The author of this issue reveals an interesting dilemma in which people claim to struggle with passionate commitment to and simultaneous discontent with an idea or policy. While those appear mutually exclusive, life and history are replete with such examples. Einstein, celebrated for his atomic theories, engaged wholeheartedly in the science field of study and with it, assisted the Allies to conquer the Nazis in the World War Two. Nevertheless, he became a fierce opponent of utilizing nuclear weapons later in life after realizing their insidious danger.

While commitment to an idea may trigger the very awareness of its faults, and that awareness might ultimately lead one to deviate from allegiance, I argue that this is not necessarily the case in most circumstances.

To begin with, not everything is complex or ambiguous enough to provoke both commitment and criticism. That is to say, our view of an idea or policy is, in many cases, plain and simple: we are either highly enthusiastic about it or deeply critical of it. For supporting examples, a myriad of discoveries come to mind which have already been proven true and remain so for a relatively long period of time. People would therefore have utter trust in such facts. For example, educated people nowadays do not dispute the fact that the Earth is round, nor would anyone deny the relationship between the Moon and the ocean waves. These things are sufficiently supported by scrupulous scientific evidence and will therefore provoke little criticism.

Moreover, I disagree with the assumption that someone who is committed to an idea could later become most critical of it. In many cases, once a person becomes faithful to an idea, he or she would ignore any voices that dispute it. This can be demonstrated by fanatically religious cults which are blind to criticism. In addition, even when people are aware of the disadvantages of an idea or policy, it is highly unlikely that those shortcomings would outweigh its advantages so people would remain loyal to it. Roosevelt's New Deal policy, among various examples, can greatly support my argument. While Roosevelt had a thorough understanding of what detrimental influence, which derives from government regulation, could be brought about upon capitalists and market economy, he adhered to such a policy, which later contributed to revitalization of American economy from the Great Depression. The very reason why he did so is that he was well aware that the potential desirable consequences resulting from the policy would ultimately outshine the undesirable ones.

Even if people understand both the advantages and disadvantages of an idea or policy, and even if the latter outweigh the former, we cannot conclude that they will become critical of it. People's behaviors are determined by a variety of factors. Of those factors, the potential profit resulting from a policy plays a paramount role. Consider factories which produce an exorbitant amount of waste every year which seriously jeopardizes the natural environment. Do the employees in this factory have no idea how detrimental this waste is? Perhaps. Are the factory owners unaware of the deleterious consequences that may be invited? I highly doubt that. The owners have much better knowledge than anyone else of the potential threat of the waste, but this in no way hinders their behavior, but on the contrary, galvanizes it. The reasons for this are the benefits that can be gained by such behavior. These owners are exactly the ones who are most committed to their policy while no at all critical of it.

To sum up, while it is interesting to assert that the contradictory attitudes may occur simultaneously, I believe that in most cases, an idea or policy are not ambiguous or complex enough to provoke an ambivalent position. Even if it is, other factors may sway our position as well, such as the information we possess regarding the policy, as well as the possible profits we may obtain from it.