

To what extent do you think governments should be held responsible when problems of homelessness and unemployment arise?

Countries where social welfare schemes are properly implemented by the governments don't have high levels of homelessness or unemployment. In fact when a country has a large number of homeless and unemployed people, it is a clear indication that something is wrong with the way it is governed. But can governments be held completely responsible for loss of jobs and homes? Let's examine.

Both internal and external factors can have a significant effect on a nation's economy. A good government should be able to control the internal conflicts that might be causing joblessness and homelessness. However, no government in the world can effectively control external affairs. For example, a lot of people lost jobs due to the economic crisis in 2008. Although recession was mainly in the US, its effect was felt all over the globe. In fact, the US recession caused job loss in countries like India and China. It affected India's booming outsourcing industry. And because it was an external factor, the governments in India or China couldn't do anything to ease its ramifications.

Nonetheless, there are many things that governments can do to reduce the severity of these problems and protect their citizens. Most governments have enough money in their coffers to ensure basic amenities like food and shelter. Governments collect taxes from the wealthy people. If this money is effectively used it will significantly improve the living standards of the poorer sections of the society. If a government fails to do it, it is either apathetic or inefficient.

In India, for example, the government has launched several schemes to provide housing and employment to people. Although the country still faces these problems, the situation has considerably improved in recent years. This is a clear indication that political willpower and proper governance can improve the economic status of a country and its people.

After analyzing the situation, it is difficult to arrive at the conclusion that governments can be held completely responsible for problems like job loss and unemployment. Of course, the governments have a role to play in easing these problems, but factors outside the control of a government too can upset a nation's financial status.

Governments should spend more money on education than on recreation and sports. Do you agree or disagree?

It is argued that countries should allocate more funds to education than to leisure and competitive games. It is agreed that national budgets should prioritise schools and universities over sports and play. This essay will discuss firstly, the economic benefits education can bring to a nation and secondly, the social benefits it has; followed by a reasoned conclusion.

Investment in its education system is one of the best ways to improve a country's economy in the long term. The more students entering third level education, the more skilled a workforce will be and this leads to higher innovation and productivity. For example, South Korea and Finland took the decision to invest a large proportion of their budget in education and this has reaped benefits in the form of high-tech companies such as Samsung and Nokia. However, people cannot work hard all the time and these companies do provide leisure facilities for their workers.

Education is not just about improving the economy it also has many social benefits. Well educated people tend to be more aware of social evils such as drugs, alcohol and sexual health. For example, Singapore educates all of its citizens on the dangers of drugs and this has resulted in one of the lowest levels of drug abuse in the world. Despite this, sports can

also teach children valuable soft skills, such as teamwork and work ethic which also help curb social ills.

In conclusion, education should take precedence over sports when it comes to funding due to the many socio-economic benefits it brings. It is recommended that governments continue to pump money into schools and universities in order to realise long-term goals.

Some governments say how many children a family can have in their country. They may control the number of children someone has through taxes. It is sometimes necessary and right for a government to control the population in this way. Do you agree or disagree?

In many countries, the government has the authority to decide how many children its people can have. Some governments try to control the population by imposing taxes on people who have more children than is permitted. In my opinion, in order to control the population growth, the government should have the legal authority to determine the size of families. In this essay, we will first examine how the problem of overpopulation can be controlled through such measures and also how proper check on population can lead to an increase in the economic growth of a nation.

The world is witnessing the negative effects of overpopulation like crime, illiteracy and pollution in many countries. With the implementation of taxes, people will understand the benefits of having a small family and this will in a way make them plan for a baby well in advance. For example, China follows a two child policy and citizens violating the law often have to pay hefty fine or face other types of punishment. Such stringent laws have enabled them to control their population growth and now China is developing rapidly.

If a state authority is able to control the birth rate by imposing higher taxes or fines on violators, they will definitely observe an elevation in the economic and social growth of their

country. People will have a healthy standard of living. Children will grow up to be more disciplined as well as responsible citizens of their country. Thus it is evident that this measure will boost the economic growth of the country. For example, according to a survey conducted by a UK university, families having one or two kids are the happiest.

In conclusion, the government should have the legal authority to reduce the size of families by imposing fines or other types of punishment on people who have more children than is permitted. While this might seem to be a violation of the rights of citizens, in the long run it will benefit everyone by helping the economy grow. Thus, in my opinion, such measures are justified.

Sample Answer 2

Controlling the burgeoning human population is the need of the hour. The global population is expected to cross 11.2 billion by the end of the 21st century and but according to statistics the earth cannot sustain more than 10 billion people. That means there is an urgent need to control the population growth. Some governments have already set a limit to the number of children a family can have and those who violate this rule are required to pay tax on the extra children. In my opinion, this is a viable measure that governments all over the world can implement.

To start with, imposing a tax on children who exceed the permitted number will send the right message to people. It will force lower and middle class families to limit the number of children they have. Affluent parents will also be influenced by this move because they will not want to expend their money in taxes for more children. The government can use the money thus collected for public welfare schemes.

Levying a tax on every second or third child will also indirectly make people realize the burden of population on the society. Parents will realize that every additional child destabilizes their

financial security and hurts the economy of the nation. What's more, this way of controlling the population sounds less harsh. Measures such as population awareness campaigns, celebrity endorsement and education programmes in schools are rather soft and ineffective. On the other hand, stringent steps such as forcible sterilization and a strict one child policy may outrage the citizens.

In summary, I believe that imposing taxes on children who exceed the permitted limit is an effective and rightful measure to control the population growth. It will convey the message that a family can have additional children only at their own expense.

Although abuse of the system is inevitable, social welfare payments are essential to protect the rights of citizens to have a granted minimum income in a demarcated society. How far do you agree?

Social welfare payments are a tool of resource allocation and redistribution in an unequal society. Given that society is rife with unequal talents and opportunities, inequality is bound to rise. Even the most successful people have utilized social resources for their own benefits. Hence it is justifiable that state appropriates and redistributes some of the wealth to provide a more meaningful existence to underprivileged and weaker section of the society.

It is fallacious to say that corruption has to be eradicated before any redistribution can take place. This will lead to chasing a mirage at the cost of basic human rights of most vulnerable section. On the contrary, welfare payments and improving efficient of distribution should go hand in hand. A mind free from having to worry about satisfying basic wants such as hunger, shelter, education, etc. can, in turn, aspire to strive for fuller development of its potential. Basic Human dignity demands that a society is not witness to the spectre of abundance and misery cohabitating in a cruel irony. The first motto of any state should be to see that no one goes to sleep on hungry stomach with naked body and shelter less.

Apart from the altruistic intention of social welfare payments, it has a utilitarian perspective too. A mind freed from basic wants can work for fuller development of its personality and then can contribute to the development of the society as a whole. Also, a more equal, harmonized society will see lesser instability, conflict and chaos. This will benefit the poor, the rich and the society as a whole.

Surmise it to say that the end of any state system should be protection of human dignity and rights. State should allow for wealth generation to incentivize development of full human potential. It should redistribute some of the wealth to weaker section to ameliorate wants and misery

Total Words – 311

Band Score - 9

There are certain needs and expenses that we cannot do away with; therefore, I agree with the argument that a guaranteed minimum income is essential to protect the rights of all citizens in a democratic country.

In almost all nations the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. The poor and the marginalized sections of the society also have basic needs. They need food, clothing and shelter. They want to send their children to school. Since many of these people lack a proper livelihood, it is essential for the government to disburse welfare payments.

Of course, the welfare schemes are bound to be abused and there is no guarantee that the aid will always reach the needy. Even so, in my opinion, such schemes are required for the all round development of a country. Take, for instance, the case of India. Although the country has made rapid economic advancements over the last few decades, it still has millions of people living below the poverty line. India has robust welfare schemes for the poor. For example, the country's public distribution system provides food grains and other essentials at highly subsidized rates for the poor. In fact, in many Indian states, poor families can get adequate amounts of rice or wheat for free. On the flip side, the poor are not the only beneficiaries of these schemes. In fact, millions of people living above the poverty line also receive the benefits by manipulating the system with the help of corrupt officials and politicians. As a result of this, the nation ends up spending a lot more money than it should for welfare schemes. However, abolishing welfare programmes is not the answer to this problem. If India pulls the plug on its public distribution system, thousands of people will die of hunger. So, the government

continues the system in spite of knowing its limitations and with the help of new and improved technologies, the country is steadily removing ineligible people from its social benefit programs.

To conclude, just because welfare programmes are liable to be abused, it does not mean that the government should abolish them. With political will and the use of new technologies, it is possible to ensure that governmental aid reaches the right hands.

Some people believe that individuals cannot improve environment, but only governments and big companies can make a difference. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Nowadays, environmental issues have become a major topic of discussion among people and governments. Many individuals / people argue that environmental protection can be achieved only by the governments or large business conglomerates. I strongly disagree with this opinion as small movements can have a big impact. Also any individual effort for the protection of the environment will be highly appreciated and supported by the public and this will increase the momentum.

Even though, the majority of individuals think individual efforts are useless, they have a great impact on a bigger picture. For example, in the waste management process segregating the household garbage items will take only a few minutes for the person who is sending the waste materials to the government agencies, but it provides a greater advantage for the government bodies since it is easier for them to process the properly separated waste materials. If everyone thinks that they cannot make any difference, there will not be any positive move. Therefore it is important for everyone to do whatever they can to protect the environment.

In addition, if individual efforts to protect the environment are highlighted through the proper channel, they will inspire many more people to follow the same path. For example, in 2017, Mr. Prashant, the then district collector of Kozhikode, took the personal initiative to clean a public lake in the district and he publicized / promoted the campaign on his Facebook page. After hearing about this, hundreds of local community persons joined the movement and made it a success. If that person was waiting for the government to take action, this would not happen.

This clearly shows that any minor initiatives, especially for the betterment of the environment will receive a huge support from the public if we publicize it properly.

To conclude, small efforts made by the individuals for the protection of the environment certainly make a difference and encourage others also to contribute. In the light of this we can strongly oppose the given argument which underestimates individual efforts, and clearly state that individual contribution is as much important as the support provided by government bodies and multinational companies.

Scientific Research should be carried out and controlled by the government rather than private companies. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Scientific research plays a very important role in the progress of a nation. It is argued that research should be controlled and funded by the government, and not private organisations or institutions. This essay agrees with the argument that the government should carry out various research works in different fields and will outline the reasons why government should be responsible for research projects.

There are several reasons to support my view point. Firstly, the government is capable of providing financial assistance to various research projects. Moreover, if the project fails to achieve its objectives, the government has the resources to cope up with the losses incurred. Secondly, the main motive of the government in conducting research is public welfare. Thirdly, when government funds research activities, there is utmost security. They do not disclose any information which could hamper national security. That is why research and development in the field of military is carried out by the government.

When private organisations conduct research, their chief concern is protecting their interests. This explains why the research conducted by coffee companies or gum companies only highlights the benefits of their products. This is not the case when the government funds research. In this case, the final verdict is more likely to be unbiased.

To conclude, after analysing the various aspects of the argument, it is not hard to see that the government funding of research is in the interests of the public. Private organizations, on the other hand, may have their own vexed interests to protect.

Some people believe that the internet should be regulated. Others are against any forms of internet censorship. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

The internet gives us access to limitless amounts of information. There is no denying the fact that it exposes us to both 'good' and 'bad' content. Some people believe that the internet should be regulated and censored. Others disapprove of any kind of censorship because they feel that the internet is a vent through which the oppressed can express their opinion.

Supporters of internet censorship argue that the internet has content that might be inappropriate for certain people. For example, they don't want children to be exposed to the online terrorist propaganda or pornographic materials. This is indeed a valid point. The internet does host lots of materials that are inappropriate for young children.

However, many people do not regard this argument as legit. In their opinion there are several ways to block inappropriate content. Parental control software is one of them. It is quite effective and allows parents to control the content their children access online. In fact, parents can exercise the best form of control by simply moving the computer to the living room. This way they can keep a tab on their children's online activities.

Some totalitarian governments use the inappropriate content argument for their benefit. They censor the internet to suppress their opposition. In my opinion, this cannot be tolerated at all. Governments that control the internet are merely demonstrating their inability to manage their affairs. They are afraid of their people and don't want their opinions to be heard. National security is important but it cannot be at the expense of freedom.

To conclude, I firmly believe that there are no valid grounds for internet censorship. I sincerely hope that governments around the world will understand this and stop censoring the internet.

In some countries, when someone gets old they often go to live in a home with other old people where there are nurses to look after them. Sometimes the government has to pay for this care. Who do you think should pay for this care, the government or the family?

Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience.

In recent years, the number of people who live in nursing homes in England, Wales and Scotland has been increasing. Some people believe that the family should pay for the care of nursing homes. However, I argue that the government should take responsibility for the cost. The first reason is that some people are too old to pay for the care of other family members and the second reason is that some families cannot afford to pay for the care.

The government should pay for the cost of nursing homes because some family members are also too old to pay for the cost of care. Some countries have an aging population due to healthier lifestyles and the advanced state of medical technology. Take Japanese society as an example; it is predicted that one-third of the population in 20 years will be over 65 years. This means that 70 year old people might have to pay for the care of their elderly parents in the future. I therefore believe that taxpayer money should pay for elderly care.

The second reason is that the financial situation varies depending on the family. In the case that families cannot afford to pay for the cost, they have to take care of their elderly loved ones. While some people think it is natural to take care of elderly people and they are willing to bath them, feed them and shower them, other people find it very difficult. It is not uncommon that family members use financial, physical, and psychological abuse on their elderly parents because of the stress from taking care of them. For example, there were an increase in the number of cases of euthanasia in countries where this is legal during the recent global economic recession.

In conclusion, I strongly agree with the idea that the state should pay for the care of the aged because some family members are too old to pay for them and it might be a heavy burden to take care of them at home. Therefore, the government should establish their pension system for the care of elderly citizens.

Some people say that the government should stop TV and newspapers from showing crimes because media coverage of violent crimes is frightening people and encouraging criminals. Do you agree or disagree?

Media gives too much importance to violence because of its shock value. Violence frightens people. It disgusts them but at the same time it interests them. Media coverage of violence has both positive and negative effects on the society.

Generally speaking, people have too much interest in crimes. They enjoy reading about such events. That is the reason media covers such events. Violent stories disgust most people. They also encourage criminals. Just because some people will be encouraged to commit crimes after reading about them, the media should not be asked to stop covering such events.

The primary duty of media is to inform people of all the good and bad things happening in the society. Since violence is on the rise, media needs to report it. They, however, need to ensure that they are not promoting or glorifying such crimes.

Media coverage of violence has some benefits. On the one hand, violent events frighten people. On the other hand, it encourages them to take the precautions to stay safe. For example, parents who read about the abduction and murder of children will take the measures to ensure that their child does not become the next casualty. People often commit horrible crimes under the influence of drugs and alcohol. Youngsters who read about such crimes will think twice before indulging in such practices themselves. On the down side, excessive coverage of violence can make people insensitive to them. The vast majority of people who

watch visuals of gory murders are repelled by what they see. Unfortunately, if we keep seeing such visuals, we will stop becoming affected by them. This apathy can be dangerous. Worse still, it can encourage people with criminal tendencies to commit similar crimes.

To conclude, coverage of violence certainly has both positive and negative impacts on the society. This, however, does not mean that the government should ask media to stop covering such events. Any such move will amount to curbing the freedom of the press.

Some people think governments should take measures to improve the health of its citizens. Others think it must be managed by individuals. Discuss both sides and give your opinion.

There are both sociological and economical reasons to develop a healthy lifestyle and habits among individuals. After all, healthy citizens are the biggest asset of a nation. Some people, therefore, argue that the government should play an active role in ensuring that its citizens lead a healthy lifestyle. Others feel that it is up to the individual to decide how they should live. In my opinion, health is mainly a matter of individual responsibility. Even so, there are lots of things the government can do to promote a healthy lifestyle among its people.

The government can make laws. It can ban things that are detrimental to the health of its people. For example, drugs are illegal in many countries. There are countries or states that ban alcohol and cigarettes. In some countries, the government imposes a high tax on junk food with the objective of discouraging its consumption. All of these are measures that can have a positive impact on the health of the people. Another very beneficial thing that the government can do for its people's health is making vaccinations mandatory. Despite the fact that vaccines are safe and effective, many communities refuse to administer them to their children citing religious or other invalid reasons. By enacting laws that make vaccinations mandatory, the government can save millions of children from the clutches of diseases and death.

Having said that, health is very much an individual matter. The government cannot monitor the lifestyle of every citizen. Even in countries where drugs are illegal, people still use them. They smoke and drink. They eat junk food and spend too much time in front of the TV or computer. They are aware of the consequences of their actions; yet they are too lazy or too ignorant to change their lifestyle. The government cannot do much to help these people.

To conclude, there are lots of things that the government can do to improve the health of its citizens. However, the government alone cannot create a healthy society. Individuals need to make a conscious effort too.