

Topic/Prompt: The Gold Standard	
Hook: Gold is as an investment. S hould you buy it?	
Background Information: The gold standard is a system in by which a currency is was defined in terms of gold. r for which the currency could be exchanged.	
Position Statement: Both passages provide information regarding the gold standard. The first passage thinks the U.S. should go back to the gold standard, while the second passage argues that the long term use of the gold standard has a cost. While both sides make an acceptable case, the second passage makes a stronger argument because of its long and short term stability and has a cost to produce gold.	
Main Idea 1: Firstly, the proponents' argument is stronger than the opponents' argument. For example, historically, "events such as the California Gold Rush (which resulted in a sudden increase of gold).	Main Idea 2: Secondly, the proponents have a stronger argument than the opponents because they prove that it is the "Civil War (which destroyed the infrastructure, making goods scarce)."
Supportive Sentence for Main Idea 1: (Textual Evidence) For instance, the proponents state that "According to historical data, price swings were greater under the gold standard."	Supportive Sentence for Main Idea 2: (Textual Evidence) For example, the proponents claim that "According to Economist Milton Friedman estimated that in 1990 the cost of maintaining a full gold standard would be 2.5% of the Gross National Product (GNP)."
Supportive Sentence for M.I. #1 (Explanation of Textual Evidence) This suggests that because of the Historical events, there was economic instability while using the gold standard.	Supportive Sentence for M.I. #2 (Explanation of Textual Evidence) This explains what the cost to maintain a gold standard was in 1990.

Commented [1]: Rewrite this idea as a complete thought i.e. exchanged how?

Commented [2]: Rewrite your thoughts so that your 3 main ideas are clearly stated. You can say: ...because it claims...(state your 3 points).

Commented [3]: You should not be presenting an example here. You should only be stating your main idea #1. Be sure to follow your previous template as a sample. Apply these comments to your main idea #2 as well.

The reason you struggled here is because your 3 main ideas were not clearly stated in your thesis (i.e. position statement).

Commented [4]: You are not providing an example here. You are only stating your main idea #2.

Commented [5]: You need to elaborate more here so that you connect your main idea and textual evidence together. Once you clarify your main idea, it should be easier to do.

Counterargument

(The other side's opinion with evidence)

On the contrary, opponents argue that the government should use the gold standard because "U.S. dollar is a fiat currency, given value by the "full faith and credit" of the U.S. government."

Rebuttal

(Evidence to disprove the other side)

However, proponents have a stronger argument because they claim that "By limiting the ability of the government to manipulate the economy, the gold standards remove economic controls that help stabilize the economy and deal with recessions." This proves that the gold standard is not a good monetary system for today's day and age.

Conclusion:

In summary, the proponents' argument that the government should not use the gold standard is better supported than the opponents' argument. The proponents prove that the gold standard has short and long term economic securities and is costly to maintain a full gold standard. In the end, a gold standard is not reliable in today's economy.

Commented [6]: This is good in that you state the other side's position, but you need to provide at least one reason why the other side is taking its position. This is referred to as clearly stating the other side's position. You'll need to do this before you transition into your textual evidence. Make sure that you are not confusing the two sides of the argument.

Commented [7]: Clearly provide evidence here. As such, you need to transition (refer to your previous template as a guide). You can say: "For example,"

However, you need to make sure that you are not confusing the two sides, and that your evidence supports the other side's perspective on the issue.

Commented [8]: This is confusing and too wordy. Also, it favors the gold standard (i.e. showing its benefits); therefore, your explanation does not work because it contradicts the evidence. You need to make sure that you are not confusing the two sides.

Commented [9]: Are these benefits? Also, you should have three main ideas not two. Once you have clearly established them in your thesis, you'll be able to easily restate them in your conclusion.