

### Section 1:

**Part #1:** "This is not acceptable. You are choosing to destroy and obliterate, our dear library to construct what? Another meaningless, soulless, economic dumpster for shops to generate INCOME. By choosing to demolish our historic library, you are erasing a lifeline for students, families, and countless others who depend on it. You are choosing to erase a space that has enriched minds, powered students and built our striving community."

Strengths:

- Passionate tone that immediately conveys urgency and emotion
- Effective use of emotive language with words like "obliterate," "meaningless," "soulless"

Weakness: Repetitive sentence structure → Your opening paragraph contains three consecutive sentences beginning with "You are," creating a repetitive rhythm that diminishes impact. While repetition can be effective as a rhetorical device, the sentences follow an identical pattern without variation in structure or length, making them blend together rather than building to a powerful crescendo.

Exemplar: *"This is utterly unacceptable. How can you justify destroying our beloved library—a cultural cornerstone of our community—merely to construct another soulless commercial venture? By demolishing this historic institution, you erase not just a building, but a vital lifeline for students, families, and countless vulnerable members of our community who depend on its resources daily."*

**Part #2:** "Many students, especially those who come from underprovided backgrounds are at risk. By destroying the library, you are not only boycotting the library from the rich and wealthy but from the poor too! You are only widening the gap and abuse the poor and needy. How would you feel, if your only refuge was a library that housed your sanctuary, only for it now to be destroyed in the makings of a new shopping complex that you do not have the money for? Well, you don't need to. They\*\* will\*\* go through such trauma."

Strengths:

- Effective rhetorical question that invites council members to empathise
- Good focus on social inequality and addressing the impact on vulnerable groups

Weakness: Imprecise vocabulary → Your use of "boycotting" is inaccurate in this context, as boycotting refers to abstaining from something as a protest. Additionally, the syntax in "abuse the poor" creates confusion about whether you're accusing council members of abuse or describing the effect of their actions. The asterisks around "will" appear to be formatting errors rather than intentional emphasis.

Exemplar: *"By destroying the library, you are not merely removing a service—you are stripping away essential educational resources from our most vulnerable citizens, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds who rely on these facilities as their only access to books, computers and quiet study spaces."*

**Part #3:** "The library is not just a building; it holds historical significance and serves as a cultural hub of the community. Its demolition would erase a space that has fostered generations of learners, readers, and thinkers, diminishing the town's identity and heritage. Without the protection and knowledge of our library, how will our community thrive? Is this perceived destruction really still what our 'council' wants?"

Strengths:

- Strong cultural argument that elevates the library beyond its physical presence
- Effective use of rhetorical questions to challenge the council's intentions

Weakness: Lack of specific detail → Your paragraph makes broad claims about historical significance and cultural importance without providing concrete examples or specific details about the library's heritage. Without these supporting details, the emotional appeal lacks the weight of evidence that would make your argument more compelling and difficult to dismiss.

Exemplar: *"Our library is far more than brick and mortar—it is the 150-year-old cornerstone of our town's cultural identity, housing irreplaceable historical archives documenting our community's development since Victorian times. Its reading room has nurtured three generations of local authors, including our town's most celebrated poet, whilst its community programmes have provided literacy support to thousands of residents. How can our community's cultural heritage possibly thrive without this vital institution?"*

■ Your piece demonstrates admirable passion and commitment to the cause, with strong use of rhetorical questions throughout. However, the overall effectiveness of your letter would benefit significantly from more varied sentence structures and concrete examples to support your claims. Your arguments about environmental impact and social inequality are particularly promising but need more specific details and evidence to truly convince council members of the library's irreplaceable value. Additionally, your letter would benefit from more physical descriptions of the library itself—what makes this particular building special? What unique features or spaces would be lost? Also, consider developing a more structured approach to your arguments, perhaps grouping related points together rather than touching on several different issues in succession. Your conclusion could be strengthened by offering a specific call to action rather than simply questioning the council's intentions.

---

**Overall score: 42/50**

---

## Section 2:

Dear Council Members,

This is not acceptable. You are choosing to destroy and obliterate~~,~~ our dear library to construct what? Another meaningless, soulless, economic dumpster for shops to generate INCOME. By choosing to demolish our historic library, you are erasing a lifeline for students, families, and countless others who depend on it. You are choosing to erase a space that has enriched minds, powered students and built our ~~striving~~ [thriving] community.

#1 When the dust settles and the shopping complex stands in its place, it will not be the developers or the corporations who bear the blame—it will be you. You will be remembered as the council that turned its back on education, culture, and the very people you were elected to serve. The loss of this library will be your legacy, and the community will not forget who made this choice. You are the ones ~~that~~ [who] widened the gap between the poor and the rich. You are the ones ~~that adds~~ [who add] to the environmental pollution. You are the ones ~~that~~ [who] burn down our community's history and culture. Is this truly the legacy you wish to leave behind?

#2 Many students, especially those who come from ~~underprovided~~ [underprivileged] backgrounds are at risk. By destroying the library, you are not only ~~boycotting~~ [removing] the library from the rich and wealthy but from the poor too! You are only widening the gap and ~~abuse~~ [abandoning] the poor and needy. How would you feel, if your only refuge was a library that housed your sanctuary, only for it now to be destroyed in the makings of a new shopping complex that you do not have the money for? Well, you don't need to. ~~They\*\*will\*\*go~~ [They will go] through such trauma. Such individuals already had such problems without you adding more! Is this really the outcome the 'council' wants?

Tearing down the library to build a commercial complex would contribute to pollution, carbon ~~gas~~ [emissions], loss of green parks and spaces and would only increase the greenhouse effect even further. Nobody wants a community with bustling townspeople, cars dotting the streets and skyscrapers to the sky. Nobody wants a colourless city. Is this still what the 'council' wants?

#3 The library is not just a building; it holds historical significance and serves as a cultural hub of the community. Its demolition would erase a space that has fostered generations of learners, readers, and thinkers, diminishing the town's identity and heritage. Without the protection and knowledge of our library, how will our community thrive? Is this perceived destruction really still what our 'council' wants?

The decision to demolish our beloved library is not just a loss of a building—it is a loss of opportunity, equity, and community spirit. It is a sanctuary for learning, a bridge for the underprivileged, and a cornerstone of our shared history. By choosing to replace it with a commercial complex, you risk alienating the very people you were elected to 'serve'. Now, finally do you see the problem in our eyes? Or do you still think that this is what our community needs?