execution of a sanctuary of knowledge~~ [person who destroyed a valuable community resource], or a hero that saved the library from the

~~scythes of death~~ [threat of demolition]. You will either be known as a cruel tyrant, greedy for finance, or an altruistic guardian that rescued the epitome of knowledge. The choice is yours.

Yours sincerely, Nandu Praveen