



ISSUE 范文精析

路莎



2021-4-21

Issue 70

Claim: Governments must ensure that their major cities receive the financial support they need in order to thrive.

Reason: It is primarily in cities that a nation's cultural traditions are preserved and generated.

The speaker's claim is actually threefold: ensuring the survival of large cities and, in turn, that of cultural traditions, is a proper function of government; government support is needed for our large cities and cultural traditions to survive and thrive. I strongly disagree with all three claims.

First of all, subsidizing cultural traditions is not a proper role of government. **Admittedly**, certain objectives, such as public health and safety, are so essential to the survival of large cities and of nations that government has a duty to ensure that they are met. **However**, these objectives should not **extend tenuously to preserving** cultural traditions. Moreover, government cannot possibly play an evenhanded role as cultural patron. Inadequate resources call for restrictions, priorities, and choices. It is unconscionable to relegate normative decisions as to which cities or cultural traditions are more deserving, valuable, or needy to a few legislators, whose notions about culture might be misguided or unrepresentative of those of the general populace. Also, legislators are all too likely to make choices in favor of the cultural agendas of their home towns and states, or of lobbyists with the most money and influence.

Secondly, subsidizing cultural traditions is not a necessary role of government. A lack of private funding might justify an exception. However, culture--by which I chiefly mean the fine arts--has always depended primarily on the patronage of private individuals and businesses, and not on the government. The Medic, powerful banking family of Renaissance Italy, supported artists Michelangelo and Raphael. During the 20th Century the primary source of cultural support were private foundations established by industrial magnates Carnegie, Mellon, Rockefeller and Getty. And **tomorrow cultural support** will come from our new technology and media **moguls**-- including the likes of Ted Turner and Bill Gates. In short, philanthropy is alive and well today, and so government need not intervene to ensure that

Claim 是这道题目的重点，
决定了我们的态度
公式是 N 对 M 有影响
N 是 financial support
M 是 thrive

1. 这个开头比较特别，考生对题目进行了三个角度的分析，我们一般不做这样的要求
2. 这两句话的逻辑衔接的很好
3. Extend A to doing B 引申到做 B
4. 本段逻辑：制定保护什么文化不是政府的责任，同时这样做也不公平
5. 同时，政府也不需要这么做；因为有个人资本的介入
6. 未来的文化支持
7. Mogul; 重要人物

our cultural traditions are preserved and promoted.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the speaker unfairly suggests that large cities serve as the primary breeding ground and sanctuaries for a nation's cultural traditions. Today a nation's distinct cultural traditions--its folk art, crafts, traditional songs, customs and ceremonies--burgeon instead in small towns and rural regions. Admittedly, our cities do serve as our centers for "high art"; big cities are where we deposit, display, and boast the world's preeminent art, architecture, and music. But big-city culture has little to do any- more with one nation's distinct cultural traditions. After all, modern cities are essentially multicultural stew pots; accordingly, by assisting large cities a government is actually helping to create a global culture as well to subsidize the cultural support were private foundations established by industrial magnates Carnegie, Mellon, Rockefeller and Getty. And tomorrow cultural support will come from our new traditions of other nations' cultures.

In the final analysis, government cannot philosophically justify assisting large cities for the purpose of either promoting or preserving the nation's cultural traditions; nor is government assistance necessary toward these ends. Moreover, assisting large cities would have little bearing on our distinct cultural traditions, which abide elsewhere.

8. 大城市也不是保护文化最好的地方

9. 个概念很重要，文化分成了大城市文化和一个国家独特的文化；这种分类很细腻，大家膜拜一下就好，模仿难度很大

10. 内容的重复需要避免

11. 通过政府做的不好，没有必要和文化的分类考生很好的支持了自己的观点。

Issue 24

Governments should not fund any scientific research whose consequences are unclear.

I agree with the speaker's broad assertion that money spent on research is generally money well invested. However, the speaker unnecessarily extends this broad assertion to embrace research whose results are "controversial," while ignoring certain compelling reasons why some types of research might be unjustifiable.

My points of contention with the speaker involves the fundamental objectives and nature of research, as discussed below. I concede that the speaker is on the correct philosophical side of this issue. After all, research is the exploration of the unknown for true answers to our questions, and for lasting solutions to our enduring problems. Research is also the chief means by which we humans attempt to satisfy our insatiable appetite for knowledge, and our craving to understand ourselves and the world around us. Yet, in the very notion of research also lies my first point of contention with the speaker, who illogically presumes that we can know the results of research before we invest in it. To the contrary, if research is to be of any value it must explore uncharted and unpredictable territory. In fact, query whether research whose benefits are immediate and predictable can break any new ground, or whether it can be considered "research" at all.

While we must invest in research irrespective of whether the results might be controversial, at the same time we should be circumspect about research whose objectives are too vague and whose potential benefits are too speculative. After all, expensive research always carries significant opportunity costs--in terms of how the money might be spent toward addressing society's more immediate problems that do not require research. One apt illustration of this point involves the so-called "Star Wars" defense initiative, championed by the Reagan administration during the 1980s. In retrospect, this initiative was ill-conceived and largely a waste of taxpayer dollars; and few would dispute that the exorbitant amount of money devoted to the initiative could have gone a long way toward addressing pressing social problems of the day--by establishing after-school programs for

匹配公式; N 应该做某事, 讨论影响

1. Introduction 的主要任务之一就是表明自己的观点; 这篇文章整体是不同意, 所以这个 agree 会起到误导作用, 因此大家在写文章的时候, 不要出现多个观点, 在开头段不要出现让步的内容
2. 这句话是这段的只要内容, 言外之意, 如果想要让研究发挥作用, 就要接受它的不可预测性; 这个内容写到中心句会更完美
3. 不管不顾
4. 这个是段让步
5. 机会成本
6. 考生这里的解释太好啦, 机会成本在这里就是钱可以花到解决眼前的社会问题, 而这些问题是不需要做研究的
7. Championed by 被……支持的

delinquent latchkey kids, by enhancing AIDS awareness and education, and so forth. As it turns out, at the end of the Star Wars debacle we were left with rampant gang violence, an AIDS epidemic, and an unprecedented federal budget deficit.

The speaker's assertion is troubling in two other aspects as well. First, no amount of research can completely solve the enduring problem of war, poverty, and violence, for the reason that they stem from certain aspects of human nature--such as aggression and greed. Although human genome research might eventually enable us to engineer away those undesirable aspects of our nature, in the meantime it is up to our economists, diplomats, social reformers, and jurists--not our research laboratories--to mitigate these problems. Secondly, for every new research breakthrough that helps reduce human suffering is another that serves primarily to add to that suffering. For example, while some might argue that physics researchers who harnessed the power of the atom have provided us with an alternative source of energy and invaluable "peace-keepers," this argument flies in the face of the hundreds of thousands of innocent people murdered and maimed by atomic blasts, and by nuclear meltdowns. And, in fulfilling the promise of "better living through chemistry" research has given us chemical weapons for human slaughter. In short, so-called "advances" that scientific research has brought about often amount to net losses for humanity.

In sum, the speaker's assertion that we should invest in research whose results are "controversial" begs the question, because we cannot know whether research will turn out controversial until we've invested in it. As for the speaker's broader assertion, I agree that money spent on research is generally a sound investment because it is an investment in the advancement of human knowledge and in human imagination and spirit. Nevertheless, when we do research purely for its own sake without aim or clear purpose--we risk squandering resources which could have been applied to relieve the immediate suffering of our dispirited, disadvantaged, and disenfranchised members of society. In the final analysis, given finite economic resources we are forced to strike a balance in how we allocate those resources

8. 这段考生的态度又回到了不同意；莎莎老师建议大家我们写把2段态度统一的段落写完，不要在中间插入让步段
9. 这段话真心长，赞叹这位考生的积累，他认为研究还具有以下特点：研究的结果不明确可能是人性有关，也和人们的使用相关；换言之，这个结果本身就是不明确的
10. 研究结果本来就是不可测的，或者是出乎意料的
11. 整体是“质疑”的态度
12. 核心原因；不试试怎么知道结果？

Issue 29

The greatness of individuals can be decided only by those who live after them, not by their contemporaries.

Can a person's greatness be recognized only in retrospect, by those who live after the person, as the speaker maintains?

In my view the speaker unfairly generalizes.

In some areas, especially the arts, greatness is often recognizable in its nascent stages. However, in other areas, particularly the physical sciences, greatness must be tested over time before it can be confirmed. In still other areas, such as business, the incubation period for greatness varies from case to case. We do not require a rear-view mirror to recognize artistic greatness--whether in music, visual arts, or literature. The reason for this is simple: art can be judged at face value. There's nothing to be later proved or disproved, affirmed or discredited, or even improved upon or refined by further knowledge or newer technology. History is replete with examples of artistic greatness immediately recognized, then later confirmed. Through his patronage, the Pope recognized Michelangelo's artistic greatness, while the monarchs of Europe immediately recognized Mozart's greatness by granting him their most generous commissions. Mark Twain became a best-selling author and household name even during his lifetime. And the leaders of the modernist school of architecture marveled even as Frank Lloyd Wright was elevating their notions about architecture to new aesthetic heights.

By contrast, in the sciences it is difficult to identify greatness without the benefit of historical perspective. Any scientific theory might be disproved tomorrow, thereby demoting the theorist's contribution to the status of historical footnote. Or the theory might withstand centuries of rigorous scientific scrutiny. In any event, a theory may or may not serve as a springboard for later advances in theoretical science. A current example involves the ultimate significance of two opposing theories of physics: wave theory and quantum theory. Some theorists now claim that a new so-called "string" theory reconciles the two opposing theories--at least mathematically. Yet "strings" have yet to be confirmed empirically. Only time will tell whether string theory indeed provides the unifying laws that all matter in the universe

匹配公式; N 对 M 有影响

1. Unfairly 直接体现态度
2. In some areas 体现典型的领域拆分
3. 前面列举的不同的情况, 但就篇幅来讲, 这段核心是艺术领域—艺术领域的成就是可以得到很快的认可的
4. 这个表达非常好, 在科学领域, 我们必须观察一段时间才可以, 所以只能是后世人才认可
5. 经过几百年的验证—妥妥后世了呀
6. 有可能不是跳板, 所以就不“伟大了”
7. 只能靠时间啦, 所以是长期

obeys. In short, the significance of contributions made by theoretical scientists cannot be judged by their contemporaries--only by scientists who follow them.

In the realm of business, in some cases great achievement is recognizable immediately, while in other cases it is not. Consider on the one hand Henry Ford's assembly-line approach to manufacturing affordable cars for the masses. Even Ford could not have predicted the impact his innovations would have on the American economy and on the modern world. On the other hand, by any measure, Microsoft's Bill Gates has made an even greater contribution than Ford; after all, Gates is largely responsible for lifting American technology out of the doldrums during the 1970s to restore America to the status of economic powerhouse and technological leader of the world. And this contribution is readily recognizable now--as it is happening. Of course, the DOS and Windows operating systems, and even Gates' monopoly, might eventually become historical relics. Yet his greatness is already secured.

In sum, the speaker overlooks many great individuals, particularly in the arts and in business, whose achievements were broadly recognized as great even during their own time. Nevertheless, other great achievements, especially scientific ones, cannot be confirmed as such without the benefit of historical perspective.

8. 再来一个领域，这篇文章核心段落的结构非常整齐，值得大家学习
9. 有些可以，有些不可以获得短期的认可；虽然可以这么说，但莎莎老师更倾向整体是可以还是不可以；因为这样我们的逻辑会更清晰，语言表述难度更小
10. 考生丰富的积累允许他进行例子之间的对比，我们举一个例子就可以了
11. 再次重申态度，整体不同意

Issue 41

If a goal is worthy, then any means taken to attain it are justifiable.

The speaker asserts that if a goal is worthy then any means of attaining that goal is justifiable. **In my view this extreme position misses the point entirely.** Whether certain means are justifiable in reaching a goal must be determined on a case-by-case basis, **by weighing the benefits of attaining the goal against the costs, or harm,** that might accrue along the way. This applies equally to **individual goals and to societal goals.**

Consider the goal of completing a marathon running race. If I need to reduce my working hours to train for the race, thereby jeopardizing my job, or if I run a high risk of incurring a permanent injury by training enough to prepare adequately for the event, then perhaps my goal is not worth attaining. Yet if I am a physically challenged person with the goal of completing a highly-publicized marathon, risking financial hardship or long-term injury might be worthwhile, not only for my own personal satisfaction but also for the inspiration that attaining the goal would provide many others. Or consider the goal of providing basic food and shelter for an innocent child. **Anyone would agree that this goal is highly worthy--considered apart from the means used to achieve it. But what if those means involve stealing from others?** Or what if they involve employing the child in a sweatshop at the expense of educating the child? Clearly, determining the worthiness of such goals requires that we confront moral dilemmas, which we each solve individually—based on our own conscience, value system, and notions of fairness and equity. **On a societal level we determine the worthiness of our goals in much the same way**—by weighing competing interests. For instance, any thoughtful person would agree that reducing air and water pollution is a worthy societal goal; clean air and water reduce the burden on our health-care resources and improves the quality of life for everyone in society. Yet to attain this goal would we be justified in forcing entire industries out of business, thereby running the risk of economic paralysis and widespread unemployment?

Or consider America's intervention in Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Did our dual interest in a continuing flow of oil to the

匹配公式; N 应该做某事,
讨论影响

1. 观点的表明非常清晰
2. 权衡利弊
3. 分两个维度讨论影响
4. 对应 personal goal, 但是中心句最好不要提及一个具体的例子; 可以显进行 2-3 句话的理论论述
5. 这个例子很好: 目标是好的, 但是手段不对
6. 这里我们最好分段; 讨论的内容已经不一样的, 可以通过中心句进行区分
7. 这种例子我们就不要举了

West and in deterring a potential threat against the security of the world justify our committing resources that could have been used instead for domestic social-welfare programs-- or a myriad of other productive purposes? Both issues **underscore** the fact that the worthiness of a societal goal cannot be considered apart from the means and adverse consequences of attaining that goal.

In sum, the speaker begs the question. The worthiness of any goal, whether it be personal or societal, can be determined only **by weighing the benefits of achieving the goal against its costs**--to us as well as others.

8. 证明了一个事实

9. 做事要经过认真思考，
权衡利弊；所以题目观点不对

Issue 45

The main benefit of the study of history is to dispel the illusion that people living now are significantly different from people who lived in earlier times.

I concede that basic human nature has not changed over recorded history, and that coming to appreciate this fact by studying history can be beneficial in how we live as a society. However, I disagree with the statement in two respects. First, in other ways there are marked differences between people of different time periods, and learning about those differences can be just as beneficial. Second, studying history carries other equally important benefits as well.

I agree with the statement insofar as through the earnest study of human history we learn that basic human nature---our desires and motives, as well as our fears and foibles---has remained constant over recorded time. And through this realization we can benefit as a society in dealing more effectively with our enduring social problems. History teaches us, for example, that it is a mistake to attempt to legislate morality, because humans by nature resist having their moral choices forced upon them. History also teaches us that our major social ills are here to stay, because they spring from human nature. For instance, crime and violence have troubled almost every society; all manner of reform, prevention, and punishment have been tried with only partial success. Today, the trend appears to be away from reform toward a "tough-on-crime" approach, to no avail.

However beneficial it might be to appreciate the unchanging nature of humankind, it is equally beneficial to understand and appreciate significant differences between peoples of different time periods---in terms of cultural mores, customs, values, and ideals. For example, the ways in which societies have treated women, ethnic minorities, animals, and the environment have evolved over the course of human history. Society's attitudes toward artistic expression, literature, and scientific and intellectual inquiry are also in a continual state of evolution. And, perhaps the most significant sort of cultural evolution involves spiritual beliefs, which have always spun themselves out, albeit uneasily, through clashes between established traditions and more enlightened viewpoints. A heightened awareness of all these

匹配公式; N 对 M 有影响

1. 提出让步的内容
2. 表明整体的观点—不同意
3. 很多北美范文都是先写让步内容，但是莎莎老师比较推荐最后写让步的内容，这样更有助于我们梳理自己的写作逻辑
4. 这段里面虽然有 history，但是并没有直接提及和人们的关系，我们可以说的更明白一点
5. 提出人们之间的不同，In terms of 就……而言，这个词组可以积累一下
6. 剩下部分都是谈及不同，但是问题是没有和 history 有什么关系

aspects of cultural evolution help us formulate informed, reflective, and enlightened values and ideals for ourselves; and our society dearly benefits as a result.

Another problem with the statement is that it undervalues other, equally important benefits of studying history. Learning about the courage and tenacity of history's great explorers, leaders, and other achievers inspires us to similar accomplishments, or at least to face own fears as we travel through life. Learning about the mistakes of past societies helps us avoid repeating them. For instance, the world is slowly coming to learn by studying history that political states whose authority stems from suppression of individual freedoms invariably fall of their own oppressive weight. And, learning about one's cultural heritage, or roots, fosters a healthy sense of self and cultivates an interest in preserving art, literature, and other cultural artifacts--all of which serve to enrich society.

To sum up, history informs us that basic human nature has not changed, and this history lesson can help us understand and be more tolerant of one another, as well as develop compassionate responses to the problems and failings of others. Yet, history has other lessons to offer us as well. It helps us formulate informed values and ideals for ourselves, inspires us to great achievements, points out mistakes to avoid, and helps us appreciate our cultural heritage.

7. 这段从另一维度否定了
题目：学习历史的好处
还会有别的

8. Tenacity 韧性

9. 这个可以换个更具体的
例子，比如我们从华盛顿
的个人经历中可以学习到什么

10. 重申让步的内容，人性
是不变的

11. 重申自己的观点

12. 为了避免不必要的麻烦，
建议大家可以优先总结
自己的观点，让步的内
容一笔带过就可以了