

Response_id=418005-18107.Response1

Response= There is much debate as to whether the effects of Daylight Savings Time, also known as DST, has a positive affect on people or a negative affect on people. It has surely been an interesting debate, because it was even debated in the late 1700's by Benjamin Franklin! If a great mind such as Benjamin Franklin was discussing this issue, then it must be a hot topic worthy of beneficial results! Looking at the arguements regarding this issue, it is clear that DST is beneficial to society in many ways. It is even said to save lives! If something with such a positive impact has so many great results then why aren't more people in favor of it? Countries such as parts of Arizona and Hawaii are still skeptical about DST and refuse to take part in it.

DST is something that was introduced in 1918 and after a few adjustments, it has been used ever since. It wasn't as successful at first because there was not a set time as to when it was supposed to take place. Once the Uniform Time Act of 1966 was enacted, there were no negative impacts of DST apparent.

Studies have been done in an attempt to undermine the positive impact of DST, but the studies do not really show conclusive results that would benefit their arguements. For example, there was a study done in indiana that tried to show negative results pertaining to DST. The three year study showed results that there was an increase in energy spending and it was concluded that DST caused an increase of air conditioning being used. The results are not valid, because weather plays a big part in the cost of energy and whether DST was implemented or not, people would be using air conditioning. Therefore, there is no real arguement as to why DST could possibly be bad for our society.

On the contrary, there are many studies that show great results in favor of DST and showcase just how beneficial DST is to average americans. DST affects energy costs, reduces crimes, and even saves lives! A study done in 1970 concluded that an average of 1% in energy costs was saved every day because of DST. Due to the prolonged amount of light at the end of the day, people have less need of electricity. DST can also save lives, and this is due to the fact that more daylight means drivers and pedestrians do not have to deal with the dark when coming home from work or school. This has decreased accidents by about 10 percent! DST affects crime rates as well because people get their errands and duties done during daylight hours and are safely home by the time it gets dark.

DST is obviously beneficial to society and is much needed to help reduce costs of energy. The meagar results against DST are vastly outnumbered by the solid results found in support of DST. It is such a great thing to have, that it should be implemented in other countries and not just our own. It would greatly benefit other countries who wish to lower energy costs and reduce crime rates. No matter what debates are brought about, it can be concluded that DST is a practice that isn't going away!

Response_id=418005-18107.Response1

Response= In the argument for daylight savings time, it seems that the pro daylight savings time position has won. The first article brings up several improvements in the daily lives of Americans which daylight savings time brings about. The article then uses studies and large scale research to support its position. In the second article, only smaller scale studies are used, and the writer uses arguments with no factual basis to support it's anti daylight savings position.

In the first article, historical facts are supplied to explain why daylight savings time was created - to save energy during the first world war - and the way it has evolved over the years from a state decision to a national one. The first argument then cites a study which, though a bit outdated, proves the effectiveness of DST by revealing that DST saves about 1% per day on electricity. The study, however, was done in the 1970s and many things in our national energy consumption have changed since then. The most important change in energy consumption, which would be effected by daylight savings time, is the use of air conditioning. The increase in daylight hours that DST causes would increase the use of the now extremely common air conditioner. If that study from the 1970s were redone today, this single energy consumer may change the outcome.

The second article cites this technology, which is much more prevalent now than in the 1970s and certainly more than during the inception of DST, as a reason that DST does not save the country money on energy costs. The article had a start to a very good argument here, but it did not follow through. If the article had argued that DST, while relevant and helpful during the first world war, and indeed for a while after, was now outdated and detrimental to the energy efficiency of the country as a whole because of the widespread and continued use of air conditioning, than the tide may have turned in favor of this second article.

The next topic, which is cited by both arguments, is driver and pedestrian safety. The first article claims that the switch from commuting to work and school in the dark to commuting in the light saves lives. The article cites nearly 30 years of research that shows a significant drop in crashes for both vehicular accidents involving pedestrians and involving only vehicles. The second argument cites the same idea, that daylight savings changes crash rates, but argues instead that the abrupt transition from one time to another causes more crashes. The second article, however, did not read the facts carefully, because the facts they cite - that 227 pedestrians were killed the week after DST ended, while only 65 pedestrians were killed the week before - suggests that having daylight savings time in effect was what kept the number down to only 65 in the week preceeding the change in time. These facts could actually be better used in the first article as an example of the drastic differences when DST is in effect and when it is not. The point they were trying to make is that the shift in time effects a drivers ability to avoid crashes, but the facts are not quite black and white enough to prove the point beyond a doubt without giving some validity to the argument for the other side.

56-A

The last argument used by the con position cites the adjustment period for drivers as a valid reason to quit daylight savings time. The article, however, does not support this claim with any hard facts, it merely gives opinionated reasons for belief in this theory. While this adjustment period is a real thing, the lack of scientific support used by the article hurts the credibility of the claim being made.

Because of the blunders in fact usage and the flimsy nature of the arguments on the second article, it is clear that the first argument is the better researched and supported argument. If the second article were to make its points more clear and use the research and studies in a different manner, then that argument would probably pull more weight simply because of the older time stamp on the first study cited in the argument for the use of daylight savings time. If the argument of changing times and outdated information were used, article two would emerge the winner.