Section 1

#1: Opening Paragraph

Strengths:

- Your opening creates a powerful emotional connection by describing the silence after a car accident, which helps readers understand the human cost of traffic deaths.
- Your thesis statement is clear and direct, making your position on mandatory autonomous vehicles easy to identify.

Vague Statistical Context → Whilst you mention "over 1.3 million families around the globe," your piece would be stronger if you explained whether this represents annual deaths or a different timeframe more clearly within the sentence itself. The phrase "every year" appears beforehand, but the connection could be tighter. Additionally, your shift from discussing tragedy to stating "they are not accidents—they are failures" needs smoother development to help readers follow your reasoning more easily.

Exemplar: *Each year, approximately 1.3 million people worldwide lose their lives in road accidents, leaving behind families consumed by an unbearable silence—the silence of unread messages and empty chairs at dinner tables.*

#2: Third Paragraph (Privacy and Freedom Arguments)

Strengths:

- Your analogy comparing dangerous driving to practising archery on crowded footpaths effectively illustrates why certain freedoms must have limits.
- Your acknowledgement of opposing viewpoints demonstrates balanced argumentation and shows you understand different perspectives.

Underdeveloped Counterargument → Your response to privacy concerns lacks depth and specific detail. When you write "a mandate would allow the government to track every movement," you acknowledge this serious worry but then dismiss it without explaining how this tracking concern could be addressed or managed. Your comparison to archery, whilst creative, doesn't fully answer the privacy question because archery and driving serve different purposes in people's lives. You need to explain more thoroughly why the privacy concerns, though valid, can be managed through proper regulations or technical solutions.

Exemplar: *Whilst privacy concerns are legitimate, modern data protection laws and encryption systems can ensure that movement tracking serves only safety purposes, much like how current number plate recognition technology operates within strict legal frameworks.*

#3: Fourth Paragraph (Economic Arguments)

Strengths:

- Your point about government mandates actually solving inequality rather than causing it shows sophisticated thinking about the issue.
- Your historical comparison between cars replacing horse carriages provides helpful context for understanding technological transitions.

Oversimplified Job Transition Claim → Your argument that "technology shifts the workforce rather than erasing it" needs more careful explanation. When you state that "new industries in fleet management, remote monitoring, and infrastructure will rise," you don't explain how millions of displaced drivers would actually move into these new jobs, many of which require different skills and training. The horse-and-carriage comparison doesn't fully work here because that transition happened over many decades, whereas your proposal suggests a faster change. You need to address the timing problem and the practical steps needed to help workers transition successfully.

Exemplar: *Whilst new industries will emerge, governments must establish comprehensive retraining programmes and transitional support to ensure that displaced workers can acquire the technical skills needed for fleet management and monitoring roles, preventing economic hardship during the changeover period.*

■ Your piece presents a well-structured argument with clear reasoning and effective use of emotional appeals. However, your content would benefit from deeper exploration of the practical challenges you mention. When you address counterarguments, you sometimes move past them too quickly without fully explaining how the problems would be solved. Additionally, your Remote Rescue system paragraph introduces an important idea but feels somewhat disconnected from your main argument about mandates—consider explaining earlier why technical solutions like this make mandates feasible. Also, your economic paragraph could explore the timeline for job transitions more thoroughly, as this is a major concern for many people. Overall, strengthen your piece by providing more specific details about implementation and addressing concerns more completely rather than dismissing them.

Overall Score: 44/50

Section 2:

The End of the Error: Why We Must Mandate Autonomous Vehicles

#1 → There is a specific kind of silence that haunts a home after a fatal car accident. It is the silence of an unread text message, an empty chair at the dinner table, and a bedroom door that will never open again. Every year, over 1.3 million families around the globe are plunged into this silence, their lives shattered in the blink of an eye. We often call these tragedies "accidents," but when the cause is almost always a preventable mistake, they are not accidents—they are failures. The debate over whether to replace

human drivers with autonomous vehicles is no longer just about convenience; it is a moral imperative. To save lives, protect our planet, and ensure equality, we must not just encourage autonomous vehicles—we must eventually mandate them.

The most logical reason to mandate autonomous vehicles is the undeniable flaw in the current system: the human driver. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, approximately 94% of serious crashes are due to human error because biological organisms get tired, distracted, angry, and intoxicated. Opponents of a mandate raise a terrifying and valid point regarding cybersecurity: unlike a single drunk driver, a hacked software network or a widespread glitch could theoretically crash thousands of cars simultaneously, weaponising the very grid meant to save us. However, while the fear of a digital catastrophe is real, it ignores the daily reality of the ~~analog~~ [analogue] catastrophe we currently live in. A computer's reaction time is measured in milliseconds, whereas a human's is measured in seconds. Cybersecurity is an engineering challenge that can be fortified with decentralisation and redundancies, whereas human nature is an unfixable biological limitation. We must trust the data: an imperfect computer is still statistically safer than a perfect human driver.

#2 → Beyond the cold logic of statistics lies the emotional weight of this transition and the immense relief it could bring to families. A mandate for autonomous vehicles is about ending the heartache of preventable loss and giving the blind, the disabled, and the elderly the dignity of independent movement. Yet, many critics view this mandate as a dystopian nightmare, arguing that it represents the ultimate surrender of personal liberty and privacy. They contend that the ability to drive oneself is a fundamental freedom and that a mandate would allow the government to track every movement, stripping citizens of their autonomy. Whilst the desire for control is deeply human, we must ask if that freedom supersedes another person's right to live. We do not allow people to practice archery on a crowded sidewalk; similarly, we should not allow dangerous manual driving on public highways. Driving can remain a hobby on private tracks, but public roads must be safe sanctuaries for all.

#3 → Finally, we must consider the ethical responsibility we have to our environment and the equitable distribution of resources. Autonomous vehicles are designed to drive with optimal efficiency, accelerating smoothly to reduce emissions and eliminate the chaotic stop-and-go traffic caused by human impatience. Economic critics, however, present a formidable argument: a mandate could destroy the livelihoods of millions of truck, taxi, and delivery drivers, whilst the high cost of the technology could restrict mobility to the wealthy elite. This is a serious concern, but a government mandate is actually the solution to inequality, not the cause. By standardising the technology and treating transportation as a public utility—similar to a bus or train service—costs would plummet through mass production. Furthermore, history shows that technology shifts the workforce rather than erasing it; just as the car replaced the horse carriage, new industries in fleet management, remote monitoring, and infrastructure will rise, ensuring that safe, efficient transport is a right for everyone rather than a luxury for the wealthy.

To ensure the system is foolproof without being overly complicated, we should implement a Remote Rescue system. One of the biggest fears people have is that a computer will not know what to do in a confusing situation, like a police officer using hand signals or a complex construction zone. The solution is simple: if the car's computer gets confused, it does not just freeze; it instantly connects to a human operator in a central command ~~center~~ [centre]. This professional human driver can see through the car's cameras and briefly take over control remotely to guide the vehicle through the tricky spot. This system gives us the best of both worlds: the tireless safety of a machine for 99% of the trip, and the judgment of a human for that complex 1%.

The transition to mandatory autonomous vehicles will be a significant cultural shift, but it is a necessary one. We have the technology to virtually eliminate car accidents, reduce pollution, and grant mobility to those who have been left behind. Clinging to the steering wheel out of habit or pride is no longer a valid excuse. For the sake of our safety and our society, it is time to let go of the wheel and let the future drive.