**The best ideas arise from a passionate interest in commonplace things.**

The world we are living has provided us with a plenty of things to study. The past decades have seen a great improvement of our modern living. We are able to search information immediately through our mobile phones or iPad everywhere. It is just because we have the need to gather information that the relative products are made. Thus, the ideas that benefit our common life arise from a passionate interest in commonplace things. However, when it comes to other areas, like academic science or arts, things may not be that easy.

We have been living in a world with rapid scientific change. All the inventors and company leaders are sparing no efforts to develop new products and inventions, fearing of falling off the track and being abandoned by modernized people. From the long development of people's science and culture, most ideas came out with a passionate interest in commonplace things. At the beginning of human development, ideas were based on the basic need of living. For example, people feel cold in winter and thus clothes were invented. And with time passing by and everyone was able to be presented with clothes, the color and style of the clothes became people's pursuit. During this time, the best ideas often arose from a passionate interest in clothes and beauty. Only a person with deep research on clothes and color match would be able to launch a new style and get a position in the drastic competition with other clothes makers.

Human cultural development is a process of the pursuit for new ideas in commonplace things, but there are some certain areas that best ideas must be provided with more complicated knowledge. In the field of science, the basic theory like numerical calculating ,data analyzing and so on, these are fundamental elements for the development of scientific research. However, the complicated ideas like time travel or the origin of lives require a full understanding of traditional physics or biology and the mention of a new idea surely comes out from a passionate interest in a subject that has a small number of people interested. Also, in the field of art, the ideas are often far from average people. Like Vincent Van Gogh, his painting could not be understood by his contemporaries in that his drawing skills go against the common values of people in that age.

Actually, the definition of the best idea is hard to give. What kind of ideas are best ideas? An idea that benefits all the people? Or just something that is beneficial to a certain field of study? Even if it can be defined, the source of a good idea is not restrained to the passionate interest of commonplace things. A case often happens that when we are doing something irrelevant or even dreaming , a good idea just come into our mind without any prescience, it is just the sixth sense dominating our thoughts. Although this may seem a little ridiculous, it happens to a lot of writers when thinking of what to write.

It is true that our common world provides us with a numerous sources of ideas, but that is not the only source of the best ideas. A best idea needs the right time and an appropriate environment.

**No Field of Study Can Advance Significantly Unless It Incorporates Knowledge And Experience From Outside That Field.**

The claim seems at first too absolute, and one can say that philosophy and natural sciences like mathematics can advance in the absence of knowledge and experience from other field of study. And they certainly could, in the childhood of human civilization, when such disciplines developed without any help from other areas, for they are the very first disciplines we studied. However, despite the fact that they could develop in the very early period, it still is the fact that their significant advancing does require knowledge and experience from outside their fields. So, in my opinion, there is not a field of study which can advance significantly without incorporating knowledge and experience from outside that field.

It is true that the generating of a field of study might need no other helps from outside that field, as I have already said above; but to advance significantly goes further than the early recognition and rather skin-deep consideration on problems. Also take mathematics for example: besides some very first axioms which can be said to come from people's common sense and intuition, other conclusions almost [always] came out after some people had taken some suggestive experience from other fields, for instance, probability theory is highly developed with the help of gamblers' knowledge. And I think an important reason why a field of study needs help from outside that field to advance significantly is that there is quite a narrow space for a discipline to develop without incorporating knowledge from other areas. Knowledge from outside a field sometimes acts as a flush of new blood, which can give people in that field a broader horizon, help them to see new problems, and enlighten them with new ideas.

Opponents may argue that knowledge and experience from outside a field may be disturbing, even misleading information which can distract people who devote themselves to that field; thus, it is highly possible that a field can advance significantly and better without any outside help. I agree that there does exist a kind of risk in incorporating with knowledge and experience from the outside, but it does not mean that the incorporation is unnecessary. As a matter of fact, when a discipline is developing, what it treasures most is different ideas, or even ideas that contradict its own and facts that can place some of its conclusions into doubt. Only in this way can the discipline find out its faults, and only after knowing its defects, can it have the chance to improve to a more advanced level.

Thus, without incorporating knowledge and experience from outside a field, I think it is almost impossible for that field to advance significantly.

**It is more harmful to compromise one's own beliefs than to adhere to them.**

There may have been many instances in our lives when we have faced the dilemma to either compromise our beliefs or to adhere to them. How does one make this choice? It all depends on your principles in life. You can choose to select the easier way out, which would be achieved by compromising on your beliefs. Adhering to your beliefs in the face of opposition is a more difficult task. Nevertheless, irrespective of the situation you are in, it always pays out in the end to adhere to your beliefs. At the first glance it does look as though a compromise would result in benefits, but in the longer run this compromise may prove to be harmful not only to your image but also to your subconscious. However, this line of thought holds true if your beliefs conform to the norms laid down by society, otherwise the opposite would be true, that is, adhering to an immoral belief will be harmful for you.

We all have our religious beliefs ingrained in us since childhood. Everyone is taught by his parents and his community to carry out his religious practices and rituals. If you belong to a religion where you are not permitted to have non-vegetarian food, would your sub-conscious allow you to have a chicken burger if you are offered the same by a person who does not belong to your community? Even if you do have it, what will be the repercussions? The effects of such a compromise may not be immediate, but they are bound to follow up as you move ahead in life. You may be ostracized by your community, you will be admonished by your parents and you may even regret it later on in life. Therefore, the better option would be to politely refuse the offer and adhere to your religious beliefs.

Adhering to your beliefs will rarely lead to any harm unless your belief does not conform to the norms of society. If you are of the belief that there is nothing wrong in taking bribes and you choose to adhere to your beliefs, then it is obvious that this will be extremely harmful for you in the long run. However, if you are of the strong opinion that one should never accept bribery and you have chosen to be honest in your profession, then compromising your belief will definitely land you into trouble. Patriots who stuck to their beliefs that their country should be free from the clutches of an imperialistic power succeeded in freeing their country. The freedom struggle of India is one such example. Could this have been possible if the freedom fighters had compromised on their beliefs? This compromise would have weakened their principles and they would not have had the strength to fight against all odds for the freedom of their country.

Your beliefs define who you are. Your identity and image are shaped by the beliefs that you follow in life. It is necessary to be flexible also in life, but wherever a choice has to be made between right and wrong; one should always follow the right path irrespective of what your beliefs are. If your beliefs are morally correct, then you cannot be harmed by adhering to your beliefs, but if your beliefs are in contrast to those of the society, then adhering to your beliefs may land you in big trouble. Therefore, it is imperative that you choose your beliefs carefully and adhere to them if you want to keep out of harm's way.

**Some people believe that corporations have a responsibility to promote the well-being of the societies and environments in which they operate. Others believe that the only responsibility of corporations, provided they operate within the law, is to make as much money as possible.**

Companies which hire corporate executives at enormously large salaries and other incentives like insurance, conveyance, accommodation etc. apart from some share of the annual profits, have high expectation from their corporate executives. These corporate executives are supposed to draw higher and higher profits for the company to justify the heavy packages received by them.

The primary goal to be achieved by corporate executives is therefore made clear by the perks and facilities provided for them. They are employed to look into different aspects of sales of the products and their return benefits. Irrespective of the nature of products manufactured, imported or exported, corporate executives are there to give the maximum monetary benefits to their respective companies.

As the norms and rules set by the government are to be followed, ways and means to draw the maximum possible profits are to be devised without challenging the laws. The profits earned can be termed as personal profits because it is for the company's growth and the promotion of corporate executives involved. The better part here is the inevitable economic growth of the nation, along with the more successful business deals of different corporate sectors. This in turn improves the economic standard of all the citizens in general.

Thus, the corporate and their business are directly related to the growth of the national and the global economy as well. Although, it is for personal benefit that the corporate executive works for, they inescapably share the responsibility of improving the living standards of people by providing job opportunities to them. Though, they may do business on their terms and conditions, they need the consent of the government over various policies and issues. Since, they utilize the resources and manpower of the nation; they ought to be responsible for the well being of their employees, customers as well as the nation as a whole. Corporate executives draw benefits of the contacts and policies formed by the government with other nations as well. Therefore, it is the liability of the corporate sectors and its top brass executives to pay back to the people of the country in turn of all the rights and authorities granted to them for the usage of various resources of the nation.

Generally, no corporate sector is fully self-financed. It starts a new project from money invested by people in the share market. The accountability of the corporate executives extends beyond their primary target of making huge profits. They are the ones who need to look into the means of sharing the profits among various investors. With them lies the responsibility of adopting the best policies for their employees, by gathering information from every successfully running industry. Corporate executives must come up with innovative ways of satisfying their customers and built a lasting good will rapport with them. An efficient corporate executive takes up the responsibility of lawfully bringing prosperity to his fellow men along with the prosperity of his company.

Hence, apart from minting money, corporate executives share the obligation of providing good service to all, thereby playing a significant role in the nation's progress.

**Claim: Many problems of modern society cannot be solved by laws and the legal system. Reason: Laws cannot change what is in people's hearts or minds.**

It is true that many problems of modern society cannot be solved by laws, as moral behavior is something for which a person has to be responsible himself. Although there are some problems that can be solved by laws, other problems like moral behavior have to be solved by the persons themselves.

It is a person responsibility to judge his behavior and follow the rules formed for the welfare of the society. Law cannot punish every person for his or her behavior. For example, to save water or not to waste water is the moral responsibility of every member of a society. Any law cannot punish an individual for such behavior. In the first look, it does not seem to be a big harm to the society but in the end, he is wasting a precious thing. Similarly, the behaviors like throwing plastic in public or spitting in public places is certainly not good behavior. Laws can do little to stop these behaviors. However, there are countries where there are laws to punish a person who does not behave properly in public places.

Similarly, with the invention of internet, there are more and more of cyber crimes where it is difficult to find a witness. A person can easily hide his identity, his name, sex, address on the internet. Hence, it becomes very difficult for law to punish the criminal. Although now a days, lawmakers have also found the ways to identify these persons. However, here again, moral behavior can play a role in reducing these kind of crimes.

However, we cannot underestimate the importance of laws in our life. We need laws to protect ourselves and punish those who harm the society. Law helps in balancing the society to be more harmonious and peaceful. Although moral behavior cannot be legislated, thorough enforcement of a few laws can help to solve social problems to some extent. Laws teach people many things about moral behavior and force them to follow those rules. If everyone conforms to laws, it would be very easy for everyone to get rid of social problems.

Still, there are people who find it difficult to follow the laws. Then for these types of people, there should be strict punishments. Otherwise, it will be very difficult to live in the society. Only enactment of stringent laws can protect everyone in the society from the problems caused by the non-moral behavior of a few persons.

To make our society, we have to instill good values in the society at the school and college levels. It will help to teach the students a subject related to moral behavior in their schools and colleges. This will help in reducing problems related to moral behavior.

Hence, although moral behavior cannot be legislated, laws have to be there to curb the problems arising out of immoral behavior. The society and laws have to work hand-in-hand to solve the problems of the modern society and to make our society peaceful.

**People who are the most deeply committed to an idea or policy are also the most critical of it.**

Good criticism requires thorough and deep knowledge of the subject. Most of the ideas and policies have a flip side to them, which invites criticism of the policy. People who are deeply committed to a cause or a policy are the ones who are aware of this flip side and therefore they not only become the advocates of the policy but also critics of this flip side. However, I also believe that this is not the case with all ideas and policies. There have been examples where an idea is supported fully by some people without being critical of it.

First let us discuss the writer's stand that it is those committed to a cause who are most critical of it. As I have mentioned earlier, genuine criticism is possible only with thorough knowledge of the subject. When a person is committed to a cause, he becomes basic to its functioning and policies. This not only makes him understand the cause that he supports but also exposes the disadvantages and harms of the policy as well. For example, a doctor who administers drugs to his patients to save their lives and make them healthy also knows the ill effects of their misuse by a healthy person. The doctors become the first persons to criticize the use of certain drugs by healthy people. Similarly, nuclear explosions have helped countries to gain power and technology, however, these countries have also showed their concern towards the misuse of this power. These countries are strong critics of destructive use of the nuclear power.

However, I maintain that every policy does not have a harmful side to it. For example, the supports of humanitarian efforts only devote themselves to social service and humanitarian work. They would not find anything wrong with helping the poor or needy. As we can see, Gandhi was a supporter of nonviolence and Mother Teresa stood for the cause of the destitute. They supported their cause with their heart and soul, without being critical of it.

Even if there is a critical way of looking at an idea or policy, it need not be criticized by its supporters. Take for example a company building hotels and malls in otherwise scenic and serene surroundings. An engineer who is involved in construction of buildings need not be critical of the construction of these buildings. He only devotes his sincere efforts to his work without thinking about the result of constructing the multistory buildings and its implications. Another example of this is that of anti-social elements like terrorists and revolutionaries. These people are also fully committed to their ideas. Their efforts are solely derived towards attaining their goal. This may involve causing damage to property, harming people, or even taking lives. This surely brings out that they are not critical of their activities. It comes as a sharp contrast to the stand taken by the writer according to which people committed to a cause are most critical of it.

In the end I would like to sum up by saying that I agree only partially with the writer. Without refuting his views that the supporters of an idea are the ones most critical of it, I would like to add that this can't be accepted as a general truth. While the writer can be true in many cases, there are exceptions where those who are committed to a cause only devote themselves to it completely, without being critical of it.

**Every individual in a society has a responsibility to obey just laws and to disobey and resist unjust laws.**

Laws, body of official rules and regulations, found in constitutions, legislations, judicial opinions, and the like, are used to govern a society and control the behavior of its members. Concerning laws, the author asserts that since laws are categorized as just ones and unjust ones, every individual in a society is incumbent to obey just laws and to disobey unjust laws. This view, in my eyes, is fundamentally irrational in ignoring the significance of certain constancy in legal system. To better present my viewpoint let me illustrate it in details.

To begin with, whether a law is just or not is more of a subjective issue that differs according to personal interests, social class, as well as one's personal value system. Consider, for example, the controversial issue abortion. For people of certain religious belief, laws indulge abortion are unjust since they believe mothers do not have the freedom to deprive infants of their rights of life, while for people of other religions, right of life comes into being after birth, which render abortion not an infringement of human right and should be at the pregnant woman's will. Besides diverges generated due to personal value system, different, or even opposite, personal interests may also result in divarication. For instance, certain laws may prohibit factories from emitting toxic effluents into rivers for the well-being of local residents. In the eye of common populace, doubtlessly, this law is just and considerate to ensure public interests, however, as for the manager of a factory, this law, which causes it to curtail employees, increase manufacturing costs, and adopt related costly processing procedures, may be regarded as unjust. Consequently, it is arbitrary to lineate an explicit line between these two kinds of laws, to which type a law belongs should be determined on a case-by-case basis varying with changing social conditions.

Nevertheless, in most occasions, whether a law is justified or not is definite with just ones more often than not fall into a line with interests of the majority, and hence every individual should faithfully abide by just laws. For example, highway codes in most countries require drivers to drive automobiles on the right side of the street, the goal of which is to ensure smooth transportation and to avoid unnecessary traffic accidents, and the disobey of them would inevitably result in chaos that threaten human lives. Similarly, various criminal laws, civil laws and administrative laws, on which every democratic society is based, are enacted for the security and order of the society. Without people's compliance, anarchy would reign supreme, not to mention insurance of basic human rights.

In terms of unjust laws, often resulted from ill-awareness of legislators or changing social conditions, some people, the author included, suggest that since they are not likely to be dismissed or disappear automatically, every individual should be incumbent to take up responsibility to overthrow them to build up a more harmonious, democratic and human-oriented society. Ostensibly, this assertion is appealing, however, an in-depth review would reveal its naivety and vulnerability. As a matter of fact, more often than not, by justifying a violation of one sort of law we find ourselves on a slippery slope toward sanctioning all types of illegal behavior, for the same reason that there may not be definite division between justness and unjustness. Consider the abortion example again. A person opposing freedom of abortion would overthrow the law by way of blocking roads to the abortion clinic, which, in his/her visual angle, is justifiable because he is just showing his opposition to unjust laws. However, it is a precariously short leap from this sort of civil disobedience to physical confrontations with clinic workers, then to the infliction of property damage, then to the bombing of the clinic and potential murder! Evidently, every sort of action threatening public security could find a well established excuse if every individual is allowed to disobey and resist unjust laws in their discretion.

In summary, from all the discussions above, we can safely draw the conclusion that the author's assertion is essentially unreasonable in that it naively divides just laws with unjust laws and neglects the importance of constancy of legal system to ensure a democratic and harmonious society. However, with social conditions changing at a breathtaking speed and considering the limitation of human insights of the future, laws should be flexible to keep pace with changing reality insofar as this proposition is not overextended.

**People should undertake risky action only after they have carefully considered its consequences.**

The statement claims that people should undertake risky action only after they have carefully considered its consequences. Under some circumstances, this recommendation is favorable and beneficial since careful consideration of consequences would help people steel themselves to manage any likely results. However, in some cases, people do not have enough time to think carefully. Also, cautious consideration may prevent people from doing long shots, causing them to lose great opportunities.

It goes without saying that having careful consideration before undertaking risky action is helpful to people. On the one hand, people are more likely to make right decisions after enough thinking. On the other hand, considering all anticipated consequences could assist people to prepare for any outcome. Take warfare for example. Before war, each side must consider carefully. One side must think what the other side’s action is likely to be and what consequences it might lead to. With the help of this reflection, commanders are likely to make right decisions under different consequences. Therefore, cautious consideration is helpful to people since risky action may cause serious consequences and people should have enough preparation for the sake of avoiding being at a loss what to do.

However, in some cases, there is not enough time for people to make careful consideration and thus this recommendation, though commendable, is sometimes unrealistic and infeasible. Any delay means opportunities are irredeemably lost. Take battlefield for example again. It is true that before battle each side should consider carefully its outcomes of every action. However, because the situation is changing fast and haphazardly, no one can have a thorough consideration of all consequences. In this case, when the war begins, some events occurring on a battlefield might require an army respond quickly and decisively. Otherwise, the opportunities to win the battle are likely to disappear. In addition, if the house is on fire and someone is trapped in the burning house, there is no time for a firefighter to think what consequence may be if he or she goes into the house to rescue this person simply because any delay would lead to death. Thus, in times of emergency, the statement mentioned above is unrealistic and impractical.

Moreover, careful consideration may have a negative influence on people, preventing them from doing any risky action. For instance, if people think most consequences of this action are desirable except a seriously bad one, they may become too timid to undertake this action even though the likelihood of success is great. Being afraid of doing any actions sometimes means losing a great number of opportunities.

In conclusion, in some cases, the recommendation is desirable for it can help people prepare for likely consequences. Nevertheless, sometimes, the recommendation becomes unrealistic. On the one hand, people have not enough time to consider carefully before doing something risky. On the other hand, careful consideration may prevent people from undertaking any risky action.

**Politicians should pursue common ground and reasonable consensus rather than elusive ideals.**

Politics is a rather complex issue; thus whether politicians should pursue common ground and reasonable consensus rather than elusive ideals or not depends on the specific situation. I agree that politicians should pursue common ground and reasonable consensus rather than elusive ideals when the country is in crisis, such as an invasion. However, I think elusive ideals should also be encouraged, because this can help foster citizens’ different respects and beliefs.

First of all, I agree that politicians should pursue common ground and reasonable consensus rather than elusive ideals when the country is in crisis, because in this situation, politicians should prioritise the benefit of the nation rather than elusive ideals which may potentially further divide the unity of the country. For instance, when a country is invaded by another country, in this circumstance, different political beliefs among politicians should be undermined, and instead politicians should find common ground and reasonable consensus to stand together against foreign invaders. Since the ultimate goal of all politicians should be serving the country and the wellness of the country, even though they may have different political views or elusive ideals, when the unity of the country is being threatened, it should be clear that politicians should align against invaders rather than fighting among themselves, or pursuing their own ideals. Therefore, in this specific circumstances, politicians should pursue common ground and reasonable consensus rather elusive ideals.

However, different politicians may have different beliefs, and sometimes it is common that their political views may contradict to each other. I think politicians should be encouraged to have their elusive ideals because this creates a political environment that fosters various views, and represent citizens with different thoughts. This can significantly broaden perspectives of other politicians. For instance, the United States have two major parties and other third parties as well. The third parties sometimes represents political views that deviate from these major parties, and help people express and pursue their political ideals. I think in this circumstance, it is encouraged to have elusive ideals because a domestic nation should be able to forster different political views, and it would be unnecessary to require all politicians to have common ground because people’s beliefs are diverse.

To sum up, I think the statement depends on the specific situation, I agree that when the nation is threatened by the foreign invasion, then, politicians should pursue common ground, however, during peace time, I also think politicians should have elusive ideals which can represent goals for diverse groups.

**Laws should be flexible enough to take account of various circumstances, times, and places.**

Laws are the basic principles of our day-to-day life; hence, behavior of people should not go beyond the lines confined by laws. Laws are strong weapons to maintain peace and harmony in a society. However, everyday and every situation can be different. You cannot generalize the circumstances beyond a certain limit. Same is the case with laws. You cannot apply the same law in each situation. It has to be flexible. Change and flexibility are required for growth.

In general, there are many laws. Violation of laws can have different forms. There are different laws for different situations. However, within a particular type of crime also, the situation might be different. Hence, while taking a decision, one has to take decisions keeping in mind circumstances of a particular case. For example, it has to be considered whether a person has made an offence deliberately, unintentionally, just for fun or for money.

There are many examples in history, which make you think in favor of flexibility of laws. The latest law is one child rule in China. This law was made to control population in China. According to this law in China, each couple can have only one child. Now after the earthquake, the Chinese government is thinking about revising this law. Hence, as a society is growing and developing, proper changes in laws are required. Laws have to keep pace with the changing times.

Another example of a law changing with time is the law related to the legal heir. In ancient times, only the oldest son or only the sons of the family had the right to the family property. As time has progressed and women have started asking for their rights, law has changed and now all the offspring have equal right to the family wealth. Now a days, another aspect in this context also plays a role. That is the will of the dying person. Family wealth is distributed according to the will of the dying person.

Similarly, you cannot give the same punishment to two persons who have killed some other persons for different reasons. While one person might have killed for some personal gain and the other person could have killed to save his own life. Both the situations are entirely different. There is no doubt that fixed laws help the judges in determining whether a person is guilty or not. However, it also forces people to follow laws, as they are afraid of punishments. It instills the fear in their minds that if they do some wrong, they will be punished.

Finally, it can be said that there should be a balance between the two aspects. There should be a fixed law for every crime to guide the judges and the government to install rules and regulations. It gives the feeling of security and stability. However, at the same time, there should be flexibility when it comes to applying the laws in different circumstances. There should be a scope of modifying the existing and fading laws to give way to the development of the society and justice to people.

**Governments should focus on solving the immediate problems of today rather than on trying to solve the anticipated problems of the future.**

Government is a body that governs the rules and regulations of a state in the interest of the people. It sets some targets for the common well being of all the citizens and tries to bring the less privileged at par with others. A government's main motive is to look after the needs of the people, best utilization of resources and implementation of ways for the development of the nation.

There are a few issues that every government has to deal with immediately, and some that need long term planning with foresight. It is therefore important for any government to segregate these issues to avoid chaos and to work efficiently.

If on one hand, the problem of unemployment needs immediate action, then on the other hand, the economic reforms should be made by anticipating the upcoming demands and problems. The government must try to foresee the future prospects of any project undertaken. It must be in a position to frame a tentative outline to meet the future demands, keeping in view the resources in hand. The borrowing or sharing of the latest technologies is done with an aim to have a smooth future. Since, enormous money is involved in adopting a technology and starting a project at the national level, like constructing a power plant, building a highway, importing or manufacturing aircrafts and ships, building a dam or railway line, the government cannot simply base them on the present demand and supply ratio. In fact, it should have a vision to see the future need and applications to avoid wastage of time and labor in the near future. Above all, it would be blocking the money too, if the plans and projects demand changes every now and then. For example, investing thoughtlessly in highways and good roads may need drastic changes owing to the increasing traffic. Thus, it would be wiser to anticipate the future of traffic on roads and accordingly invest in the different diversions on busy junctions, by-lanes and flyovers wherever necessary.

Challenges like illiteracy need to be taken care of immediately along with long term planning. If it is necessary to make the adults of today aware of the importance of education, then the government needs to anticipate the future and provide requisite facilities such that no one is disappointed by sending their children to educational institutions. Similarly, the law and order problems need to be tackled at times by an immediate amendment in the law. The provision of amendments in laws should be made with a futuristic approach such that the offshoots of similar situations may be handled as well.

The issues of poverty, natural calamities, terrorism, need immediate attention. If only plans for future are drafted to reduce poverty without taking care of immediate poor and malnourished, then the futuristic goals make no sense. In a similar fashion, if means are adopted to avert the situations of flood and famine without looking after the present victims of such natural disasters, then such a government is a disaster itself. The vice-versa being equally true, it is a sheer wastage of time, money and effort to wait for a disaster to occur, in order to provide relief to the victims. Thus, the government has a huge responsibility of focusing on both immediate problems of today and plan such that the anticipated problems of future are also efficiently dealt with.

**Scientists and other researchers should focus their research on areas that are likely to benefit the greatest number of people.**

Scientists and other researchers should focus their research on areas that are likely to benefit the greatest number of people. Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the recommendation and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, describe specific circumstances in which adopting the recommendation would or would not be advantageous and explain how these examples shape your position.

The statement claims that scientists should focus their research on areas that are likely to benefit the greatest number of people. Although this recommendation is well intentioned, there exist some problems in this suggestion. The answers to which areas are likely to benefit the greatest number of people may vary according to different circumstances since the world is changing every moment and the future is unpredictable to some extent.

It is true that some research may be beneficial to the greatest number of people under certain circumstances. Paying attention to these investigations is worthy and desirable. Take medicine for example. Currently, a large number of people die from cancer, AIDS or other serious diseases. Had these people been cured of these dreadful diseases, they would lead a happy life or even make great contributions to society. Apart from that, agriculture is likely to benefit most people if productivity of crops improves as plenty of people, especially those in Africa and Asia, are suffering huger for a long time. Therefore, paying attention to medicine might be advantageous to greatest number of people. And it goes without saying that this recommendation is favorable and commendatory.

Nevertheless, scientists also need to focus their research on some areas, even though these areas might not be regarded as one which are helpful to greatest number of people. It is because the future is unpredictable and thus any research may turn out to be rewarding in the long term. Take computer science for example. In the early 20th century, when the first computer appeared in the laboratory, no one could foresee that this invention would revolutionize the lives of human race dramatically. Nor could they envision that doing research on computers could make mainframes become much smaller and faster, which stimulated the emergence of personal computers helping them work more effectively and efficiently. Consider astronomy as another example. Though astronomy might not be the field which has benefited plenty of people hitherto, it is likely to become such an area as computer field because in the future, not only the earth may be overcrowded by people, but also the natural resources would run out. Until that time, the only way to solve this complication might be transferring people to another planet. Therefore, because of a little unpredictability of future, some fields would turn out to benefit most people.

In conclusion, under the current situation, focusing research on areas that are likely to benefit large numbers of people is rewarding for it would solve immediate problems. However, scientists also need to pay attention to areas that are seemingly unlikely to beneficial to most people. It is because future is unpredictable to some extent. Maybe in the near future, most people will benefit a lot from these research.

**In any situation, progress requires discussion among people who have contrasting points of view.**

It is always a good thing to have a healthy discussion wherein people have contrasting points of view. Such a discussion enables everyone participating in the discussion to address the issue from the perspective of the others. However, can you force someone else to agree to your viewpoint? On the contrary, how many times have you agreed with the viewpoint of the other person or have you ever agreed that you are wrong and that the other person is right? We as humans always try to stick to our viewpoint and rarely admit that we are wrong. Therefore, can a discussion among people with contrasting points of view proceed in the right direction? It is true that everyone will learn something new as he sees the issue from a different angle, but it would be wrong to assume that such a discussion can actually lead to progress and that this would be the best way to make progress. On the contrary, it is very rare to make progress in the right direction when the participants of a discussion do not see eye to eye with each other on the issue being discussed.

Consider the example of a committee that has been constituted to work out the modalities for the implementation of a publicity campaign. What do you expect will happen if the members of the committee have contrasting viewpoints on the method to be adopted for the publicity campaign? If the members of the committee do not agree to a common method for the launch of the publicity campaign, how can one expect the details of the campaign to be worked out? The members of the committee who are of the view that spending money on advertising in the print media is a total wastage of money will definitely oppose those who think that the print media is as important as the television media. Each member will try his best to criticize the viewpoint of the other members in a bid to defend his own viewpoint. The discussion can progress further only if all members agree on a common method and then only can the other details be worked out.

There can be no progress if the participants of the discussion stick to their viewpoints which are in stark contrast to those of the others. Such a discussion would lead to total chaos and wastage of time. The only solution lies in either forcing some of the participants to agree to the viewpoints of the others or finding a solution that both parties agree to. Isn't this always the best method to steer a discussion in a direction that will lead to progress? We have always heard of cases wherein discussions were fruitful because the participants either agreed on an issue unanimously or found a common ground where everyone agreed.

Whenever a discussion goes out of hand, the person chairing the discussion opts for carrying out voting to arrive at the solution which is agreed to by a majority of the participants. This is done because it is certain that a discussion cannot progress in the right direction if the participants have contrasting points of view.

**Claim: The best test of an argument is its ability to convince someone with an opposing viewpoint. Reason: Only by being forced to defend an idea against the doubts and contrasting views of others does one really discover the value of that idea.**

The ability to convince someone with an opposing viewpoint is sometimes a good way to test an argument, for being able to defend contrasting ideas requires both deep understanding in the defender and cogent logic in the argument itself. However, I do not think it is always the case, for there are several factors which leave a doubt in determining whether this way is the best.

First, opponents of an argument may not be hard to convince for their own personal reasons. Many times there are those who claimed to be opposed to a theory are not actually so opposed, or they are used to going from one theory to another frequently, because they do not actually have their own ideas on such and such problems. And if an argument which can simply convince people like this, people, let's say, who do not think themselves but just follow others to decide what they support and what they oppose, I do not take it as a good indicator of the value of the argument itself. In fact, in this situation, it is very likely that it's not the argument that convinces them, but the lack of thoughts among people themselves who make them give in.

Second, it is not objective enough to test an argument by seeing whether it can convince its opponents, because some opponents can even not be convinced by certain arguments at all due to some emotional reasons. For instance, it is hard for a Jew to be in agreement with a Fascist's idea, even if the idea itself has some value. Since the best way to test an argument, in my point of view, should be at least objective and equal to every argument regardless of its proposers, the way mentioned in the claim is certainly not the best in this respect.

It is true that through defending an idea, one can certainly discover the value of it better, but each argument has its own defects, and when one discovers its value one could also learn more about its defects. So I think to convince someone with an opposing viewpoint is not the best test of an argument, but is the best way to improve an argument. One who is for the argument can have a deep and insightful look at both its advantages and disadvantages, and it helps to judge and fortify the argument. In my opinion, the reason given in the prompt just digresses a little from supporting the given claim; instead, it gives us a good reason to believe why trying to defend contrasting views is important in the development and improvement of an argument.

So, even though I cannot point out what should be the best test of an argument, I do not believe that its ability to convince its opponents is a good one, for the above-mentioned factors have some influences which cannot be ignored on this so-called "test".

下降：reduce; decline; diminish; decrease; down; fallen; drop

上升：

证明：demonstrate; justify; substantiate; illustrate; exemplify; reveal; cites

因为：

所以：since; as; in view of the fact that; owing to the fact that; seeing that/as

举例：namely; that is to say; to be specific; specifically; one example is that; A great case in hand is

说: argue; imply; emphasize; assert; cites; conclude; insist; recommend; exerts;

结论：in sum; in short; to sum up; in conclusion; Ultimately,

有利于: contribute to; be conducive to; beneficial; opportune to

可能: might; likely; probably;

要求: require; demand; compel; force; oblige; recommend; advocate; endorse; advise; exhort; persuade; dissuade;

必需/重要: essential; crucial; indispensable; paramount; fundamental; elemental; inevitable; significant; consequential;

大量: a majority of; a variety of

满意: satisfy; cater to; satiate; gratify; fulfill; conform to;

对于谁来说：For; From the point of view of

尤其/特别: especially; specially; specifically; particularly;

地区/领域: area; district; regions; domain; field

不同: different; dissimilar; divergent;

相同:

即使: Even if

不合适: inappropriate; impassible；

抑制：dampen; inhibit; restrain; curb