**31. Society should make efforts to save endangered species only if the potential extinction of those species is the result of human activities.**

**Write a response in which you discuss your views on the policy and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider the possible consequences of implementing the policy and explain how these consequences shape your position.**

Whether the mentioned policy is apropos is primarily contingent on the specific conditions. In many cases, human is supposed not to interfere in the natural selection of the wildlife. Therefore, with certain qualifications, I fundamentally agree with the prompt.

Indeed, the argument needs to be revised in some respects. For instance, the green plants which perform photosynthesis would essentially help improve the environment and are likely to perpetuate most of the species living on earth. Taking into account such enormous advantages, if the plant species account for the Amazon rainforest, which is often referred to as the lung of the earth, are doomed to extinction regardless of either being caused by human activities or intensively consumed by natural animal species, we must be devoted to reviving those plant species so as to attain environmental sustainability. Otherwise, devoid of a considerable amount of oxygen produced by those plant species, the overall earth environment will deteriorate rapidly and no longer recuperate to previous conditions.

Despite the generalizations, I suggest that human ought to observe the natural rules and allow some flagging species to be eliminated. To elaborate, the particular species on the verge of extinction imply that they mostly bear genetic defect inside so that they cannot survive without intentional assistance. That is to say, those genes should not be passed from the ancestors onto the successors on account of the grand benefits of all the other species. Obviously, it is justifiable to let the nature choose to wipe out them, such as extensively eaten by more powerful species. Conversely, if we plan to rescue those nearly extinct species, it might exert an unexpectable adverse effect on the environment as a whole.

Furthermore, preserving those feeble species will in turn deplete a vast number of resources, which apparently undermines the chance for human to survive much longer. For example, human is required to establish protective region to accommodate those species, and maintaining such areas requests a copious amount of electricity and water supplies. Specifically, those fragile species demand strict temperature control and sufficient sunlight and water, or their populations are impossible to meet an acceptable standard to sustain themselves. It is glaring that such policy will exacerbate the condition of deficiency in natural resources, thus wrecking people’s basic living standard and environmental circumstances.

In sum, aside from the sweeping generalizations regarding the creatures of significant influence in the ecosystem, including plants growing in Amazon rainforest, I basically approve of the policy and contend that the most critical thing society should do is to comply with the natural law of survival and try not to disturb the original natural balance.

**44. Claim: It is no longer possible for a society to regard any living man or woman as a hero.**

**Reason: The reputation of anyone who is subjected to media scrutiny will eventually be diminished.**

**Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the claim and the reason on which that claim is based.**

Whether it is feasible to consider any of individuals living in current society a hero/heroine primarily depends on specific conditions. In many cases, the author’s claim is justifiable according to the widespread belief that people are mostly self-interested and have defects in their characteristics. Therefore, with some qualifications, I fundamentally agree with the claim.

Indeed, this claim needs to be revised in some respects. The term of “hero/heroine” is not clearly defined in the claim and how to fairly judge a person is a disputable issue. Suppose we regard person who achieves an outstanding accomplishment as a hero who the whole society should venerate/revere, we cannot readily rule out the possibility of hero existing. Specifically, the man who starts up TSMC in our country perfectly exemplifies/personifies/embodies/epitomizes such interpretation. Owing to his prominent success, our country overwhelmingly dominates the nanochip market throughout the world, making our country easily stand out. Not only does this achievement bring an inestimable profit into our country, but it attracts numerous people with talent to our country as well, essentially enhancing our economic strength. Accordingly, in such case, we are inclined to respect this man who establish this corporation solitarily.

Despite the generalizations, with a more scrupulous examination of a person in order to determine if he/she is qualified for being a hero/heroine, there is little chance to discover such a person. As is known, most celebrities and government officials are reported to be involved in scandals when meticulously scrutinized by social media even though they exert enormous effects on our society. If we define the term of “hero/heroine” as a person of flawless trait, they are apparently excluded from the list, supporting the author’s claim.

Furthermore, people can hardly refrain from doing something unacceptable or erroneous once they acquire either renowned reputation or powerful authority. For example, some eminent basketball players are often seen in the coverage of news for their disloyalty to their own families. This is mainly because as they become more celebrated, more lure in society faces them and each of them, in general, fails to resist the urge to indulge oneself. Additionally, while the masses are more intrigued by such notorious fame for the public/social figures, the social media will make efforts to disclose their private lives and, in most cases, their behavior renders themselves failing to be perceived as a hero/heroine in spite of their career achievement.

In sum, aside from the sweeping generalizations regarding a looser definition of the term of “hero/heroine”, I basically approve of the claim and the reason on which that claim is based as well.

**43. The increasingly rapid pace of life today causes more problems than it solves.**

**Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider the ways in which the statement might or might not hold true and explain how these considerations shape your position.**

Nowadays, in the wake of technological advancement, the masses live in a society with tremendously increasing pace; thus, the issue of whether this trend leads to more problems than it solves has been put forward. In my opinion, however, I basically disagree with the author’s argument with some qualifications.

Admittedly, the statement’s position might hold up in some respects. As we all know, the environmental problems have arisen recently and grow to the extent that all of us cannot overlook/dismiss/discount it. That is, most people attribute such deterioration to the progress in society and contend that the whole society should slow down the pace and prioritize the environmental problems over the human benefits. For instance, the extensive industrialization has resulted in contamination of the sea due to the deleterious/pernicious/noxious substances discharged from the widespread plants. Moreover, the air pollution is another grave crisis that the human beings are primarily responsible for since people constantly chop the trees for industrial purposes and owing to considerable amount of waste gas released by private cars and factories. Accordingly, taking account of problems mentioned above, the argument seems persuasive.

Nevertheless, to oppose the disadvantages brought by human activities today, we should consider the outstanding technology human beings have created. Without the major breakthroughs in technology, we may not imagine that it only takes about half a day to travel from Asia countries to America. Furthermore, even though we have no spare time spent on such traveling, we still can communicate with our foreign friends through phone calls or even see them personally by video calls, all thanking to the development of telecommunications. Obviously, the convenience resulting from the rapid pace toward improvement cannot be excluded when evaluating the issue mentioned by the author.

Finally, although the environmental problems still exist and significantly relate to our daily life, the technology essentially assists in tackling those problems. For example, the effort made to research into the renewable energy, including solar and wind power, gradually have inspiring/encouraging outcome. Precisely, the conversion rate of these forms of energy has been elevated so immensely that they even can supplant the thermal power plants, which is one of main sources of air and environmental pollution. In turn, it is expected to reduce an enormous amount of waste being produced. Additionally, the cars driven by electricity become prevalent recently and the scientists’ face pace is undoubtedly the critical factor in contributing to such forward movement.

In sum, despite some rising environmental problems, people in attempt to improve our society yet seemingly overshadow those problems. Therefore, I fundamentally disapprove of the author’s statement and believe that human beings will successfully overcome those unpleasant situations in the foreseeable future.

**82. Colleges and universities should require their students to spend at least one semester studying in a foreign country.**

**Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the recommendation and explain your reasoning for your position you take. In developing and supporting your position, describe specific circumstances in which adopting recommendation would or would not be advantageous and explain how these examples shape your position.**

Over the past few decades, the tertiary education has drawn the public’s attention due to its powerful influence in students’ development and future career; accordingly, the universities’ policies generally arouse vigorous debate, one of which is whether the colleges should require their students to spend at least one semester studying in a foreign country. In many cases, this recommendation is advantageous to college students. Therefore, with some qualifications, I basically agree with this proposition.

Admittedly, this recommendation needs to be revised in some respects. As is known, studying in foreign countries constantly charges students a considerable amount of tuition fees, which might place an enormous burden on them. If students’ families are penurious, they can hardly afford to send students to study abroad. Under such circumstances, if the colleges still implement the mentioned policy, students from impoverished background would have to take part-time jobs during the semester, tremendously impairing their learning efficiency. To put it differently, this recommendation adversely impedes students’ development and does not bring benefits as expected. Consequently, this recommendation can be adopted only when most students possess fair means to cover tuition, or when the universities are willing to fund students born in impecunious families.

Despite the generalizations, compelling students to study in foreign countries essentially benefits them. Precisely, this policy can promote independence in students. To be more specific, when students plan to study abroad, they must arrange the accommodation on their own in the country they are intended for. Moreover, once they arrived there, they are also required to prepare their daily meals on account of the restaurants there they scarcely can afford. Living in foreign countries they are not familiar with causes copious problems as well given that they have to rebuild social network and can no longer turn to their parents for assistance. Apparently, during the process of studying abroad, students can become far more independent.

Furthermore, students can broaden their vision/horizon through temporarily living in a foreign country. In other words, suppose the universities plan to carry out the policy, the students then ought to research into the countries they are aimed at. As a result, they will discover distinctive cultural customs and appreciate that they have been always confined to their home country culture during their previous stage. Additionally, when studying in the foreign countries, students will be enriched through experiencing utterly disparate social etiquette that they had little chance to undergo before. More importantly, students can acquire discrete education and learn more from foreign classes: some foreign education, for instance, attaches importance to interaction between teachers and students whereas others lay emphasis on fundamental academic knowledge. Obviously, students who have the opportunities to study abroad can be receptive to multifarious points of view in comparison with those who do not.

In sum, aside from the sweeping generalizations concerning the students who fail to defray the expenditure on studying abroad, I fundamentally approve of the argument and believe that students mostly can benefit from such recommendation since they will become self-dependent as well as receive diversified opinions.