**“A nation should require all its students to study the same national curriculum until they enter college rather than allow schools in different parts of the nation to determine which academic courses to offer.”**

People in most countries have to receive basic(**compulsory**) education. Accordingly, whether to provide the same national curriculum for students has become a debatable issue. Personally speaking, I think a nation should not require all of its students to study the same curriculum but require most of them to do so.

First, students care about their college education, and requiring them to study the same courses is beneficial to their further studies. For example, in Asia, more than 90% of high school students are required to study basic curriculum, such as Literature, Math, Physics, and so forth. By doing so, students would possess basic comprehension **of** several fields of academics. Moreover, when they enter colleges, they can apply such essential knowledge to understand advanced topics. In detail, once students have learned Math in high schools, they will be able to study Calculus and Linear Algebra in their colleges. Apparently, requiring students to study the same curriculum is beneficial to **higher education**.

Second, our nations should take care of the cost of education, and requiring all students to study the same subjects can significantly reduce the cost. For instance, in Taiwan, hiring a general Math or Chemistry teacher only cost**s** 25-30 US dollars an hour. Yet, inviting an Art or Music teacher for teaching costs up to 50-100 US dollars an hour. In this case, we can see that if students are taught the same basic subjects, like Math or Chemistry, schools can save a large amount of budget. Furthermore, schools can utilize the budget saved to build teaching buildings or research centers. In this way, the quality of education is brought to a high level. Obviously, not only **does** providing the same curriculum reduce the cost of education, but it also improves the whole education.

Undoubtedly, giving students the same curriculum has some disadvantages. Those who advocate this idea might maintain that some students, even accounting for a small percentage of all students, have special talents that school should emphasize and help them cultivate. Take Art and Music for instance. Such talents are supposed to be exploited as early as possible. However, most **~~of~~** schools have no capacity to provide students **with** such a suitable environment to facilitate their special abilities. Suppose a school spends a fair amount of money to hire masters of Art or Music for teaching a minority of students, this measure may suppress educational resources for universal students. Therefore, I believe that nations should set up special schools for students who have **remarkable/outstanding gifts**, so that the above-mentioned problem can be solved perfectly.

In conclusion, a nation should not require "all" students to study the same curriculum. Instead, it should require most students to do so, and provide those who have special talents with **particularly reserved** resources.