

| IDEAS: the central message supported by enriching detail | Developing the Grade Level Expectation | Applying the Grade Level Expectation | Meeting the Grade Level Expectation | Exceeding the Grade Level Expectation |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> main idea is unclear limited or confusing detail | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> emerging central idea some connection to the topic some appropriate details included leaves some unanswered questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> main idea is clear directly addresses the topic relevant and appropriate detail engages the reader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of ideas is original and innovative, demonstrating maturity and sophistication beyond the grade level expectation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization demonstrates a maturity or sophistication beyond the grade level expectation. |
| <p>ORGANIZATION: the internal structure, the thread of central meaning</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> problems with organization make the text difficult to follow | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a recognizable introduction has a recognizable conclusion makes an attempt to use transitions paragraphing is effective at times | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has an effective introduction has an effective conclusion uses effective transitions sequencing is logical paragraphing is consistently effective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voice is consistently compelling, original, and moving, demonstrating maturity and sophistication beyond the grade level expectation. |
| <p>VOICE: the unique perspective and style of the writer</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> voice is limited voice suits purpose and audience at times | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> voice is mostly engaging voice mostly suits purpose and audience | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> voice is consistently engaging voice is appropriate to purpose and audience voice is sustained throughout the text | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Word choice demonstrates maturity and sophistication beyond the grade level expectation. |
| <p>WORD CHOICE: precise and vivid language that moves and engages the reader</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> word choice is limited | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> repetitive use of words and phrases words sometimes used inappropriately words are adequate but basic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> word choice enhances and clarifies meaning and is consistently: precise accurate effective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentence fluency demonstrates maturity and sophistication beyond the grade level expectation. |
| <p>SENTENCE FLUENCY: the rhythm, flow and sound of language</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> errors in sentence construction impair fluency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sentences are usually effective and: are mostly well constructed include some variety in length, structure, and beginnings are mostly fluent | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sentences are consistently effective and: are well constructed vary in length and structure begin in a variety of ways flow smoothly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of conventions demonstrates maturity and sophistication beyond the grade level expectation. |
| <p>CONVENTIONS: the mechanical correctness of the piece</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> errors in conventions distract the reader and make the text difficult to follow. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> conventions are mostly correct, including: grammar/usage spelling punctuation paragraphing/formatting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> conventions are consistently correct, including: grammar/usage spelling punctuation paragraphing/formatting | |

ME

ME

ME

Benny Berkenkotter-Core D-November 25, 2014

Nuclear Weapons Control

The problem of disarmament of nuclear weapons was most important after the events of World War II. Treaties, bans and discussions have been made to try and solve this issue but, unfortunately out of the many attempts only two have been successful. People, mostly Conservatives, think that these nuclear weapons or Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD's) are necessary to try and protect ourselves from other countries' weapons which are WMD's as well such as what North Korea has in its arsenal. I believe that every country should dismantle any piece of WMD's they have because it is a health hazard, it is a threat to world peace, and the use of these weapons can result in a nuclear war.

In the first place, the use of nuclear weapons are a major health hazard especially to organisms ^{? w/c} such as ourselves. According to Britannica World Book Online, the effect of these weapons do not only happen from the initial blast or explosion of the weapons but also from the prolonged exposure from the radiation it produces. Radiation from the explosion is known to travel in the speed of light and can be transported by wind, burning anything combustible in its path. Debris from this blast can contain residual radiation which, if exposed, can become radioactive and release more radiation. Prolonged exposure from radiation mostly results in death. According to "Nukes The Spread of Nuclear Weapons" by Minneus Steve, this radiation can cause cancer and can damage your body to death. You here fictional stories about superheroes first coming intact with radiation, then getting superpowers but there is almost a one hundred percent chance you will die from this. The chance of dying from something you can't see or don't notice is a very dreadful thought, no one can ever know until the last moment when you have it. Even though I have never seen this happen in real life, I have seen videos and I have studied about what this radiation can do to you and it is horrifying. I most certainly do not want to die by this invisible force. The use of these weapons is a major health hazard to the environment, and as a result it is a major threat to world peace.

Moreover, the potential of some countries having these weapons is a tremendous threat to world peace. Bans or treaties such as the London Naval Conference of 1930 and the disarmament conference sponsored by the League of Nations in 1932 have failed. These failures help me generate the question, "Do the countries who declined this treaty, not want world peace?" President George W. Bush during the twenty-first century also had a speech that announced that the US would no longer participate in the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) saying, "We need a new framework that allows us to build missile defences to counter the different threats of today's world. To do so, we must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year ABM Treaty." and, "Nuclear weapons still have a vital role to play in our security that of our allies." (George W. Bush National Defense University, Washington, May 1, 2001) From my standpoint, this is a very conservative response to the treaty saying that the US does not want any part of the foreign affair or disarmament rather they want to keep these weapons as protection. I *understand* his argument saying that we need something to keep us safe and in case of war we something to protect ourselves. If my family could have done something that could make someone angry and potentially kill them, I would do anything in my power to try and protect them like what George W. Bush did. I would never, however, go as far as use nuclear weapons. I strongly *disagree* with his statement. I truly think that they should have stayed with the treaty to dismantle it and discontinue the manufacturing of these weapons. Having a major entity of the world say that, can change a lot of people's minds on this topic. For example, if a teacher tells you a fact from a textbook such as, "Apples are red", you are more likely to believe that fact than to believe someone who says, "Apples are yellow." I have learned this from experience. So George W. Bush dceclaring that the US would no longer be apart of it is a huge developement in the a way that can change people's minds about this problem. If countries such as the US, or China decline or abandon this matter, then there could be a possibility of another World War.

Very
interesting
paragraph

Furthermore, the use of WMD's can result in another World War if used against another country. The problem of dismantling these weapons was most

important after the second World War so if they do not solve this matter the most logical result would be another World War. I have heard many stories and watched a couple of documentaries portraying the event and horrors of these wars. From these stories, I can see the agony and pain of the people who lived through this. I most certainly do not want to live through this. People such as George W. Bush think that keeping these weapons can protect us but they won't. These weapons will inevitably destroy us because these are weapons that can wage wars. According to Britannica World Book Online countries such as the US, China, Russia, France, India, and Pakistan have declared that they had nuclear arsenals. These countries are a major influence in the world, so if anyone of them, even by accident, launches a missile then another war will happen. So wouldn't the best explanation or solution be to dismantle or destroy these weapons? I believe that rather to keep them just in case, we should dismantle them to ensure world peace and no other war would happen.

The issue of dismantling WMD's has had a rough history of failures especially in terms of discussions and treaties. In the book "*Nukes The Spread of Nuclear Weapons*", the United Nations said that any country that agrees with their treaty will have the help of the United Nations to dismantle these weapons and convert them into energy to support their country. This is a truly magnificent solution to this problem, but rather than to turn them into a beneficial tool that can potentially solve our energy crisis people would rather keep them as weapons to protect themselves. The decision that many people have made of keeping these weapons and using them as protection is shocking. Weapons such as these are a major health hazard in the world especially since radiation can travel in the speed of light almost everywhere and can affect everything that stands in its way. WMD's are threat to world peace, and to keep the world we all want we need to get rid of these weapons to ensure that the peace will be kept. If they were to be used in any situation, then the peace would be broken and there is a huge probability that another war will happen. In other words, I strongly agree that WMD's should be dismantled because it is a major health hazard, it can abolish world peace, and it can ignite another World War.

Still needed
to make
this
concise!
↓
Get to
the point
Benny!

Benny Berkenkotter-Core D-November 25, 2014

Nuclear Weapons Control

The problem of disarmament of nuclear weapons was most important after the events of World War II. Treaties, bans and discussions have been made to try and solve this issue but, unfortunately, out of the many attempts only two have been successful. People think that these nuclear weapons or Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD's) are necessary to try and protect ourselves from other countries' weapons. I believe that every country should dismantle any piece of WMD's they have because it is a health hazard, it is a threat to world peace, and the use of these weapons can result in nuclear war. ✓

In the first place, the use of nuclear weapons is a major health hazard especially to organisms such as ourselves. According to Britannica World Book Online, the effect of these weapons to not only happen from the initial blast or explosion of the weapons but also from the prolonged exposure from the radiation it produces. Radiation from the explosion is known to travel in the speed of light and can be transported by wind, burning anything combustible in its path. Debris from this blast can contain residual radiation which, if exposed, can become radioactive and release more radiation. Prolonged exposure from radiation mostly results in death. According to "*Nukes The Spread of Nuclear Weapons*" by Minneus Steve, this radiation can cause cancer and can damage your body to death. You here fictional stories about superheroes first coming intact with radiation, then getting superpower but there is almost a one hundred percent chance you will die from this. The chance of dying from something you can't see or don't notice is a very dreadful thought, no one can every know until the last moment when you have it. I most certainly do not want to die by this. The use of these weapons is a major health hazard to the environment, and as a result it is a major threat to world peace. ✓

satellite structure/fluency?

Moreover, the potential of some countries having these weapons is a tremendous threat to world peace. Bans or treaties such as the London Naval

stronger
more
language?

Conference of 1930 and the disarmament conference sponsored by the League of Nations in 1932 have failed. These failures help me generate the question, "Do the countries who declined this treaty no want world peace?" President George W. Bush during the twenty-first century also had a speech that announced that the US would no longer participate in the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) saying, "We need a new framework that allows us to build missile defences to counter the different threats of today's world. To do so, we must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year ABM Treaty." and, "Nuclear still have a vital role to play in our security that of our allies." (George W. Bush National Defense University, Washington, May 1, 2001) From my standpoint, this is a very conservative response to the treaty saying that the US does not want any part of the foreign affair or disarmament rather they want to keep these weapons as protection. I ^{it all's} understand ~~where he is going with~~ in his argument saying that we need something to keep us safe and in case of war we something to protect ourselves. But I strongly ^{it all's?} disagree with his statement. I truly think that they should have stayed with the treaty to dismantle it and discontinue and manufacture of these weapons. Having a major entity of the world say that, can change a lot of people's minds on this topic. For example, if a teacher tell you a fact from a textbook such as, "Apples are red", you are more likely to believe that fact than to believe someone you says, "Apples are yellow." If countries such as the US, or China decline or abandon this matter, then there could be a possibility of another World War.

Furthermore, the use of WMD's can result in another World War if used against another country. The problem of dismantling these weapons was most important after the second World War so if they do not solve this matter the most logical result would be another World War. I have hear many stories and watched a couple of documentaries portraying the event and horrors of these wars. From these stories, I can see the agony and pain of the people who lived through this. I most certainly do not want to live through this. People such as George W. Bush think that keep these weapons can protect us but they won't. These weapons will inevitably destroy us because these are weapons that can wage wars. According to Britannica World Book Online countries such as the US,

China, Russia, France, India, and Paistan have declared that they had nuclear arsenals. These countries are a major influence in the world, so if anyone of them, even by accident, launches a missile then another war will happen. So wouldn't the best explanation or solution be to dismantle or destroy these weapons? I believe that rather to keep them just in case, we should dismantle them to ensure world peace and no other war would happen.

The issue of dismantling WMD's has had a rough history of failures especially in terms of discussions and treaties. In the book "*Nukes The Spread of Nuclear Weapons*", the United Nations said that any country that agrees with their treaty will have the help of the United Nations to dismantle these weapons and convert them into energy to support their country. This is a magnificent solution to this problem, but rather that to turn them into beneficial tool, people would rather keep them as weapons to protect themselves. Weapons such as these are a major health hazard in the world especially since radiation can travel in the speed of light almost everywhere. WMD's are threat to world peace, and to keep the world we all want we need to get rid of these weapons to ensure that the peace will be kept. If they were to be used in any situation then, the peace would be broken and there is a huge probability that another war will happen. In other words, I strongly agree that WMD's should be dismantled because it is a major health hazard, it can abolish world peace, and it can ignite another World War.

Can this be more concise?

Ethos?
Pathos?



Nuclear Weapons Control - Benny B.

| | |
|--|---|
| Intro | |
| <p>✓</p> <p><i>stronger TRANSITIONS!</i></p> <p><i>According to WHO?</i></p> | <p>Paragraph 1</p> <p>TRANSITION: Firstly,</p> <p>RDF: the use of nuclear weapons is a major health hazard especially to organisms such as ourselves.</p> <p>EVIDENCE/EXAMPLES/DATA/EXPERIENCE/EXPLANATION/ELABORATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *The effects of these weapons do not only happen from the initial blast radius of the explosions but also from the prolonged exposure from the radiation from the bomb *Radiation from this source can travel in the speed of light mostly from wind and can light or burn combustible materials. *Debris from this blast can also contain residual radiation which, if exposed, can become radioactive and release more radiation *Prolonged exposure from radiation mostly results in death *Death from something you don't notice or invisible is not how most people such as I want to die by |
| Transition Sentence | <p>The use of these weapons is a major health hazard to the environment, and as a result it is a major threat to world peace.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 2</p> <p><i>make sure you use more emotive language!</i></p> | <p>TRANSITION: Moreover,</p> <p>RDF: the potential of some countries having these weapons is a tremendous threat to world peace. ✓</p> <p>EVIDENCE/EXAMPLES/DATA/EXPERIENCE/EXPLANATION/ELABORATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Band or treaties such as the London Naval Conference of 1930 and the disarmament conference sponsored by the League of Nations in 1932 have failed *These failures help me come up with the question "Do the countries who declined this treaty not want world peace?" *George W. Bush during the 21st century also had a speech that announced that the US would no longer participate in the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) saying that if other countries do have these weapons, then the US would need weapons to protect themselves *From my standpoint this is a conservative view point saying that they do not want any part in world matters and want more protection and security *I understand where he is going with this saying that we need to protect ourselves as well and not to dismantle it *But I disagree, I think they should have dismantled it because having one major entity in the world saying that can change a lot of people or countries minds on this matter |
| Transition Sentence | <p>If countries such as the US decline or abandon this matter, then there could be a possibility of another World War.</p> |
| Paragraph 3 | <p>TRANSITION: Furthermore,</p> <p>RDF: the use of WMD's can result in another World War if used against another country.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <p>According to who?</p> | <p>EVIDENCE/EXAMPLES/DATA/EXPERIENCE/EXPLANATION/ELABORATION</p> <p>*The problem of dismantling these weapons was a major problem after the second World War so if they do not solve it then the most logical result would be another World War.</p> <p>*I have heard many stories from the war and most of these I would not like to live through but if they don't dismantle these weapons, the story might become true again.</p> <p>*Countries such as the United States, China, Russia, France, India, and Pakistan have declared that they have nuclear weapons.</p> <p>*These countries have a major influence in the world so if even one of them, even if its by accident, launches any weapons then another war would happen.</p> <p>*So wouldn't the most logical explanation be to destroy or dismantle these weapons then?</p> <p>*I think so, but some people believe that we need to protect ourselves just in case this happens.</p> <p>*I believe that rather than to keep them just in case, we should dismantle them to ensure world peace and not to have another war.</p> |
| <p>Conclusion</p> | <p>[This area is currently blank in the image.]</p> |

Underline where you are using Ethos, Pathos and Logos in your essay.

Which paragraph are you going to use for your counter argument?

Write down or underline what persuasive language you are using in each of your paragraphs.

Ms. Bevear
 比維亞 

Benny B.

Nuclear Weapons Control Citations:

"Weapons of Mass Destruction." *Opposing Viewpoints Online Collection*. Detroit: Gale, 2014. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*. Web. 12 Nov. 2014.

Document URL

<http://ic.galegroup.com/ic/ovic/ReferenceDetailsPage/ReferenceDetailsWindow?failOverType=&query=&pro...>

"nuclear weapons." *Britannica School*. Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., 2014. Web. 20 Nov. 2014. <<http://school.ebonline.com/levels/middle/article/276133>>.

Minneus, Steve. "The Road to Treaties." *Nukes The Spread of Nuclear Weapons*. First ed. New York: Rosen Group, 2008. 13-18. Print.

"disarmament." *Britannica School*. Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., 2014. Web. 12 Nov. 2014. <<http://school.ebonline.com/levels/middle/article/274017>>.

Bush, George W. "Start, NMB, and the ABM Treaty." *Acronym Institute*. 2001 The Acronym Institute., 1 May 2001. Web. 24 Nov. 2014.

Ms. Bevear
比維亞 

