**GMAT Issues Writing Samples**

1. The extent to which the broadcast media should be censored for offensive language and behavior involves a conflict between our right of free speech and the duty of the government to protect its citizenry from potential harm. In my view, our societal interest in preventing the harm that exposure to obscenity produces takes precedence over the rights of individuals to broadcast this type of content.

First of all, I believe that exposure to obscene and offensive language and behavior does indeed cause similar behavior on the part of those who are exposed to it. Although we may not have conclusive scientific evidence of a cause-effect relationship, ample anecdotal evidence establishes a significant correlation. Moreover, both common sense and our experiences with children inform us that people tend to mimic the language and behavior they are exposed to.

Secondly, I believe that obscene and offensive behavior is indeed harmful to a society. The harm it produces is, in my view, both palpable and profound. For the individual, it has a debasing impact on vital human relationships; for the society, it promotes a tendency toward immoral and antisocial behavior. Both outcomes, in turn, tear apart the social fabric that holds a society together.

Those who advocate unbridled individual expression might point out that the right of free speech is intrinsic to a democracy and necessary to its survival. Even so, this right is not absolute, nor is it the most critical element. In my assessment, the interests served by restricting obscenity in broadcast media are, on balance, more crucial to the survival of a society. Advocates of free expression might also point out difficulties in defining "obscene" or "offensive" language or behavior. But in my view, however difficult it may be to agree on standards, the effort is worthwhile.

In sum, it is in our best interest as a society for the government to censor broadcast media for obscene and offensive language and behavior. Exposure to such media content tends to harm society and its citizenry in ways that are worth preventing, even in light of the resulting infringement of our right of free expression.

2. The speaker asserts that an international effort is needed to preserve the world's energy resources for future generations. While individual nations, like people, are at times willing to make voluntary sacrifices for the benefit of others, my view is that international coordination is nevertheless necessary in light of the strong propensity of nations to act selfishly, and because the problem is international in scope.

The main reason why an international effort is necessary is that, left to their own devices, individual nations, like people, will act according to their short-term motives and self-interest. The mere existence of military weapons indicates that self-interest and national survival are every nation's prime drivers. And excessive consumption by industrialized nations of natural resources they know to be finite, when alternatives are at hand demonstrates that self-interest and short-sightedness extend to the use of energy resources as well. Furthermore, nations, like people, tend to rationalize their own self-serving policies and actions. Emerging nations might argue, for example, that they should be exempt from energy conservation because it is the industrialized nations who can better afford to make sacrifices and who use more resources in the first place.

Another reason why an international effort is required is that other problems of an international nature have also required global cooperation. For example, has each nation independently recognized the folly of nuclear weapons proliferation and voluntarily disarmed? No: only by way of an international effort, based largely on coercion of strong leaders against detractors, along with an appeal to self-interest, have we made some progress. By the same token, efforts of individual nations to thwart international drug trafficking have proven largely futile, because efforts have not been internationally based. Similarly, the problem of energy conservation transcends national borders in that either all nations must cooperate, or all will ultimately suffer.

In conclusion, nations are made up of individuals who, when left unconstrained, tend to act in their own self-interest and with short-term motives. In light of how we have dealt, or not dealt, with other global problems, it appears that an international effort is needed to ensure the preservation of natural resources for future generations.

3. Which is a better way to classify and reward employees of a business: a "flat" organizational structure or a hierarchical structure? The speaker prefers a "flat" structure in which distinctions between employees based on education or experience are not used as a basis for monetary rewards. I strongly disagree with the speaker's view, for two reasons.

In the first place, the speaker's preference for a "flat" structure is based upon the claim that cooperation and collegiality among employees is more likely under this system than under a hierarchical one. However, this claim ignores our everyday experience in human interaction. Disagreements among coworkers are inevitable. Without a clear authoritative figure to resolve them and to make final decisions, disputes are more likely to go unresolved and even worsen, thereby undermining cooperation, congeniality and, ultimately, productivity and profit.

In the second place, whether or not collegiality and cooperation are best fostered by a flat organizational structure is beside the point. My main reason for rejecting an organizational structure that does not distinguish workers in terms of their abilities or experience is that under such a system workers have little incentive to improve their skills, accomplish their work-related goals, or assume responsibility for the completion of their assigned tasks. In my experience, human motivation is such that without enticements such as money, status or recognition, few people would accomplish anything of value or assume responsibility for any task. A flat system actually might provide a distinct disincentive for productivity and efficiency insofar as workers are not held accountable for the quality or quantity of their work. By ignoring human nature, then, a company may be harming itself by encouraging laziness and complacency.

In sum, the speaker's opinion that a "flat" organizational structure is the best way to promote collegiality and cooperation among employees runs counter to the common sense about how people act in a work environment, and in any case provides a feeble rationale for the preference of one organizational structure over another.

4. This quote means essentially that people admire powerful individuals who do not use their power to the utmost to achieve their goals but rather use only the minimum amount required to attain them. While this view is admirable in the abstract, the statement is inaccurate in that it fails to reflect how people actually behave.

The popularity of "revenge" movies aptly illustrates that many people are not impressed with individuals who use restraint when exercising their power. In these movies the protagonist is typically portrayed as having certain physical abilities that would enable him to easily defeat the various adversaries he encounters. In the initial confrontations with these individuals he typically refrains from using his abilities to defeat them. The audience, however, soon grows tired of this, and when the hero finally loses control and completely demolishes his opponent, they burst into applause. This homey example strongly suggests that many people are more impressed with the use of power than with the restraint of its use.

The Gulf War provides another example of a situation where restraint in the use of power was not widely acclaimed. When the allied forces under the command of General Schwartzkoff showed restraint by not annihilating the retreating Iraqi army, the general was widely criticized by the public for not using the force available to him to eliminate this potential enemy once and for all. This example shows once again that often people are not impressed by individuals who exhibit restraint in using their power.

In conclusion, the examples cited above clearly indicate that, contrary to the view expressed in the quote, many?aif not most?apeople are more impressed with individuals who utilize their power to the utmost than with those who exercise restraint in the use of their power,

5. Which is a more productive method of performing a group task: allowing ail group members to share in the decision making, duties and responsibilities, or appointing one member to make decisions, delegate duties and take responsibility? The speaker's opinion is that the first method is always the best one. In my view, however, each of these alternatives is viable in certain circumstances, as illustrated by two very different examples.

A jury in a criminal trial is good example of a group in which shared decision-making, duties, and responsibility is the most appropriate and effective way to get the job done. Each member of the jury is on equal footing with the others. While one person is appointed to head the jury, his or her function is to act as facilitator, not as leader. To place ultimate authority and responsibility on the facilitator would essentially be to appoint a judge, and to thereby defeat the very purpose of the jury system.

By way of contrast, a trauma unit in a hospital is a case in which one individual should assume responsibility, delegate duties and make decisions. In trauma units, split-second decisions are inherently part of the daily routine, and it is generally easier for one person to make a quick decision than for a team to agree on how to proceed. One could argue that since decisions in trauma units are typically life-and-death ones, leaving these decisions to one person is too risky. However, this argument ignores the crucial point that only the most experienced individuals should be trusted with such a burden and with such power; leaving decisions to inexperienced group members can jeopardize a patient's very life.

In conclusion, I agree that in some situations the best way to accomplish a task is through teamwork?asharing responsibility, duties and decision making. However, in other situations, especially those where quick decisions are necessary or where individual experience is critical, the most effective means is for one individual to serve as leader and assume ultimate responsibility for completing the job.

6. The speaker here defines success simply as the ability to choose how to spend one's life. Under this definition, people who have the freedom to do whatever they want at any time they choose would presumably be the most successful ones, while those who have no such freedom would be the biggest failures. Viewing the definition in this light reveals three serious problems with it.

The chief problem with this definition of success is that by the definition nearly all people would be regarded as failures. The reason for this is simple. Most people have extremely limited choices in what they can do and when they can do it. In other words, unrestricted freedom of choice is a luxury only a few people?aperhaps a handful of tyrannical dictators and ultra-wealthy individuals?acan afford.

Secondly, people who have a high degree of freedom in choosing their lifestyle often acquire it through means that would not earn them the accolade of being successful. For example, lottery winners or people who inherit a great deal of money may be able to spend their life in any way they choose, but few people would regard them as successful merely due to their financial fortune.

A third reason this definition of success is unacceptable is that it repudiates some of our basic intuitions about success. For most people, success is related to achievement. The more you achieve, the more successful you are; conversely, the less you achieve the less successful you are. Defining success in terms of freedom of choice ignores this intuition.

In sum, the proposed definition of success is far too limiting, and it belies our intuition about the concept. I think that most people would agree with me that success is better defined in terms of the attainment of goals.

7. Some people think that the best way to advise people is simply to find what they want and help them attain it? In my view, this method is generally not the best way to proceed in advising others; it ignores the plain truth that many people do not know what they want and do not know what is best for them.

My main reason for rejecting this technique is that people very rarely have any clear idea of what they want. This applies not only to consumer items such as clothing, cars and luxury items but also to what they want out of life in general. In fact, numerous studies have shown that most people cannot list the ten things they want most out of life, even if given considerable time to think about it.

My second reason for rejecting this method is that more often than not what people want is not what is best for them. Parents continually face this problem when advising their children. For example, suppose a child wants to quit school and get a job. Surely, the parents would be derelict in helping their child attain this want instead of convincing the child that continuing education would be in his or her best interest.

Admittedly, following the proposed advising method would result in a high rate of compliance, since the person being advised would act consistently with his or her own will by following the advice. However, as noted above, acting according to what one wants is not necessarily desirable. Proponents of this method might also point to college counselors as models of this technique. However, college counselors should not necessarily be held up as models for advising people generally, let alone as models for advising students.

In conclusion, I do not agree that the best way to advise people is to find what they desire and help them achieve it. In my estimation the pitfalls of such a technique outweigh any of its potential advantages.

8. The prospect of converting the world's monetary system of metal coins and printed paper into a computerized system of credits and debits is intriguing. Opponents of the idea regard a digital economy as a dangerous step toward a totalitarian society in which an elite class dominates an information-starved lower class. My view, however, is that conversion to a digital economy has far-reaching economic and social virtues that outweigh the potential risk of misuse by a political elite.

Supporters of the idea of "digital cash" view the move to a digital economy as the next logical step toward a global system of free trade and competition. Herein lies the main virtue of a digital economy. In facilitating trade among nations, consumers worldwide would enjoying a broader range of goods at more competitive prices.

In addition, a digital economy would afford customers added convenience, while

at the same time saving money for businesses. Making purchases with electronic currency would be simple, fast, and secure. There would be no need to carry cash and no need for cashiers to collect it. A good example of the convenience and savings afforded by such a system is the "pay and go" gasoline pump used at many service stations today, Using these pumps saves time for the customer and saves money for the business.
A third benefit of such a system is its potential to eliminate illegal monetary transactions. Traffickers of illegal arms and drugs, dealers in black-market contraband, and counterfeiters all rely on tangible currency to conduct their activities. By eliminating hard currency, illegal transactions such as these would be much easier to track and record. As a result, illegal monetary transactions could be virtually eliminated. A related benefit would be the ability to thwart tax evasion by collecting tax revenues on transactions that otherwise would not be recorded.
To sum up, I think it would be a good idea to convert current monetary systems into a system of electronic accounts. The economic benefits, convenience and savings afforded by such a system, along with the potential to reduce crime, far outweigh the remote boss ??? at a significant social or political shift toward totalitarianism.

9. Should employees leave their personal lives entirely behind them when they enter the workplace, as the speaker suggests here? While I agree that employees should not allow their personal lives to interfere with their jobs, the speaker fails to consider that integrating personal life with work can foster a workplace ambiance that helps everyone do a better job, thereby promoting success for the organization.
Engaging coworkers in occasional conversation about personal interests and activities can help build collegiality among coworkers that adds to their sense of common purpose on the job. Managers would be well advised to participate in and perhaps even plan the sharing of personal information?aas a leadership tool as well as a morale booster. An employee feels valued when the boss takes time to ask about the employee's family or recent vacation. The employee, in turn, is likely to be more loyal to and cooperative with the boss. Company-sponsored social events picnics, parties, excursions, and so forth?aalso help to produce greater cohesiveness in an organization, by providing opportunities for employees to bond with one another in ways that translate into better working relationships.
Admittedly, employees should guard against allowing their personal life to impinge upon their job performance or intrude on coworkers. Excessive chatting about nun business topics, frequent personal telephone calls, and the like, are always distracting. And romances between coworkers are best kept confidential, at least to the extent they disrupt work or demoralize or offend other employees. By the same token, however, employees who are too aloof?asharing nothing personal with others?amay be resented by coworkers who perceive them as arrogant, unfriendly, or uncooperative. The ill-will and lack of communication that is likely to result may ultimately harm the organization.
In the final analysis, employees should strike a careful balance when they mix their personal lives with their jobs. Although there are some circumstances in which bringing one's personal life to the job may be counterproductive, for many reasons it is a good idea to inject small doses of personal life into the workplace.

10. The question at hand is whether the process of making or doing something is ultimately more important than the final product. Process may not always be more

important than product, but it often is. A process may provide an opportunity for new and important discoveries with ramifications far beyond the current product; moreover, a process can often be an important end in and of itself for those engaged in it.
New discoveries are often unexpectedly made during routine processes. Such was the case with Alexander Fleming in 1928, who while conducting an unremarkable study of bacteria, discovered inadvertently that mold growing on one of his cultures was killing the bacteria. His ordinary process led to an unexpected and remarkable end: the development of penicillin.
Process also offers opportunities for refining old methods and inventing new ones. For example, as the defense industry slowed down after the cold war, many methods and technologies for weapons production proved useful in other areas from commercial aviation to medical technology. The same has been true of technologies developed for the space program, which now find broad application in many other fields.
Finally, in my observation and experience, people become caught up in processes primarily for the challenge and enjoyment of the activity, not merely to produce some product. Once the process has culminated in a final, product, the participants immediately search for a new process to involve them with. From a psychological standpoint, then, people have a need to busy themselves with meaningful activities?ai.e., processes. So most processes can fittingly be characterized as ends in themselves insofar as they fulfill this psychological need.
In sum, the process of making or doing something frequently has implications far beyond the immediate product. For this reason, and because process fills a basic human need, I strongly agree with the speaker's assertion the process is ultimately more important than product.

11. Perhaps in some instances the personal failings of great achievers are unimportant relative to the achievements. In many cases, however, the relative significance of personal failings can be very great, depending on two factors: (1) the extent to which the failing is part of the achievement process itself, and (2) the societal impact of the achiever's failing apart from his or her own success.
Personal failings and achievement are often symbiotically related. The former test the would-be achiever's mettle; they pose challenges?anecessary resistance that drives one to achieve despite the shortcoming. Personal failings may also compel one to focus on one's strengths, thereby spawning achievement. For example, poor academic or job performance may propel a gifted entrepreneur to start his or her own business. In the arts, a personal failing may be a necessary ingredient or integral part of the process of achieving. Artists and musicians often produce their most creative works during periods of depression, addiction, or other distress. In business, insensitivity to the "human" costs of success has bred grand achievements, as with the questionable labor practices of the great philanthropist Andrew Carnegie.
A second type of personal failing is one that is unrelated to the achievement. Modern politics is replete with examples: the marital indiscretions of the great leader John F. Kennedy and the paranoia of the great statesman Richard Nixon, to name just two. Were the personal failings of these two presidents less "important" than their achievements? In the former example, probably so. in the latter example, probably not since it resulted in the Watergate scandal?aa watershed event in American politics. In cases such as these, therefore, the societal impact of shortcoming and achievement must be weighed on a case-by-case basis.
In sum, history informs us that personal failings are often part-and-parcel of great

achievements; even where they are not, personal shortcomings of great achievers often make an important societal impact of their own.

12. Which factor offers more opportunities for success in our society: education or money and property? In my view, education has replaced money and property as the main provider of such opportunities today. I base my view on two reasons. First, education?aparticularly higher education?aused to be available only to the wealthy but now is accessible to almost anyone. Second, because of the civil-rights movement and resulting laws, businesses are now required to hire on the basis of merit rather than the kinds of personal connections traditionally common among the wealthy.
Education probably always played a key role in determining one's opportunities for success. But in the past, good post-secondary education was available mainly to the privileged classes. Because money and property largely determined one's access to higher education, money and property really were the critical factors in opening doors to success. However, higher education is more egalitarian today. Given our vast numbers of state universities and financial-aid programs, virtually anyone who meets entrance requirements for college can obtain an excellent college education and open up windows of opportunity in life.
Another reason those opportunities will be open to educated young people from middle-class and poorer backgrounds is that hiring is more meritocratic today than ever before. In principle, at least, we have always been a society where all people are equal; yet in the past, children of the wealthy and the well connected could expect to obtain higher-status jobs and to receive better pay. But the laws and programs resulting from our civil-rights struggles have produced a modern business climate in which jobs are available on an equal-opportunity basis, and in which candidates have a legal right to be judged on the merit of their educational background and experience.
In conclusion, education is probably the main factor in opening doors to success for young people in our society. The fact that education has supplanted money and property in this role is owing to a more egalitarian system of higher education, as well as to more merit-based hiring practices mat generally value individual education over family fortune or connections.

13. While nearly everyone would agree in principle that certain efforts to preserve the natural environment are in humankind's best interest, environmental issues always involve a tug of war among conflicting political and economic interests. For this reason, and because serious environmental problems are generally large in scale, government participation is needed to ensure environmental preservation.
Experience tells us that individuals (and private corporations owned by individuals) tend to act on behalf of their own short-term economic and political interest, not on behalf of the environment or the public at large. For example, current technology makes possible the complete elimination of polluting emissions from automobiles. Nevertheless, neither automobile manufacturers nor consumers are willing or able to voluntarily make the short-term sacrifices necessary to accomplish this goal. Only the government holds the regulatory and enforcement power to impose the necessary standards and to ensure that we achieve such goats.
Aside from the problems of self-interest and enforcement, environmental issues inherently involve public health and are far too pandemic in nature for individuals to solve on their own. Many of the most egregious environmental violations traverse state and sometimes national borders. Environmental hazards are akin to those involving

food and drug safety and to protecting borders against enemies; individuals have neither the power nor the resources to address these widespread hazards.

In the final analysis, only the authority and scope of power that a government possesses can ensure the attainment of agreed-upon environmental goals. Because individuals are incapable of assuming this responsibility, government must do so.

14. The speaker claims that all organizations should include a clear hierarchy of accountability because any other structure would work against human nature and therefore prove fruitless in the end. This claim gives rise to complex issues about human nature and the social structures best suited to it. In my view, the claim assumes a distortedly narrow view of human nature, ignoring certain aspects of it that are undermined by hierarchical structure in ways that ultimately hurt the organization.

First, the organizational structure the speaker recommends undermines the nexus between worker and product that facilitates efficiency and productivity. When employees are responsible for just their small component of work, they can easily lose sight of larger organizational goals and the importance of their role in realizing these goals. In turn, workers will feel alienated, unimportant, and unmotivated to do work they are proud of. These effects cannot help but damage the organization in the end.

Second, compartmentalizing tasks in a hierarchical structure stifles creativity. An acquaintance of mine worked for a company that had established a rigid organizational barrier between designers and engineers. The designers often provided the engineers with concepts that were unworkable from an engineering standpoint. Conversely, whenever an engineer offered a design idea that allowed for easier engineering, the designers would simply warn the engineer not to interfere. This is a typical case where organizational barriers operate against creativity, harming the organization in the end.

Third, strict hierarchy undermines the collegiality and cooperation among coworkers needed for a sense of common purpose and pride in accomplishment. The message from the designers to the engineers at my friend's company produced just the opposite?aresentment between the two departments, low morale among the engineers whose creative suggestions were ignored, and ultimate resignation to do inferior work with an attitude that developing ideas is a waste of time.

In sum, the speaker seems to assume that humans are essentially irresponsible and unmotivated, and that they therefore need external motivation by way of a layered bureaucratic structure. The speaker misunderstands human nature, which instead requires creative exercise and sense of purpose and pride in accomplishment. By stifling these needs with organizational barriers, the organization is ultimately worse off.

15. The issue here is whether an international effort to regulate children's access to adult material on the Internet is worthwhile. In my view, nations should attempt to regulate such access by cooperative regulatory effort. I base this view on the universality and importance of the interest in protecting children from harm, and on the inherently pandemic nature of the problem.

Adults everywhere have a serious interest in limiting access by children to pornographic material. Pornographic material tends to confuse children?adistorting their notion of sex, of themselves as sexual beings, and of how people ought to treat one another. Particularly in the case of domination and child pornography, the messages children receive from pornographic material cannot contribute in a healthy way to their emerging sexuality. Given this important interest that knows no cultural bounds, we should regulate children's access to sexually explicit material on the Internet.

However, information on the Internet is not easily contained within national borders. Limiting access to such information is akin to preventing certain kinds of global environmental destruction. Consider the problem of ozone depletion thought to be a result of chloroflourocarbon (CFC) emissions. When the government regulated CFC production in the U.S., corporations responsible for releasing CFC's into the atmosphere simply moved abroad, and the global threat continued. Similarly, the Internet is a global phenomenon; regulations in one country will not stop "contamination" overall. Thus, successful regulation of Internet pornography requires international cooperation, just as successful CFC regulation finally required the joint efforts of many nations.

Admittedly, any global regulatory effort faces formidable political hurdles, since cooperation and compliance on the part of all nations?aeven warring ones?ais inherently required. Nevertheless, as in the case of nuclear disarmament or global warming, the possible consequences of failing to cooperate demand that the effort be made. And dissenters can always be coerced into compliance politically or economically by an alliance of influential nations.

In sum, people everywhere have a serious interest in the healthy sexual development of children and, therefore, in limiting children's access to Internet pornography. Because Internet material is not easily confined within national borders, we can successfully regulate children's access to adult materials on the internet only by way of international cooperation.

16. The extent to which new public buildings reflect societal values and attitudes depends on whether one considers a building's intended function or its design. In the former sense, new public buildings do mirror society, while in the latter sense they do not.

The intended uses of new public buildings say something about our priorities and values as a society. For example, proliferation of public cultural centers and schools reflects a societal concern for the arts and education, respectively, while new prison construction indicates a heightened concern for safety and security.

The design of new public buildings, however, fails to mirror society, for two reasons. First, modern democratic states do not have the luxury of making cultural "statements" at any expense. Functionality and fiscal accountability dictate the face of public architecture today. Second, public participation in the process is limited. New buildings typically reflect the architect's eccentric vision or the preference of a few public officials, not the populace's values and attitudes. In England, for example, Prince Charles oversees and approves the design of new public buildings. The resulting conventional designs suggest his unwillingness to break from tradition. Yet it would seem unfair to assign his lack of vision to English society. In Denver, the controversial design of a new airport met with public outcry for its appearance, expense, and lack of functionality. Does the airport reflect the values of Denver's denizens? Probably not.

in conclusion, while modern public buildings seem to reflect the values and attitudes of a society in their function, they do not necessarily do so in their design.

17. The speaker claims that a detailed time-management plan fails to afford adequate flexibility to deal with the unexpected at the workplace. He seems to offer an either/or choice between planning one's time rigidly, by detailing important daily as well as long-term plans, and not planning at all; and he prefers the second choice. The speaker's claim is overly simplistic, since it is possible for a detailed time-management plan to

also provide flexibility.
Working at any job-without a detailed road map for the immediate and longer-term can trivialize the efforts of both employees and organizational units so that all their efforts become aimless. The only sensible way proceed is to consider first one's most important long-term objectives; then an organizational unit and its employees can order daily and weekly tasks according to how much each adds to the achievement of those objectives. With a broader perspective, workers can eliminate from the list those daily activities that may seem urgent or may be most enjoyable but don't really contribute to long-term job goals or to organizational objectives.
A detailed time-management system need not be inflexible. Knowing which items to eliminate from a "to-do" list gives a time-management plan its flexibility. When the unexpected arises, it can be judged according to its role in fulfilling long-term goals. If what at first seemed urgent turns out not to be important, it can be deferred to another time or ignored altogether. But if something unexpected needs handling in order to fulfill an important business or life plan, it will take priority over lesser activities in the daily or weekly schedule. For instance, I might have a meeting planned for one o'clock with coworkers to decide the location of an awards banquet, and find out at noon that an important client is thinking of switching to our competitor but wants to talk with me first. I can easily discern that the banquet meeting is less important than a critical meeting with a valuable client.
In conclusion, effective time management must involve a detailed scheduling of tasks. But it also requires determining which tasks are more central than others to the satisfaction of long-term objectives. This way, the daily or weekly schedule becomes not just a list of tasks to check off, but a flexible plan that can accommodate important urgencies while allowing us to bypass less significant scheduled tasks and ignore unimportant interruptions.

18. We take for granted that a primary objective and obligation of a corporation is to maximize profits. But does this mean a corporation cannot also fulfill its obligations to society? The speaker claims mat the two duties necessarily conflict. In my view, however, a corporation's duties to maximize shareholder wealth and to serve society will at times coincide and at times-conflict; and when they do conflict, neither takes automatic precedence over the other.
.Beyond the obvious duty to maximize shareholder wealth, corporations indeed owe a duty to serve society, especially the immediate community, which permits corporations to operate in exchange for an implicit promise that the corporations will do no harm and will bring some benefit to the community. These duties can often be fulfilled together. For example, a successful corporation brings jobs and related economic benefit to the community. And, by contributing to community activities and changes in other ways, the corporation gains a reputation for social responsibility that often helps it become even more successful.
However, at times these duties do conflict. Consider, for instance, a company that unknowingly leaks into the ground a toxic substance that threatens to contaminate local groundwater. While the company may favor an inexpensive containment program, community leaders may want the company to go further by cleaning up and restoring their environment?aeven if the expense will force the company to leave and take jobs from the community. Whatever the company decides, it should not assume that protecting profits automatically outweighs social obligation. In many instances it does not, as highly visible tobacco, automobile safety, and asbestos liability cases aptly illustrate. Such examples reveal a limit as to how far a corporation can ethically go in

trading off the well being of the community for the sake of its own profits.
In sum, corporations have duties both to do well and to do good. Although conflict between these duties is not inevitable, it does occur. Determining which duty takes precedence in time of conflict requires careful consideration of all the ethical ramifications of each alternative.

19. Sample Essay 1:
Whether an employer should emphasize specialization in business courses or a more varied academic preparation is a controversial one. On the one hand, the increasing diversification of business activities requires employees to have specialized knowledge. On the other hand, the capricious nature of the market needs employees to have a more varied academic preparation so that he could handle unexpected situations. However, in the final analysis, I believe that an employer should emphasize specialized knowledge in business courses.
One reason for my belief is that there are special requirements for each position of a company and only those who have adequate knowledge for the position can take the position. If everyone does his job well, the whole company will prosper.
Another reason for my belief lies in the fact that entry-level employees do not need a varied academic preparation, for they do not have to handle complicated situations. Unlike those of a senior staff member, their responsibilities are clearly defined in the job description.
Perhaps the best reason for my belief is that one's energy is limited. If the employer expects their employees to have a more varied academic preparation, college graduates will spend less time on their own special field of study. As a result, they may not have adequate special knowledge for their future positions.
For the reasons above I therefore believe that an employer should emphasize specialization in business courses in the application process. Although general knowledge is also important in many respects, a specialist is more useful for a company.

Sample Essay 2:
In recruiting for entry-level jobs, should employers stress a broad liberal arts education, a technical business background, or should employers favor neither one over the other? In my view, while the ideal job candidate has significant academic experience in both realms, whether employers should favor one type of background over the other depends on the nature of the particular job and the anticipated length of employment.
First, a strong business background is more critical for some entry-level jobs than for others. Fledgling accountants, financial analysts, and loan officers cannot perform optimally without a solid academic background in accounting, finance, and banking. Even in sales of financial products and services, new employees need extensive technical knowledge to educate the customer and to be effective salespeople. However, in other entry-level positions?asuch as personnel, advertising and marketing?atechnical business knowledge may not be as critical as a broad experience with various types of people and an enlightened view of different cultures.
Second, the employer's hiring decision should also depend on the anticipated length of employment. In recruiting short-term workers, especially for positions that are labor intensive and where judgment and experience are not of paramount importance, the applicant who is strongly business-oriented may be the better choice. On the job, this applicant will probably be more pragmatic, and spend less time pondering the job and more time doing it. However, an employer looking for a long-term employee may be better served by hiring an applicant with a strong liberal arts background. By way of

their more general education, these applicants have acquired a variety of general, transferable skills. They may be more adept than their colleagues with business-only backgrounds at recognizing and solving management problems, dealing with business associates from different cultures, and viewing-issues from a variety of perspectives. All of these skills contribute to a person's lifelong ability to adapt to and even anticipate changes that affect the company, and to move easily into new positions as such changes demand.

In sum, recruiters for entry-level jobs should avoid preferring one type of applicant over another in all cases. Instead, recruiters should consider the immediate technical demands of the job as well as the prospect of advancement and long-term employment within the company.

20. Sample Essay 1:

The issue of whether machines are an advantage or disadvantage to humans is a controversial one. On the one hand, humans are more and more dependent on machines. On the other hand, machines are making our lives better and better. However, in the final analysis, I believe that the advantages of machines outweigh their disadvantages.

One reason for my belief is that machines have made our lives much easier than before. For example, with help of my computer, I can navigate on the internet everyday, searching for the information I need, while my automatic washing machine is doing my laundry for me. My mobile phone connects me with my friends and my office wherever I go. I cannot image what my life would be like without all these machines and devices.

Another reason for my belief is that machines can do many dangerous work for us. For example, a robot bomb expert can dismantle a bomb for the police so that no one will be hurt. Other robots can work under extreme weather conditions.

Perhaps the best reason for my belief is that machines have opened more and more possibilities for humans. For instance, a spaceship can take us to outer space where we had never dared to go. Likewise, a submarine can bring us to the bottom of the ocean, which used to be forbidden area to humans. I believe that there will be more machines doing hazardous jobs.

For all these reasons, I therefore believe that machines are so important to humans that we cannot do without them. Of course, machines have also brought with it many disadvantages. Such machines as calculators, cars, typewriters have made some people lazy, stupid, weak, and clumsy. However, whether machines are beneficial to humans depends on how you use them. We can use machines to save us time and then use the time to do more creative work or to enjoy life. Anyway, there are still more advantages than disadvantages. (326 words)

Sample Essay 2:

In some respects humans serve machines, while in other respects machines serve us by enhancing our lives. While mechanical automation may have diminished our quality of life on balance, digital automation is doing more to improve our lives than to undermine our autonomy.

Consider first mechanical automation, particularly assembly line manufacturing. With automation came a loss of pride in and alienation from one's work. In this sense, automation both diminished our quality of life and rendered us slaves to machines in our inability to reverse "progress." Admittedly, mechanical automation spawned entire industries, creating jobs, stimulating economic growth, and supplying a plethora of innovative conveniences. Nevertheless, the sociological and environmental price of progress may have outweighed its benefits.

Digital automation has brought its own brand of alienation. Computer automation, and especially the Internet, breeds information overload and steals our time and attention away from family, community, and coworkers. In these respects, digital automation tends to diminish our quality of life and create its own legion of human slaves. On the other hand, by relegating repetitive tasks to computers, digital technology has spawned great advances in medicine and physics, helping us to better understand the world, to enhance our health, and to prolong our lives. Digital automation has also emancipated architects, artists, designers, and musicians, by opening up creative possibilities and by saving time. Perhaps most important, however, information technology makes possible universal access to information, thereby providing a democratizing influence on our culture.

In sum, while mechanical automation may have created a society of slaves to modem conveniences and unfulfilling work, digital automation holds more promise for improving our lives without enslaving us to the technology.

21. According to the statement, in order to ensure high productivity, companies should base their employees' salaries and job security solely on job performance, and not on length of service to the company. I agree that salary increases and job security are powerful incentives to high achievement and should generally go to those who do the best work. However, to ensure employee productivity, companies must also reward tenured employees with cost-of-living raises?athough not with job security.

On the one hand, rewarding average job performance with large pay increases or promises of job security is a waste of resources?afor two reasons. First, complacent employees will see no reason to become more productive. Secondly, those normally inclined to high achievement may decide the effort isn't worthwhile when mediocre efforts are amply compensated. Companies should, therefore, adjust their pay schedules so that the largest salaries go to the most productive employees.

On the other hand, employees who perform their jobs satisfactorily should be given regular, though small, service-based pay increases?aalso for two reasons. First, the cost of living is steadily rising, so on the principle of fair compensation alone, it is unjust to condemn loyal employees to de facto salary reductions by refusing them cost-of-living raises. Secondly, failure to adjust salaries to reflect the cost of living may be counterproductive for the firm, which will have difficulty attracting and retaining good employees without such a policy.

In the final analysis, the statement correctly identifies job performance as the single best criterion for salary and job security. However, the statement goes too far; it ignores the fact that a cost-of-living salary increase for tenured employees not only enhances loyalty and, in the end, productivity, but also is required by fairness.

22. The speaker here argues that government must support the arts but at the same time impose no control over what art is produced. The implicit rationale for government intervention in the arts is that, without it, cultural decline and erosion of our social fabric will result. However, I find no empirical evidence to support this argument, which in any event is unconvincing in light of more persuasive arguments that government should play no part in either supporting or restricting the arts.

First, subsidizing the arts is neither a proper nor a necessary job for government. Although public health is generally viewed as critical to a society's very survival and therefore an appropriate concern of government, this concern should not extend tenuously to our cultural "health" or well being. A lack of private funding might justify

an exception; in my observation, however, philanthropy is alive and well today, especially among the new technology and media moguls.
Second, government cannot possibly play an evenhanded role as arts patron. Inadequate resources call for restrictions, priorities, and choices. It is unconscionable to relegate normative decisions as to which art has "value" to a few legislators and jurists, who may be unenlightened in their notions about art. Also, legislators are all too likely to make choices in favor of the cultural agendas of those lobbyists with the most money and influence.
Third, restricting artistic expression may in some cases encroach upon the constitutional right of free expression. In any case, governmental restriction may chill creativity, thereby defeating the very purpose of subsidizing the arts.
In the final analysis, government cannot philosophically or economically justify its involvement in the arts, either by subsidy or sanction. Responsibility lies with individuals to determine what art has value and to support that art.

23. The speaker asserts that schools should teach only academic skills, and not ethical or social values. I agree with the speaker insofar as instruction on certain moral issues is best left to parents and churches. However, in my view it is in the best interests of a democratic society for schools to teach at least the values necessary to preserve freedom and a democratic way of life, and perhaps ever) additional values that enrich and nurture a society and its members.
We all have in interest in preserving our freedom and democratic way of life- At the very least, then, schools should provide instruction in the ethical and social values required for our democracy to survive?aparticularly the values of respect and tolerance. Respect for individual persons is a basic ethical value that requires us to acknowledge the fundamental equality of all people, a tenet of a democratic society. Tolerance of differences among individuals and their viewpoints is required to actualize many of our basic constitutional rights?aincluding life, liberty, pursuit of happiness, and freedom of speech and religion.
While respect and tolerance are the minimal values that schools should teach, the list should ideally go further?ato include caring, compassion, and willingness to help one another. A democracy might survive without these values, but it would not thrive. Respect and tolerance without compassion, it seems to me, breed a cool aloofness that undermines our humanity, and leaves those in the worst position to suffer more and suffer alone?aan unhealthy state for any society.
Admittedly, schools should avoid advocating particular viewpoints on controversial moral issues such as abortion or capital punishment. Instruction on issues with clear spiritual or religious implications is best left to parents and churches. Even so, schools should teach students how to approach these kinds of issues?aby helping students to recognize their complexity and to clarify competing points of view. In doing so, schools can help breed citizens who approach controversy in the rational and responsible ways characteristic of a healthy democracy.
In sum, schools should by all means refrain from indoctrinating our young people with particular viewpoint on controversial questions of morality. However, it is in a democratic society's interest for schools to inculcate the democratic values of respect and tolerance, and perhaps even additional values that humanize and enrich a society.

24. Historical examples of both influential public officials and influential business leaders abound. However, the power of the modern-era business leader is quite different

from that of the government official. On balance, the CEO seems to be better positioned to influence the course of community and of nations.

Admittedly the opportunities for the legislator to regulate commerce or of the jurist to dictate rules of equity are official and immediate. No private individual can hold that brand of influence. Yet official power is tempered by our check-and-balance system of government and, in the case of legislators, by the voting power of the electorate. Our business leaders are not so constrained, so, their opportunities far exceed those of any public official. Moreover, powerful business leaders all too often seem to hold de facto legislative and judicial power by way of their direct influence over public officials, as the Clinton Administration's fund-raising scandal of 1997 illuminated all too well.

The industrial and technological eras have bred such moguls of capitalism as Pullman, Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Gates, who by the nature of their industries and their business savvy, not by force of law, have transformed our economy, the nature of work, and our very day-to-day existence. Of course, many modern-day public servants have made the most of their opportunities?afor example, the crime-busting mayor Rudolph Giuliani and the new-dealing President Franklin Roosevelt. Yet their impact seems to pale next to those of our modern captains of industry.

In sum, modem business leaders by virtue of the far-reaching impact of their industries and of their freedom from external constraints, have supplanted lawmakers as the great opportunists of the world and prime movers of society.

25. Is the most effective management approach to hire the best people, then to give them as much autonomy as possible to serve the firm's goals? This strategy would certainly enhance an employee's sense of involvement, purpose and personal worth. It would also benefit the firm by encouraging employees to work creatively and productively. But the strategy requires two constraints to operative effectively.

First, the strategy must be constrained .by strong leadership that provides clear vision and direction. Simply putting the most capable people together, and letting them loose on projects will provide neither. Thinking so involves the mistaken assumption that just because the parts of a whole are good, the collection of the parts into a whole will be equally good. Business organizations are more than just the sums of their excellent parts; to be similarly excellent, the organization must also be unified and cohesive. And it is strong and visionary leadership that provides these two ingredients.

Second, the strategy must be constrained by an organizational structure that brings all individual efforts together as a coherent whole. Of course, structure can be crippling heavily layered, overly bureaucratic organizations probably stifle more creative productivity than they inspire. Still, individuals will be capable at some things and not others, so some organization of efforts is always called for. The moderate?aand perhaps optimal?aapproach would be to create a structure that gives individuals some authority across areas relating to their field of expertise, while reserving final authority for higher-level managers. For example, no individual in a finance department should have much authority over a design department. However, within the design department, individual researchers, artists, drafters, and engineers can all contribute meaningfully to one another's projects, and a flexible organizational structure would allow them to do so.

In sum, the advice to hire the best people and give them wide authority requires modification. Hiring capable people and granting them some concurrent authority across areas related to their expertise is better advice. Moreover, solid leadership and a cohesive organizational structure are prerequisites?aboth are needed to coordinate individual efforts toward the accomplishment of common goals.

26. In retail, or "storefront," business, location is still a key ingredient of business success. The extent to which this will continue to be true, given the inexorable growth of Internet commerce, will vary among industries.
In more traditional retail sectors, such as clothing, cosmetics, and home improvement, an in-person visit to a retail store is often necessary?ato try on clothes for fit, compare fragrances, or browse among a full selection of textures, colors, and styles. Also, activities such as shopping and dining out are for many consumers enjoyable experiences in themselves, as well as excuses to get out of the house and mingle with others in their community. Finally, shipping costs for large items such as appliances and home-improvement items render home shopping impracticable. Thus, burgeoning technologies pose no serious threat to Main Street, and location will continue to play a pivotal role in the fate of many retail businesses.
Nevertheless, technology-related industries are sure to move away from physical storefronts to virtual ones. Products that can be reduced to digital "bits and bites," such as books and magazines, recordings, and software applications, are more efficiently distributed electronically. Computer hardware will not disappear from Main Street quite so quickly, though, since its physical look and feel enters into the buying decision. Computer superstores should continue to thrive alongside companies such as Dell, which does not distribute through retail stores.
In conclusion, consumer demand for convenient location will continue with respect to certain tangible products, while for other products alternative distribution systems will gradually replace the storefront, rendering location an obsolete issue.-

27. I agree that job satisfaction is an important factor in determining whether a company will be successful in the long term. However, other factors typically play just as vital a role in the ultimate success or failure of a business. At the same time, job security is becoming decidedly unimportant for many employees and, in any event, often leads to substandard job performance.
I agree that business success is more likely when employees feel satisfied with their lobs. Employees who dislike the workplace or their jobs are not likely to reach their potential performance levels; they may tend to arrive late for work, perform their tasks in an unimaginative and sluggish manner, or take excessive sick leaves. Nevertheless, a firm's long-term success may equally result from other factors such as finding a market niche for products, securing a reputation for quality products and services, or forming a synergistic alliance with a competitor. This list hardly exhausts all the factors that can contribute to a firm's ultimate success, and no one of them?a including job satisfaction?ais pivotal in every case.
While job satisfaction clearly boosts employee morale and contributes to the overall success of a company, the same cannot be said for job security. Admittedly an employee worried about how secure his or her job is might be less creative or productive as a result. By the same token, however, too much confidence in the security of one's job can foster complacency, which, in turn, may diminish employees' creativity and productivity. Moreover, many employees actually place job security relatively low on the list of what they want in a job. In fact, more and more workers today are positively uninterested in long-term job security; instead, they are joining firms for the sole purpose of accomplishing near-term professional goals, then leaving to face the next challenge.
To sum up, the claim at issue overrates the importance of job satisfaction and security by identifying them as the key factors in a company's long-term success. Job

satisfaction among employees is very important, but it is not clearly more important than many other factors. At the same time, job security is clearly less important, and even unimportant in some cases.

28. This argument is untenable for two reasons. First, the claim that high-quality ads are used to promote tow-quality products is unsupported empirically and by common sense. Second, undue attention by schools to consumerism is unnecessary and inappropriate, especially for younger students.
Regarding the first reason, empirical evidence does not suggest that high-quality advertising is used to promote low-quality products. To the contrary, companies that produce low-quality products seem to resort to low-budget, poor-quality ads, especially in broadcast media. Firms that take pride in the quality of their products are far more likely also to produce ads they can be proud of. Furthermore, high-quality products are more likely to succeed in the marketplace and thereby generate the revenues needed to ensure high production value in advertising.
As for the second reason, it is not the job of our schools to breed legions of smart shoppers. Teachers should devote class time to examining the market place of ideas, no that of consumer goods and services, which students spend sufficient time examining outside the classroom. Admittedly consumerism and advertising may be appropriate topics for college-level marketing and psychology courses. However, "undue focus on media and materialism may give younger students a distortedly harrow view of the world as little more than a flea market. Additionally, revealing the deceptive side of the advertising business may breed unhealthy cynicism among youngsters, who need positive messages, not negative ones, during their formative years.
In sum, the premise that high-quality ads tout low-quality products is specious at best; in any event, for schools to provide extensive training in consumerism would be to assign them an inappropriate role and to foster in impressionable minds a distortedly narrow and unhealthy view of the world.

29. This advice means fundamentally that if we focus our attention on the details of a project rather than on the end product, the result will be better than if we proceed the other way around. Admittedly, this advice has some merit; by focusing on the details at hand one is less likely to become discouraged by the daunting or overwhelming tasks ahead in an ambitious project. Otherwise, however, I think this advice is poor,
The central problem with this advice is that focusing attention completely on the task at hand without reference to how that task is related to the end product would be virtually impossible to do. The reason for this is simple. Without some reference to a goal or a result we would have no idea of what task to perform in the first place. As a result, the various tasks we engage in would be somewhat random and, in turn, no matter how diligent and careful we were in performing them the likelihood of producing worthwhile or successful end products would be minimal.
To ensure good results, one should instead take a balanced approach to the task at hand. By a balanced approach I mean paying attention to both the desired result and the specific tasks that are required to achieve it. House building provides a good example of this approach. The house plan not only contains a rendering of the finished product but also contains detailed drawings and descriptions of each of the specific components required to ensure a successful result. Moreover, the order of the tasks is determined with reference to this result. In my estimation, virtually all successful projects proceed in the fashion illustrated in this example.

In sum, I don't think that the advice offered in the statement is worth following. In my view, following this advice is more likely to produce unsuccessful results than successful ones.

30. According to this statement, companies would be well advised to discourage employees from working overtime or from taking projects home, since employees are more productive when they return to the job after a break from their work. While I agree with this policy in general, on some occasions the company stands to benefit more from asking employees to forego leisure time than from insisting they be rested and refreshed when they come to work.

In the normal course of business operations, companies benefit when they discourage employees from putting in long hours or from taking work home. Breaks from work provide opportunities to enjoy outside interests and activities, and to spend important time with friends and family. Employees who make time for relationships and leisure activities will find that they return to the job refreshed and with new perspectives on the challenges they face at work. Both of these factors contribute to clearer focus on the task at hand and greater efficiency.

At the same time, every organization is familiar with the press of crucial deadlines and other crisis situations. At such times a company should call upon employees to work overtime, and even to take projects home, especially when doing so might make the difference between the business' success or failure. Moreover, it is in the company's best interest to reward the devoted worker accordingly?anot in order to encourage workaholic habits but rather to foster good will and loyalty.

In sum, I agree that encouraging employees to make a habit of working after hours or taking work home is generally counterproductive for an enterprise. Nevertheless, in exceptional situations, especially where the company is at great risk, calling on employees to forego their ordinary schedules and to work overtime is well justified.

31. Financial gain is certainly one factor to consider when selecting a career. But many people do not, and should not, focus on this factor as the main one. The role that money plays in career choice should depend on the priorities, goals and values of the particular person making the choice.

The main problem with selecting a career primarily on the basis of money is that for many people to do so would be to ignore one's personal values, needs, and larger life goals. Indeed, many people appreciate this notion when they choose their career. For example, some people join one of the helping professions, such as nursing, teaching or social work, well aware that their career will not be financially lucrative, Their choice properly stems from an overriding altruistic desire, not from an interest in financial gain. Others choose to pursue intellectual or creative fulfillment?aas writers, artists, or musicians?aknowing that they are trading off dollars for non-tangible rewards. Still others forego economic gain to work as full-time parents; for these people, family and children are of paramount importance in life. Finally, many people subordinate economic prospects to their desire to live in a particular location; these people may place a high value on recreation, their physical health, or being near a circle of friends.

Another problem with focusing primarily on money when selecting a career is that it ignores the notion that making money is not an end in end of itself, but rather a means of obtaining material goods and services and of attaining important goals?asuch as providing security for oneself and one's family, lifelong learning, or freedom to travel or to pursue hobbies. Acknowledging the distinction, one may nevertheless select a career on the basis of money?asince more money can buy more goods and services as well as the security, freedom, and time to enjoy them. Even so, one must strike a balance, for if these things that money is supposed to provide are sacrificed in the pursuit of money itself, the point of having money?aand of one's career selection?ahas been lost.

In conclusion, economic gain should not be the overriding factor in selecting a career. While for a few people the single-minded pursuit of wealth may be fulfillment enough, most people should, and indeed do, temper the pursuit of wealth against other values, goals, and priorities. Moreover, they recognize that money is merrily a means to more important objectives, and that the pursuit itself may undermine the achievement of these objectives.

32. In order to determine whether advertisements reflect a nation's ideas, it is necessary to determine whether advertisements present real ideas at all, and, if so, whose ideas they actually reflect. On both counts, it appears that advertisements fail to accurately mirror a nation's ideas.

Indisputably, advertisements inform us as to a nation's values, attitudes, and priorities?awhat activities are worthwhile, what the future holds, and what is fashionable and attractive. For instance, a proliferation of ads for sport-utility vehicles reflects a societal concern more for safety and machismo than for energy conservation and frugality, while a plethora of ads for inexpensive on-line brokerage services reflects an optimistic and perhaps irrationally exuberant economic outlook. However, a mere picture of a social more, outlook, or fashion is not an "idea"?ait does not answer questions such as "why" and "how"?

Admittedly, public-interest advertisements do present ideas held by particular segments of society?afor example, those of environmental and other public-health interest groups. However, these ads constitute a negligible percentage of all advertisements, and they do not necessarily reflect the majority's view. Consequently, to assert that advertisements reflect a nation's ideas distorts reality. In truth, they mirror only the business and product ideas of companies whose goods and services are advertised and the creative ideas of advertising firms. Moreover, advertisements look very much the same in all countries. Western and Eastern alike. Does this suggest that all nations have essentially identical ideas? Certainly not.

In sum, the few true ideas we might see in advertisements are those of only a few business concerns and interest groups; they tell us little about the ideas of a nation as a whole.

33. People are more likely to accept the leadership of those who have shown they can perform the same tasks they require of others. My reasons for this view involve the notions of respect and trust.

It is difficult for people to fully respect a leader who cannot, or will not, do what he or she asks of others. President Clinton's difficulty in his role as Commander-in-Chief serves as a fitting and very public example. When Clinton assumed this leadership position, it was well known that he had evaded military service during the Vietnam conflict. Military leaders and lower-level personnel alike made it clear that they did not respect his leadership as a result. Contrast the Clinton case with that of a business leader such as John Chambers, CEO of Cisco Systems, who by way of his training and experience as a computer engineer earned the respect of his employees.

It is likewise difficult to trust leaders who do not have experience in the areas under their leadership. The Clinton example illustrates this point as well. Because President Clinton Sacked military experience, people in the armed forces found it difficult to trust that his policies would reflect any understanding of their interests or needs. And when put to the test, he undermined their trust to an even greater extent with his naive and largely bungled attempt to solve the problem of gays in the military. In stark contrast, President Dwight Eisenhower inspired nearly devotional trust as well as respect because of his role as a military hero in World War II.

In conclusion, it will always be difficult for people to accept leaders who lack demonstrated ability in the areas under their leadership. Initially, such leaders will be regarded as outsiders, and treated accordingly. Moreover, some may never achieve the insider status that inspires respect and trust from those they hope to lead.

34. The potential benefits of mandatory public service must be weighed against administrative problems and concerns about individual liberty. On balance, the costs to a nation and to the participants would probably exceed the benefits.

Admittedly, a colorable argument can be made for mandatory public service. It would help alleviate "free-rider" problems, where those who do not contribute benefit from the efforts of those who do. It would mitigate pressing social problems?awith education, public health and safety, and the environment. It might instill in participants a sense of civic duty, community, and individual responsibility. Finally, it has worked on a smaller scale, particularly in urban areas, where renewal projects succeed in making communities safer, healthier, and more prosperous.

Far more compelling, however, are the arguments against mandatory public service. First, who would make assignments and decide what projects are worthwhile, and how would compliance be assured? Resolving enforcement issues would require government control, in turn requiring increased taxes and/or cuts in other social programs, thereby nullifying the benefits of mandatory public service. Second, a mandatory system would open the floodgates to incompetence and inexperience. Finally, the whole notion seems tantamount to Communism insofar as each citizen must contribute, according to his or her ability, to a strong state. Modern history informs us that such systems do not work. One could argue that mandatory public service is simply a tax in the form of labor rather than dollars. However, compulsory labor smacks of involuntary servitude, whereas financial taxes do not.

In conclusion, logistical and philosophical barriers to mandating public service outweigh its potential benefits for the nation as well as for participants.

35. I agree with the speaker that decisions and actions of businesses are too often "infected" by short sighted motives. Admittedly, attention to immediate results and short-term goals may be critical, and healthy, for survival of a fledgling company. However, for most established businesses, especially large corporations, failure to adequately envision the long-term implications of their actions for themselves and for others is all-too common and appropriately characterized as a "disease."

The business world is replete with evidence that companies often fail to envision the long-term implications of their actions for themselves. Businesses assume excessive debt to keep up with booming business, ignoring the possibility of a future slowdown and resulting forfeiture or bankruptcy. Software companies hastily develop new products to cash in on this year's fad, ignoring bugs and glitches in their programs that ultimately drive customers away. And manufacturers of inherently dangerous products cut safety corners to enhance short-term profits, failing to see the future implications:

class action liability suits, criminal sanctions, and shareholder revolts.
Similarly, businesses fail to see implications of their actions for others. Motivated only by the immediate bottom line, movie studios ignore the deleterious effects that movie violence and obscenity may have on their patrons and on the society at large. Captains of the energy industry pay lip service to environmental ramifications of unbridled energy use for future generations, while their real concern is with ensuring near-term dependence on the industry's products or services. And manufacturers of dangerous products do a long-term disservice to others, of course, by cutting corners in safety and health.
In sum, I think the criticism that businesses are too concerned with immediate results and not concerned enough with the long-term effects of their actions and decisions is for the most part a fair assessment of modern-day business.

36. The relationship between teamwork and individual strength, energy, and commitment is complex; whether they operate in a complementary or antagonistic manner depends on: (1) the goals toward which the traits are directed, (2) the degree of emphasis on teamwork, and (3) the job of the individual within an organization.
A person's ability to work effectively in a team is not in consistent per se with personal strength, energy, and commitment. If exercised in a self-serving manngr?afor example, through pilfering or back stabbing?athese traits can operate against the organization. Conversely, if directed toward the firm's goals, these traits can motivate other team members, thereby advancing common goals. World War II generals Patton and Rommel understood this point and knew how to bring out the best individual qualities in their troops, while at the same time instilling a strong sense of team and common purpose.
Nevertheless, over-emphasizing teamwork can be counterproductive for an organization. A successful team requires both natural leaders and natural followers; otherwise, a team will accomplish little. Undue emphasis on teamwork may quell initiative among natural leaders, thereby thwarting team goals. Also, teamwork can be overemphasized with a commissioned sales force of highly competitive and autonomic individuals. Overemphasis on teamwork here might stifle healthy competition, thereby defeating a firm's objectives. In other organizational areas, however, teamwork is critical. For example, a product-development team must progress in lock-step fashion toward common goals, such as meeting a rollout deadline.
In sum, individual strength, commitment, and energy can complement a strong team approach; as long as individual autonomy is not undermined, all can operate in a synergistic manner to achieve an organization's goals.

37. Because scientific knowledge is increasingly important in our technological world and in the practical world of jobs and careers, schools should devote sufficient time to teaching mathematics and science. This is not to say, however, that schools should devote less time to the arts or humanities. To the contrary, in a technological age the study of arts and humanities is probably more important than ever?afor three reasons.
First of all, studying the arts and humanities can help students become better mathematicians and scientists. For example, recent studies of cognitive development show that studying music at an early age can strengthen a child's later grasp of mathematics. And understanding philosophical concepts has helped scientists recognize their own presuppositions, and frame their central questions more accurately.
Secondly, studying the creative and intellectual achievement of others helps

inspire our own creativity and intellectual questioning. This is particularly important in an era dominated by technology, where we run a serious risk of becoming automatons who fit neatly into the efficient functioning of some system.
Finally, technology is valuable as an efficient means to our important goals. But neither technology, nor the science on which it is founded, decides which goals are best, or judges the moral value of the means we choose for their attainment. We need the liberal arts to help us select worthwhile ends and ethical means.
In conclusion, schools should not devote less time to the arts and humanities.
These areas of study augment and enhance learning in mathematics and science, as well as helping to preserve the richness of our entire human legacy while inspiring us to further it. Moreover, disciplines within the humanities provide methods and contexts for evaluating the morality of our technology and for determining its proper direction.

38. The speaker claims that simple courtesy and good manners are disappearing from modern life, and that the quality of our lives is therefore deteriorating. While I do encounter frequent instances of discourtesy and bad manners, I also encounter many instances of the opposite behavior. For this reason, and because negative experiences tend to be more memorable and newsworthy, I find the speaker's claim to be dubious.
Most people encounter multiple instances of ordinary courtesy and good manners every day?asimple acts such as smokers asking whether anyone minds if they light up, people letting others with fewer items ahead in grocery-store lines, and freeway drivers switching lanes to accommodate faster drivers or those entering via on-ramps.
Admittedly, most people also encounter discourtesy or poor manners on a daily basis?a people using obscene language in public places where young children are present, and business associates intentionally ignoring phone calls, to name a few. However, such acts do not prove that good manners and courtesy are disappearing; they simply show that both courtesy and discourtesy abound in everyday life. Thus the claim that courtesy and good manners are disappearing grossly distorts reality.
Another -reason that the claim is suspect is that we tend to remember negative encounters with people more so than positive ones, probably because bad experiences tend to be more traumatic and sensational, if not more interesting to talk about. The news stories that the media chooses to focus on certainly support this rationale.
However the fact that we remember, hear about, and read about discourtesy more than about courtesy shows neither that discourtesy is increasing nor that courtesy is decreasing. It simply shows that negative experiences leave "stranger impressions and tend to be more sensational. In fact, I suspect that if one were to tally up one's daily encounters with both types of behavior, one would conclude that good manners and courtesy are far more prevalent than the opposite behavior.
In conclusion, the speaker's claim that common courtesy and good manners are disappearing is not born out by everyday experience. I suspect the speaker has failed to consider that negative experiences leave stronger impressions on our memory and are more interesting to relate to others than positive ones.

39. Are professional success and a fulfilling personal life mutually exclusive?
Probably not, although it is more difficult today to achieve both.
Undeniably, today's professionals must work long hours to keep their heads above water, let alone to get ahead in life financially. This is especially true in Japan, where cost of living, coupled with corporate culture, compel professional males to all but abandon their families and literally to work themselves to death. While the situation

here in the states may not be as critical, the two-income family is now the norm, not by choice but by necessity.

However, our society's professionals are taking steps to remedy the problem. First, they are inventing ways?asuch as job sharing and telecommuting?ato ensure that personal life does not take a backseat to career. Second, they are setting priorities and living those hours outside the workplace to the fullest. In fact, professional success usually requires the same time-management skills that are useful to find time for family, hobbies, and recreation. One need only look at the recent American presidents--Clinton, Bush, Reagan, and Carter?ato see that it is possible to lead a balanced life which includes time for family, hobbies, and recreation, while immersed in a busy and successful career. Third, more professionals are changing careers to ones which allow for some degree of personal fulfillment and self-actualization. Besides, many professionals truly love their work and would do it without compensation, as a hobby. For them, professional fulfillment and personal fulfillment are one and the same.

In conclusion, given the growing demands of career on today's professionals, a fulfilling personal life remains possible by working smarter, by setting priorities, and by making suitable career choices.

40. With the growth of the global economy and the need for international cooperation, every human being has assumed a role as citizen of the world. Does this mean that our roles as citizens of our respective nations are thereby superseded by our role as world citizens, as the speaker suggests? Not at all. Good citizenship at one level is often compatible with good citizenship at another. In fact, being a good citizen in one social domain can help one be a better citizen in another.

Good global citizenship is not incompatible with good citizenship at other levels. Consider, for example, one's efforts as a citizen to preserve the natural environment. One particular person might, for example: (1) lobby legislators to enact laws preserving an endangered redwood forest, (2) campaign for nationally-elected officials who support clean air laws, and (3) contribute to international rainforest preservation organizations. This one person would be acting consistently as a citizen of community, state, nation and world.

Admittedly, conflicting obligations sometimes arise as a result of our new "dual" citizenship. For example, a U.S. military official with an advisory role in a United Nations peace-keeping force might face conflicting courses of action?aone that would secure U.S. military interests, and another that would better serve international interests. However, the fact that such a conflict exists does not mean that either action is automatically more obligatory?athat is, that one's role as either U.S. citizen or world citizen must invariably supersede the other. Instead, this situation should be resolved by carefully considering and weighing the consequences of each course of action.

Moreover, being a good citizen in one social context can often help one be a better citizen in another. For example, volunteering to help underprivileged children in one's community might inspire one to work for an international child-welfare organization. And inculcating civic values?asuch as charity and civic pride?amay give rise to personal traits of character that transfer to all social domains and contexts.

In sum, although our "dual" citizenship may at times lead to conflicts, one role need not automatically take precedence over the other. Moreover, the relationship between the two roles is, more often than not, a complementary one?aand can even be synergistic.

41. Imposing heavy penalties on those who pollute or destroy the environment is one way to preserve our environment. But it is not the only way; nor is it the best way. Penalties may elicit grudging compliance, but other approaches?athose that instill a sense of genuine commitment?aare likely to be more effective in the long term.
Admittedly, motivating compliance with environmental regulations by way of penalties will serve environmental goals up to a point. The deterrent effect of these remedies cannot be denied. Yet it should not be overstated. Some businesses may attempt to avoid punishment by concealing their activities, bribing (lobbying) legislators to modify regulations, or moving operations to jurisdictions that allow their environmentally harmful activities. Others might calculate the trade-off between accepting punishment and polluting, budget in advance for anticipated penalties, then openly violate the law. My intuition is that this practice is a standard operating mode among some of our largest manufacturers.
A better way to ensure environmental protection is to inculcate a sense of genuine commitment into our corporate culture?athrough education and through shareholder involvement. When key corporate executives become committed to values, the regulations associated with those values become a codification of conscience rather than obstacles to circumvent. The machinations and maneuverings described earlier will thereby be supplanted by thoughtful concern about all the implications of one's actions. Moreover, commitment-driven actions are likely to benefit the environment over and above what the law requires. For example, while a particular regulation might permit a certain amount of toxic effluents, businesses committed to environmental protection may avoid harmful emissions altogether.
Instilling a genuine sense of commitment through education and shareholder action is not just a better approach in theory, it is also less costly overall than a compliance-driven approach. Regulatory systems inherently call for legislative committees, investigations and enforcement agencies, all of which adds to the tax burden of the citizens whom these regulations are designed to protect. Also, delays typically associated with bureaucratic regulation may thwart the purpose of the regulations, since environmental problems can quickly become very grave.
In sum, penalties for violating environmental-protection laws are essentially expensive band-aids. A commitment-based approach, involving education and shareholder activism, can instill in corporate culture a sense an environmental conscience, resulting in far more effective environmental protection.

42. The speaker argues that because scientists continually shift viewpoints about how our actions affect the natural environment, companies should not change their products and processes according to scientific recommendations until the government requires them to do so. This argument raises complex issues about the duties of business and about regulatory fairness and effectiveness. Although a wait-and-see policy may help companies avoid costly and unnecessary changes, three countervailing considerations compel me to disagree overall with the argument.
First, a regulatory system of environmental protection might not operate equitably. At first glance, a wait-and-see response might seem fair in that all companies would be subject to the same standards and same enforcement measures. However, enforcement requires detection, and while some violators may be caught, others might not. Moreover, a broad regulatory system imposes general standards that may not apply equitably to every company. Suppose, for example, that pollution from a company in a valley does more damage to the environment than similar pollution from a company on the coast. It would seem unfair to require the coastal company to invest as heavily in abatement or,

in the extreme, to shut down the operation if the company cannot afford abatement measures.
Secondly, the argument assumes that the government regulations will properly reflect scientific recommendations. However, this claim is somewhat dubious. Companies with the most money and political influence, not the scientists, might in some cases dictate regulatory standards. In other words, legislators may be more influenced by political expediency and campaign pork than by societal concerns.
Thirdly, waiting until government regulations are in place can have disastrous effects on the environment. A great deal of environmental damage can occur before regulations are implemented. This problem is compounded whenever government reaction to scientific evidence is slow. Moreover, the EPA might be overburdened with its detection and enforcement duties, thereby allowing continued environmental damage by companies who have not yet been caught or who appeal penalties.
In conclusion, despite uncertainty within the scientific community about what environmental standards are best, companies should not wait for government regulation before reacting to warnings about environmental problems. The speaker's recommended approach would in many cases operate inequitably among companies: moreover, it ignores the political-corruption factor as well as the potential environmental damage resulting from bureaucratic delay.

43. Examining history makes us better people insofar as it helps us to understand our world. It would seem, therefore, that history would also provide useful clues for dealing with the same social ills that have plagued societies throughput history. On balance, however, the evidence suggests otherwise.
Admittedly, history has helped us learn the appropriateness of addressing certain issues, particularly moral ones, on a societal level. Attempts to legislate morality invariably fail, as illustrated by Prohibition in the 1930s and, more recently, failed federal legislation to regulate access to adult material via the Internet. We are slowly learning this lesson, as the recent trend toward legalization of marijuana for medicinal purposes and the recognition of equal rights for same-sex partners both demonstrate.
However, the overriding lesson from history about social ills is that they are here to stay. Crime and violence, for example, have troubled almost every society. All manner of reform, prevention, and punishment have been tried. Today, the trend appears to be away from reform toward a "tough-on-crime" approach. Is this because history makes clear that punishment is the most effective means of eliminating crime? No; rather, the trend merely reflects current mores, attitudes, and political climate. Also undermining the assertion that history helps us to solve social problems is the fact that, despite the civil-rights efforts of Martin Luther King and his progenies, the cultural gap today between African-Americans and white Americans seems to be widening. It seems that racial prejudice is here to stay. A third example involves how we deal with the mentally ill segment of the population. History reveals that neither quarantine, nor treatment or accommodation solves the problem, only that each approach comes with its own tradeoffs.
To sum up, while history can teach us lessons about our social problems, more often than not the lesson is that there are no solutions to many social problems?aonly alternate ways of coping with them.

44. The speaker claims that high-quality ads can sell almost anything, and that companies should accordingly invest heavily in such advertising. I agree that the quality

of an ad can in some instances play a pivotal role in a product's success or failure in the marketplace. However, the speaker over-generalizes, for advertising is far more critical in some businesses and for some products than for others.

Certain types of businesses benefit greatly from investing in high-quality advertising. Fledgling companies, for example, may require an extensive top-notch advertising campaign to achieve the name recognition that older competitors already enjoy. Even established companies may need an expensive ad campaign. When introducing new products or venturing into new markets. Companies selling products that are no utilitarian value perhaps stand to gain the most from an extensive high-quality advertising effort. Consider, for example, the kinds of products that are marketed by means of the most extensive and expensive advertising: beer, cigarettes, soft drinks, and cosmetics. None of these products has any utility. Their success depends on consumers' fickle tastes, their emotions, and their subjective perceptions. Accordingly, influencing consumer attitudes through popular and appealing ads is about the only way to increase sales of such products.

In some industries, however, substantial-investment in high-quality advertising simply does not make sense from a cost-effectiveness viewpoint. Pharmaceutical companies, for example, might be better off limiting their advertising to specialized publications, and focus instead on other kinds of promotional programs, such as the distribution of free samples. And widespread, flashy advertising would probably have a limited effect on overall sales for companies such as Deere and Caterpillar, whose name recognition and long-standing reputations for quality products are well established and whose customers are unlikely to be swayed by sensational ads.

In sum, the speaker over-generalizes. Not all companies have an equal need to invest heavily in high-quality advertising. Companies with new products and products that have little utility stand to benefit most from expensive, high-quality advertising. But other companies, especially those whose customers are businesses rather than consumers, would be better off focusing on product quality and reputation, not on sensational advertising.

45. The speaker claims that following high ethical standards is the best way to maximize profits in the long run. However, this claim seems to be more of a normative statement than an empirical observation. The issue is more complex than the speaker suggests. In my observation, the two objectives at times coincide but at other times conflict.

In many ways behaving ethically can benefit a business. Ethical conduct will gain a company good reputation that earns repeated business. Treating suppliers, customers and others fairly is likely to result in their reciprocating. Finally, a company that treats its employees fairly and with respect will gain their loyalty which, in turn, usually translates into higher productivity.

On the other hand, taking the most ethical course of action may in many cases reduce profits, in the short run and beyond. Consider the details of a merger in which both firms hope to profit from a synergy gained thereby. If the details of the merger hinge on the ethical conviction that as few employees as possible should lose their jobs, the key executives may lose sight of the fact that a leaner, less labor-intensive organization might be necessary for long-term survival. Thus, undue concern with ethics in this case would results in lower profits and perhaps ultimate business failure.

This merger scenario points out a larger argument that the speaker misses entirely?athat profit maximization is per se the highest ethical objective in private business. Why? By maximizing profits, businesses bestow a variety of important benefits on their community and on society: they employ more people, stimulate the economy, and enhance healthy competition. In short, the profit motive is the key to ensuring that the members of a free market society survive and thrive. While this argument might ignore implications for the natural environment and for socio-economic justice, it is a compelling argument nonetheless.

Thus the choice to follow high ethical standards should not be made by thinking that ethical conduct is profitable. While in some cases a commitment to high ethical standards might benefit a company financially, in many cases it will not. In the final analysis, businesses might best be advised to view their attempts to maximize profits as highly ethical behavior.

46. Contrary to the statement's premise, my view is that businesses are less likely than government to establish large bureaucracies, because businesses know that they are more vulnerable than government to damage resulting from bureaucratic inefficiencies. My position is well supported by common sense and by observation.

First, public administrators lack the financial incentives to avoid bureaucratic waste. In contrast, inefficiencies in a private corporation will reduce profits, inflicting damage in the form of job cuts, diminishing common-stock value, and reducing employee compensation. These are ample incentives for the private firm to minimize bureaucratic waste.

Second, there is almost no accountability among government bureaucrats. The electorate's voting power is too indirect to motivate mid-level administrators, whose salaries and jobs rarely depend on political elections. In contrast, private corporations must pay strict attention to efficiency, since their shareholders hold an immediate power to sell their stock, thereby driving down the company's market value.

Third, government is inherently monopolistic, large, and unwieldy; these features breed bureaucracy. Admittedly some corporations rival state governments in size. Yet even among the largest companies, the profit motive breeds a natural concern for trimming waste, cutting costs, and streamlining operations. Even virtual monopolies strive to remain lean and nimble in order to maintain a distance from upstart competitors. When government pays lip service to efficiency, shrewd listeners recognize this as political rhetoric designed only to pander to the electorate.

In the final analysis, financial incentives, accountability, and competition all distinguish private business from government, both in teems of their likelihood of establishing large bureaucracies and in terms of the damage that these bureaucracies can inflict on the organization.

47. The responsibility for preventing environmental damage should be shared by government, private industry and individuals alike. The primary obligation, however, belongs to individuals. Moreover, within organizations like the government or a corporation, responsibility should be increasingly distributed to individuals according to level of authority.

The primary obligation to preserve the environment belongs to individuals for the reason that assigning responsibility to a government or corporation is problematic. This is because abstract entities like these do not fulfill the usual criteria for being responsible. An entity can shoulder responsibility only if it can be held accountable for its actions. Furthermore, being held accountable for an action requires that the entity act willingly and on the basis of conscious intentions. But governments and businesses are abstractions, having neither will nor consciousness beyond that of the individuals within

them.
Still, we can make some sense of treating corporations and governments as if they were individuals. They are individuals under the law, and therefore subject to laws, penalties, and lawsuits. They can even be identified as beneficiaries in wills. Nevertheless, when responsibility is vaguely allocated to abstract entities like governments or corporations, it becomes easy for those within such organizations to cover individual actions that result in devastation to the environment. Consider the famous case of the Exxon Valdez accident and oil spill off the Alaskan coast. While it was easy to single out Captain Hazelwood and determine his blameworthiness the night of the mishap, it was not so easy to identify those responsible at higher levels. Someone was responsible for hiring Hazelwood; others should have known about his drinking or other job-related problems. Thus when we do assign responsibility to governments or business organizations, it must be clearly distributed to individuals in relevant lines of authority within the organization.
In conclusion, individuals are mainly responsible for protecting the environment. And while it makes some sense in a vague way to talk about the similar responsibilities of government and industry, in the end such obligations will belong to individuals within them. Therefore, some individuals will assume greater shares of responsibility for the environment, since they act in positions of authority on behalf of government or industry.

48. In the hiring process, it is more difficult to assess personality and work habits than to determine work experience and educational background. Even so, it is important to try and judge the less quantifiable characteristics of a prospective colleague or employee?asuch as honesty, reliability, creativity, self-motivation, and the capacity to get along and work well with others. If it doesn't seem obvious that these are important qualities in a coworker, then consider the alternatives.
First of all, dishonest or unreliable workers harm an organization in many ways. Dishonest employees impose costs on a company whether they steal on the grand or small scale: jus; taking a few days of unwarranted sick leave here and there can add up to significant lost productivity. And lying about progress on a project can result in missed deadlines and even lost contracts. Unreliability works the same way; if an employee cannot meet deadlines or fails to appear at important meetings, the organization will suffer accordingly.
In addition, coworkers who lack motivation or creativity take some of the life out of an organization. To the extent that employees simply plug along, the company will be less productive In contrast, employees who have imagination and the motivation to implement ideas are productive and can spark those around them to greater achievement.
Finally, employees who cannot get along with or work well with others can as well be detrimental to the organization. The mere presence of a troublemaker is disruptive; moreover, the time such people spend on petty disagreements is time away from getting the job done successfully. In addition, those who cannot smoothly coordinate their efforts with others will end up making things more difficult for everyone else.'
In conclusion, it may not be easy to Judge the personality traits and work habits of prospective employees, but it certainly is worth the effort to try. Having coworkers who are honest, reliable, creative, self-motivated, compatible with one another and good team players will greatly enhance everyone's work life, and benefit a organization In the most significant way?awith greater productivity.

49. There is no doubt that hard work contributes to success. Yet a person can work awfully hard and still achieve very little. In order to bring about success, hard work has to be directed by dear goals and the knowledge of how to reach them. Moreover, imagination, intelligence and persistence can be equally important to success.
Individual success is gauged by the extent to which one reaches his important personal goals. And it takes careful planning to set goals and discover the best means of realizing them. Before hard work even begins, therefore, considerable time and effort should be spent on planning.
Intelligence and imagination play important roles in planning. Imagination helps one to envision new solutions to problems, and new means by which to achieve goals. Intelligence helps one research and critically evaluate the possibilities that imagination has provided. Together, imagination and intelligence can even help one avoid certain kinds of hard work, by producing more efficient ways to accomplish 'goals.
Finally, persistence is crucial to success. Sometimes, rewards do not come quickly?aeven when one carefully sets the goals, creatively and intelligently plans ways to achieve them, and work hard according to plan. Tradition has it, for example, that Thomas Edison made thousands of attempts to create a light bulb before he finally succeeded. In the face of countless failures, he refused to quit. In fact, he considered each failure a successful discovery of what not to do!
In conclusion, it is true that there is no substitute for hard work. But hard work is an ingredient of success, and not the key. Hard work can produce real accomplishment only if it is directed by a plan involving some idea of one's goals and the means to them. And a good plan, as well as its successful implementation, requires imagination, intelligence, and persistence.

50. Unsatisfactory employee performance demands appropriate response from a manager or supervisor. The question is what is appropriate? Some managers might claim that verbal abuse and intimidation are useful in getting employees to improve. While this may be true in exceptional cases, my view is that the best managerial responses generally fulfill two criteria; (1) they are respectful: and (2) they are likely to be the most effective in the long run.
Treating employees with respect is important in all contexts. Respect, in the most basic sense, involves treating a person as equal in importance to oneself. For a manager or supervisor, this means recognizing that occupying a subordinate position does not make a worker a lesser person. And it means treating subordinates as one would want to be treated?ahonestly and fairly. Using threats or verbal abuse to elicit better employee performance amounts to treating a worker like the office copy machine?aas an object from which to get what one wants.
Moreover, while verbal abuse might produce the desired reaction at a particular time, it is likely to backfire later. Nobody likes to be abused or intimidated. If such methods were the general practice in an office or division, overall morale would probably be low. And it is unlikely that employees would give 100 percent to managers who so obviously disregarded them.
More beneficial in the long run would be careful but clear feedback to the worker about specific deficiencies, along with ideas and encouragement about improvement. In addition, supervisors should allow employees to explain the problem from their point of view and to suggest solutions. Of course, a supervisor should never mislead a subordinate into thinking that major problems with work performance are insignificant or tolerable. Still, an honest message can be sent without threats or assaults on self-

esteem.
In conclusion, supervisors should avoid using verbal abuse and threats. These methods degrade subordinates, and they are unlikely to produce the best results in the long run. It is more respectful, and probably more effective overall, to handle cases of substandard work performance with clear, honest and supportive feedback.

51. We ordinarily think, as the speaker does here, that the presence of competition is always healthy for business because it sparks efficiency and innovation. While competition is generally good for business in these respects, the speaker here ignores the many problems that can accrue from attempting to keep up with or beat a competitor, and that may be decidedly detrimental to a business.
Admittedly, competition among businesses can occasion all sorts of improved - practices. The need for competitive product pricing can motivate effective micro-management of production and marketing costs. Competition for market share can spark invention and innovation in product design that lead to the cutting edge of technology. External competition is known to inspire team spirit within an organization, thereby yielding greater productivity. And competition can challenge a company to streamline operations, thereby improving efficiency.
But taken too far, attempting to keep up with or beat competitors brings about detrimental results for a company. In some cases, companies compromise product quality by switching to inferior, less expensive materials in order to keep prices competitive. Other times, plant managers ignore important employee-safety measures just to save money. And companies are even known to trade off consumer safety in the interest of competition. Perhaps the paradigmatic case involved the Ford Pinto, where Ford management rejected an inexpensive retrofit that would have saved hundreds of lives in rear-end collisions, solely in order to shave a few dollars off the car's sticker price, thereby enhancing the car's competitiveness.
Competition can even bring about large-scale social change that some consider undesirable. For instance, the emergence of large, efficient factory farms has resulted in the virtual disappearance of family farming in the U.S. And it isn't clear that the factory farms always improve farming practices, in the case of the tomato, the old homegrown kind are far superior in taste and texture to the tough, underripe version that has been genetically engineered for machine picking in huge quantity.
In conclusion, competition frequently motivates changes that are beneficial in many ways. But competition is a double-edged sword that can also result in-inferior or unsafe products and dangerous working conditions for employees. Moreover, large competitors can swallow up smaller concerns without yielding noticeably better products or practices.

52. I agree generally that setting new goals in small increments above past accomplishments is a reliable path to achieving those goals. I think anyone would be hard-pressed to find fault with this advice. Nevertheless, in some exceptional instances, a more dramatic "leap-frog" approach may be more appropriate, or even necessary, to achieve a significant goal.
The virtues of setting goals in small, easily-attainable increments are undeniable. Overwhelming challenges are reduced to readily attainable tasks. A psychological boost is afforded by each intermediate success, helping to ensure that the achiever won't become discouraged and give up. Each step in this process can raise one's level of aspiration, and in manageable proportions that make success more likely. Moreover, this approach can be used by anyone?aa sedentary office worker who decides to complete

the New York Marathon; a paralegal who wishes to become a surgeon; or a small business owner who aspires to become CEO of a Fortune 500 Company.
In some instances, however, the step-by-step approach is not adequate. For example, many great creative achievements?ain art, music, and literature?aare made not by the achiever's disciplined setting of incremental goals, but rather by a spontaneous flash of brilliance and intense creativity. Another exception to this approach is the case of the ultra-successful actor, model, or even socialite who might suddenly leap-frog to his or her goal through serendipity. Third, for those who have already achieved great things, taking baby steps toward the next goal would only frustrate them and slow them down. Suppose, for example, a recent gold medalist in the Olympic Games' 100-meter sprint wishes to become a member the football franchise that won last year's Super Bowl. What small, incremental accomplishments are needed to achieve his goal? None, aside from a phone call by his agent to the front office of the team. Admittedly, these are exceptional cases: yet they do exist.
In conclusion, setting modest but increasingly higher goals is generally good advice. Yet this approach may be inappropriate or inadequate under certain exceptional circumstances.

53. If one focuses on systems such as financial services and telecommunications, where emerging technologies have the greatest impact, one sees increasing user-friendliness. However, in other systems?apublic and private alike?ainefficiencies, roadblocks, and other "unfriendly" features still abound. One such example is the U.S. health-care delivery system.
To a large extent, the user-unfriendly nature of health-care delivery stems from its close tie to the insurance industry. Service providers and suppliers inflate prices, knowing that insurance companies can well afford to pay by passing on inflated costs to the insured. Hospital patients are often discharged prematurely merely because insurance fails to cover in-patient care beyond a certain amount or duration. In the extreme, patients are sometimes falsely informed that they are well or cured, just so that the facility can make room for insured patients. Insurance providers reject claims and coverage intentionally and in bad faith when the insured has suffered or is statistically likely to suffer from a terminal or other long-term and costly?aillness. Insurance companies also impose extreme coverage exceptions for pre-existing conditions. Both tactics are designed, of course, to maximize insurance company profits at the expense of the system's user. Finally, new medical technologies that provide more effective diagnosis and treatment are often accessible only to the select few who can afford the most comprehensive insurance coverage.
The consequences of these user-unfriendly features can be grave indeed for the individual, since this system relates directly to a person's physical well-being and very life. For example, when a claim or coverage is wrongfully denied, lacking financial resources to enforce their rights, an individual customer has little practical recourse. The end result is to render health care inaccessible to the very individuals who need it most.
These user-unfriendly features can be deleterious on a societal scale as well. An unhealthy populace is an unproductive one. Also, increased health-care costs place an undue burden on bread-winning adults who feel the squeeze of caring for aging parents and for children. Finally, these features foster a pervasive distrust of government, big business, and bureaucracy.
In sum, today's "point-and-click" paradigm inaccurately portrays the actual functionality of many systems, including our health-care delivery system, which is well-entrenched in self-interest and insensitivity to the needs of its users.

54. Clearly, most popular films and television shows are superficial and/or include a certain amount of violence or obscenity. Just as clearly, popularity leads to commercial success. But can we conclude that these productions are overly influenced by commercial interests? Perhaps not, since some popular films and television shows are neither superficial, obscene, nor violent. Closer scrutiny, however, reveals that most such productions actually support, not disprove, the thesis that commercial interests dictate movie and television content.
One would-be threat to the thesis can be found in lower-budget independent films, which tend to focus more on character development and topical social issues than on sensationalism. Recently, a few such films have supplanted Hollywood's major studio productions as top box-office hits. Does this mean that profit potential no longer dictates the content of films. No; it simply suggests that the tastes and preferences of the movie-going public are shifting.
A second ostensible challenge to the thesis can be found in companies such as Disney, whose productions continue to achieve great popularity and commercial success, without "resort to an appeal to baser interests. Yet it is because these productions are commercially successful that they proliferate.
The only cogent challenge to the thesis is found in perennial television favorites such as "Nova." a public television show that is neither commercially supported nor influenced. However, such shows are more in the nature of education than entertainment, and for every one program like "Nova" there are several equally popular?aand highly superficial?aprograms.
With few exceptions, then, commercial success of certain films and television shows is no accidental byproduct of popularity; it is the intentional result of producers' efforts to maximize profits.

55. I agree that supervisors should under most circumstances merely tell subordinates what to do, but not necessarily how to do it. Of course, employees need adequate training in order to do a job. But beyond that, trusting employees to discover and develop their own methods for meeting a supervisor's expectations can produce surprising rewards that outweigh any pitfalls of such an approach.
First of all, restraint in directing the how-to aspect of a project signals the supervisor's confidence in an employee's intelligence and abilities. Sensing this confidence, the subordinate will often respond with his or her best work. This phenomenon lends truth to the adage that people rise to the level of what others expect from them.
Secondly, by allowing a subordinate to decide how best to attain an objective, a supervisor imparts a larger share of responsibility for the project to the subordinate. This alleviates some of the burden from the supervisor, who may have more time for other tasks as a result. At the same time, when the subordinate shares in the responsibility, he or she will probably feel more accountable for how the job turns out. The result is likely to be better job performance.
Thirdly, directing every step of a project often blocks a worker's own creativity, as well as creating animosity. Except in the training of a new worker with little or no experience, it would be naive and arrogant for any supervisor to assume there is one and only one best way--the supervisor's own way--to get a job done. A bright, competent subordinate is likely to resent being led by the hand like a child. Allowing employees to choose their own means and methods will spark their ingenuity in ways that enhance productivity now and in the future, and will foster goodwill and mutual respect in the workplace.
In sum, telling a subordinate how to do a job is rarely the best management

approach. Instead, supervisors should assign tasks without directing each step. When employees are left to choose methods for completing work, they will be bolstered by the supervisor's trust, motivated to greater creativity and inclined to feel accountable for outcomes.

56. This statement is ambiguous. It could mean, literally, that business success depends on knowing more than anyone else about one's operations, products and markets. Or it could be a subtle recommendation to acquire privileged information, by whatever means, to use for one's own advantage. I agree with the statement in the first sense. However, I strongly disagree with many implications of the second possible meaning.

It goes without saying that competitive edge in business is a function of knowledge. It is crucial to fully understand the technology and uses of one's products; and it is prudent to micromanage operations, knowing as much as possible about the small details that can add up to a significant economic difference. It is also prudent, and legitimate, to take every measure to protect that knowledge as trade secrets, since they often play a pivotal role in a firm's competitiveness.

But the advice to know something that nobody else does could easily become distorted. If taken another way, the advice could recommend that one dig up dirt in order to damage or discredit a rival. It could also be taken to recommend stealing trade secrets or other inside information from a competitor in order to gain an unfair business advantage. All of these tactics are some also violate civil and criminal laws. Moreover, the recommendation to find and use any information, even unfairly or illegally, can backfire. People who follow such advice risk civil liability, criminal prosecution, and the loss of an important business asset?atheir good reputations..

In sum, I agree with the statement up to the point that it validates detailed and even proprietary knowledge as a key to competitiveness. Insofar as the statement sanctions unfair practices, however, following it would be unethical, bad for business, and damaging to the character and reputation of the perpetrator.

57. In determining whether we are becoming more respectful of one another's differences, one must examine both overt actions and underlying motives, as well as examining whether our differences are increasing or decreasing. The issue, therefore, is quite complex, and the answer is unclear.

Disrespect for one another's differences manifests itself in various forms of prejudice and discrimination. Since the civil rights and feminist movements of the 60s and 70s, it would seem that we have made significant progress toward eliminating racial and sexual discrimination. Antidiscriminatory laws in the areas of employment, housing, and education, now protect all significant minority groups racial minorities and women, the physically challenged and, more recently, homosexuals. Movies and television shows, which for better or worse have become the cynosure of our cultural attention, now tout the rights of minorities, encouraging acceptance of and respect for others.

However, much of this progress-is forced upon us legislative. Without Title 10 and its progenies, would we voluntarily refrain from the discriminatory behavior that the laws prevent? Perhaps not. Moreover, signs of disrespect are all around us today. Extreme factions still rally around bigoted demagogues; the number of "hate crimes" is increasing alarmingly; and school-age children seem to flaunt a disrespect toward adults as never before. Finally, what appears to be respect for one another's differences may in fact be an increasing global homogeneity?athat is, we are becoming more and more

alike.
In sum, on a societal level it is difficult to distinguish between genuine respect for one another's differences on the one hand and legislated morality and increasing homogeneity on the other. Accordingly, the claim that we are becoming more respectful of one another's differences is somewhat dubious.

58. This quotation suggests that the ultimate purpose of business is to streamline and mechanize work, thereby minimizing it, so that people can make a living but still have time for other things in life. The assumptions behind this view of business are that the value of work is entirely instrumental, and that our work lives are distinct from the rest of our lives. I disagree with both assumptions.
Admittedly, work is to a large extent instrumental in that we engage in it to provide for our needs while leaving time and resources for other activities?araising families, participating in civic life, traveling, pursuing hobbies, and so forth. And these activities normally take place away from the workplace and are distinct from our work. However, for most people, work is far more than a means to these ends. It can also be engaging, enjoyable and fulfilling in itself. And it can provide a context for expressing an important pan of one's self. However, work will be less of all these to the extent that it is streamlined and mechanized for quick disposal, as the quotation recommends. Instead, our jobs will become monotonous and tedious, the work of drones. And we might become drone-like in the process.
In addition, work can to some extent be integrated with the rest of our lives. More and more companies are installing on-site daycare facilities and workout rooms. They are giving greater attention to the ambiance of the break room, and they are sponsoring family events, excursions and athletic activities for employees as never before. The notion behind this trend is that when a company provides employees with ways to fulfill outside needs and desires, employees will do better work. I think this idea has merit.
In conclusion, I admit that there is more to life than work, and that work is to some extent a means to provide a livelihood. But to suggest that this is the sole purpose of business is an oversimplification that ignores the self-actualizing significance of work, as well as the ways it can be integrated with other aspects of our lives

59. Juvenile delinquency is clearly a serious social problem. Whether businesses must become more involved in helping to prevent the problem depends, however, on the specific business--whether it is culpable in creating the problem and whether its owners' collective conscience calls for such involvement.
Although parents and schools have the most direct influence on children, businesses nonetheless exert a strong, and often negative, influence on juveniles by way of their advertisements and of the goods they choose to produce. For example, cigarette advertisements 'aimed at young people, music and clothing that legitimize "gang" sub-culture, and toys depicting violence, all sanction juvenile delinquency. In such cases perhaps the business should be obligated to mitigate its own harmful actions?afor example, by sponsoring community youth organizations or by producing public-interest ads.
In other cases, however, imposing on a business a duty to help solve juvenile delinquency or any other social problem seems impractical and unfair. Some would argue that because business success depends on community support, businesses have an ethical duty to give back to the community?aby donating money, facilities, or services to social programs. Many successful businesses?asuch as Mrs. Field's. Ben & Jerry's, and Timberland?ahave embraced this philosophy. But how far should such a duty

extend, and is it fair to impose a special duty on businesses to help prevent one specific problem, such as juvenile delinquency? Moreover, businesses already serve their communities by enhancing the local tax base and by providing jobs, goods and services. In the final analysis, while businesses are clearly in a position to influence young people, whether they should help solve juvenile delinquency is perhaps a decision best left to the collective conscience of each business.

60. Determining whether employers should have access to personal information about employees requires that the interests of businesses in ensuring productivity and stability be weighed against concerns about equity and privacy interests. On balance, my view is that employers should not have the right to obtain personal information about current employees without their consent.

A business' interest in maintaining a stable, productive workforce clearly justifies right of access to certain personal information about prospective employees. Job applicants can easily conceal personal information that might adversely affect job performance, thereby damaging the employer in terms of low productivity and high turnover. During employment, however, the employee's interests are far more compelling than those of the employer, for three reasons.

First, the employer has every opportunity to monitor ongoing job performance and to replace workers who fail to meet standards, regardless of the reason for that failure. Second, allowing free access to personal information about employees might open the floodgates to discriminatory promotions and salary adjustments. Current federal laws--which protect employees from unfair treatment based on gender, race, and marital status, may not adequately guard against an employer's searching for an excuse to treat certain employees unfairly. Third, access to personal information without consent raises serious privacy concerns, especially where multiple individuals have access to the information. Heightening this concern is the ease of access to information which our burgeoning electronic intranets make possible.

In sum, ready access to certain personal information about prospective employees is necessary to protect businesses; however, once hired, an employee's interest in equitable treatment and privacy far outweighs the employer's interest in ensuring a productive and stable workforce.

61. I agree with the statement insofar as government systems of taxation and regulation are, in general, a great burden to business, and I agree that government constraints are needed to prevent serious harms that would result if business were left free in the singular pursuit of profit. However, I think the speaker states the obvious and begs the more relevant question.

Is government "at best" a "tremendous burden" on business, as the speaker claims? l think one would be hard-pressed to find any small business owner or corporate CEO who would disagree. Businesses today are mired in the burdens that government has imposed on them: consumer and environmental protection laws, the double-tiered tax structure for C-corporations, federal and state securities regulations, affirmative action requirements, anti-trust laws, and so on. in focusing solely on these burdens, one might well adopt a strict laissez faire view that if business is left free to pursue profit the so-called invisible hand of competition will guide it to produce the greatest social benefit, and therefore that the proper nexus between business and government is no nexus at all. Is government, nevertheless, a "necessary" burden on business, as the speaker also claims? Yes. Laissez faire is an extreme view that fails to consider the serious harms

that business would do?ato other businesses and to the society?aif left to its own devices. And the harms may very well exceed the benefits. In fact, history has shown that left entirely to themselves, corporations can be expected not only to harm the society by making unsafe products and by polluting the environment, but also to cheat one another, exploit workers, and fix prices -all for profit's sake. Thus, I agree that government constraints on business are necessary burdens.
Ideally, the government should regulate against harmful practices but not interfere with the beneficial ones. But achieving this balance is not a simple matter. For instance, I know of a business that was forced by government regulation of toxic effluents to spend over $120,000 to clean up an area outside of its plant where employees had regularly washed their hands. The 'toxin' in this case was nothing more than biodegradable soap. This example suggests that perhaps the real issue here is not whether government is a necessary burden on business?afor it clearly is?abut rather how best to ensure that its burdens don't outweigh its benefits.
In sum, the speaker's two assertions are palpable ones that are amply supported by the evidence. The more intriguing question is how to strike the best balance.

62. This view of education seems to recommend that schools stress the unity of all people instead of their diversity. White I agree that education should include teaching students about characteristics that we all share, doing so need not necessarily entail shifting focus away from our differences. Education can and should include both.
On the one hand. we are in the midst of an evolving global community where it is increasingly important for people to recognize our common humanity, as well as specific hopes and goals we all share. People universally prefer health to disease, being nourished to starving, safe communities to crime-riddled ones, and peace to war. Focusing on our unity will help us realize these hopes and goals. Moreover, in our pluralistic democracy it is crucial to find ways to unify citizens from diverse backgrounds. Otherwise, we risk being reduced to ethnic, religious or political factions at war with one another, as witnessed recently in the former Yugoslavia. Our own diverse society can forestall such horrors only if citizens are educated about the democratic ideals, heritage, rights and obligations we all have in common.
On the other hand, our schools should not attempt to erase, ignore, or even play down religious, ethnic or cultural diversity. First of all, schools have the obligation to teach the democratic ideal of tolerance, and the best way to teach tolerance is to educate people about different religions, cultures and so on. Moreover, educating people about diversity might even produce a unifying effect?aby promoting understanding and appreciation among people from all backgrounds.
In conclusion, while it may appear paradoxical to recommend that education stress both unity and diversity, it is not. Understanding our common humanity will help us achieve a better, more peaceful world. Toward the same end, we need to understand our differences in order to better tolerate them, and perhaps even appreciate them. Our schools can and should promote both kinds of understanding by way of a balanced approach.

63. At first glance, it would seem that increased bureaucracy creates obstacles between the citizens and those who govern, thereby separating the two groups. Closer examination reveals, however, that in many ways government bureaucracy actually bridges this gap, and that new technologies now allow for ways around the gap.
First of all, many government bureaucracies are established as a response to the needs of the citizenry. In a sense, they manifest a nexus between citizens and

government, providing a means of communication and redress for grievances that would not otherwise be available. For example, does the FDA, by virtue of its ensuring the safety of our food and drugs, separate us from the government? Or does the FHA, by helping to make home ownership more viable to ordinary citizens, thereby increase the gap between citizens and the government? No; these agencies serve our interests and enhance the accessibility of government resources to citizens.
Admittedly, agencies such as these are necessary proxies for direct participation in government, since our societal problems are too large and complex for individuals to solve. However, technology is coming forward to bridge some of the larger gaps. For example, we can now communicate directly with our legislators by e-mail, visit our lawmakers on the Web, and engage in electronic town hall meetings. In addition, the fact that government bureaucracies are the largest employers of citizens should not be overlooked. In this sense, bureaucracies bridge the gap by enabling more citizens to become part of the government..
In the final analysis, one can view bureaucracies as surrogates for individual participation in government; however, they are more accurately viewed as a manifestation of the symbiotic relationship between citizens and the government.

64. I agree that business has some obligation to the community and society in which it operates. As it stands, however, the statement permits one to conclude that this obligation should take precedence over the profit objective. By allowing for this interpretation, the speaker fails to appreciate the problems associated with shouldering business with an affirmative duty to ensure the public's well being.
The primary reason why I agree business should have a duty to the public is that society would be worse off by exonerating business from social responsibility. Left entirely to their own self-interest, businesses pollute the environment, withhold important product information from consumers, pay employees substandard wages, and misrepresent their financial condition to current and potential shareholders. Admittedly, in its pursuit of profit business can benefit the society as well?aby way of more and better-paying jobs, economic growth, and better yet lower-priced products. However, this point ignores the harsh consequences?asuch as those listed earlier?aof imposing no affirmative social duty on business.
Another reason why I agree business should have a duly to the public is that business owes such a duty. A business enters into an implied contract with the community in which it operates, under which the community agrees to permit a corporation to co business while the business implicitly promises to benefit, and not harm, the community. This understanding gives rise to a number of social obligations on the part of the business?ato promote consumer safety, to not harm the environmental, to treat employees and competitors fairly, and so on.
Although I agree that business should have a duty to serve the pubic, I disagree that this should be the primarily objective of business. Imposing affirmative social duties on business opens a Pandora's box of problems?afor example, how to determine. (1) what the public interest is in the first place, (2) which public interests are most important, (3) what actions are in the public interest, and (4) how business' duty to the public might be monitored and enforced. Government regulation is the only practical way to deal with these issues, yet government is notoriously inefficient and corrupt; the only way to limit these problems is to limit the duty of business to serve the public interest.
In sum, I agree that the duty of business should extend beyond the simple profit

motive. However, its affirmative obligations to society should be tempered against the pubic benefits of the profit motive and against the practical problems associates

65. Although global homogeneity in a broader sense may not be as inexorable as the speaker here suggests, I agree that multinational corporations are indeed creating global sameness in consumer preferences. This homogeneity is manifested in two concurrent megatrends: (1) the embracing of American popular culture throughout the world, and (2) a synthesis of cultures, as reflected in consumer preferences.
The first trend is toward Americanization of popular culture throughout the world.
In food and fashion, once a nation's denizens "fall into the Gap" or get a taste of a Coke or Big Mac, their preferences are forever Westernized. The ubiquitous Nike "swoosh," which nearly every soccer player in the world will soon don, epitomizes this phenomenon. In media, the cultural agendas of giants such as Time-Warner now drive the world's entertainment preferences. The Rolling Stones and the stars of America's prime-time television shows are revered among young people worldwide, while Mozart's music, Shakespeare's prose, and Ghandi's ideology are largely ignored.
A second megatrend is toward a synthesis of cultures into a homogenous stew.
The popularity of "world music" and of the "New Age" health care and leisure-time activities aptly illustrate this blending of Eastern, Western and third-world cultures. Perhaps nowhere is the cultural-stew paradigm more striking, and more bland, than at the international "food courts" now featured in malls throughout the developed world.
These trends appear inexorable. Counter-attacks, such as Ebonies, rap music, and bilingual education, promote the distinct culture of minority groups, but not of nations. Further homogenization of consumer preferences is all but ensured by failing trade barriers, coupled with the global billboard that satellite communications and the Internet provide.
In sum, American multinationals have indeed instigated a homogeneous global, yet American-style, consumerism?aone which in all likelihood will grow in extent along with free-market capitalism and global connectivity.

66. In determining whether manufacturers should be accountable for all injuries resulting from the use of their products, one must weigh the interests of consumers against those of manufacturers. On balance, holding manufacturers strictly liable for such injuries is unjustifiable.
Admittedly, protecting consumers from defective and dangerous products is an important and worthwhile goal. No doubt nearly all of us would agree that health and safety should rank highly as an objective of public policy. Also, compelling a high level of safety forces manufacturers to become more innovative in design, use of materials, and so forth. Consumers and manufacturers alike benefit, of course, from innovation.
However, the arguments against a strict-liability standard are more compelling.
First, the standard is costly. It forces-manufacturers to incur undue expenses for overbuilding, excessive safety testing, and defending liability law suits. Consumers are then damaged by ultimately bearing these costs in the form of higher prices. Second, the standard can be unfair. It can assign fault to the wrong party; where a product is distributed through a wholesaler and/or retailer, one of these parties may have actually caused, or at least contributed to, the injury. The standard can also misplace fault where the injured party is not the original consumer. Manufacturers cannot ensure that second-hand users receive safe products or adequate "instructions and warnings. Finally, where the injured consumer uses the product for a purpose or in a manner other than the intended one, or where there were patent dangers that the user should have been aware

of, it seems the user. not the manufacturer, should assume the risk of injury.
In sum, despite compelling interests in consumer safety and product innovation, holding manufacturers accountable for all injuries caused by their products is unjustifiably costly to society and unfair to manufacturers.

67. The speaker claims that our jobs greatly influence our personal interests, recreational activities and even appearance. While I agree that the personal lives of some people are largely determined by their work, in my view it would be a mistake to draw this conclusion generally. In my observation, the extent to which occupation influences personal life depends on (1) the nature of the work, and (2) how central the work is to one's sense of self.
On the one hand, consider my friends Steve and William. Steve works as a gardener, but after work he creates oil paintings of quality and poignancy. His leisure time is spent alternately at the sea, in the wilderness, and in dark cafes. William paints houses for a living, but on his own time he collects fine art and books in first edition, as well as reading voraciously in the area of American history. Their outside activities and appearance speak little about what Steve or William do for a living, because these men view their jobs as little more than a means of subsidizing me activities that manifest their true selves. At the same time, they have chosen jobs that need not spill over into their personal lives, so the nature of their jobs permits them to maintain a distinctive identity apart from their work.
On the other hand, consider my friend Shana?aa business executive who lives and breathes her work. After work hours you can invariably find her at a restaurant or bar with colleagues, discussing work. Shana's wardrobe is primarily red?aright off the dress-for-success page of a woman's magazine. For Shana, her job is clearly an expression of her self-concept. Also, by its nature it demands Shana's attention and time away from the workplace.
What has determined the influence of work on personal lives in these cases is the extent to which each person sees himself or herself in terms of work. Clearly, work is at the center of Shana's life, but not of either Steve's or William's. My sample is small; still, common sense and intuition tell me that the influence of work on one's personal life depends both on the nature of the work and on the extent to which the work serves as a manifestation of one's self-concept.

68. I agree that physical workspace can affect morale and productivity and that. as a result, employees should have a significant voice in how their work areas are designed. However, the speaker suggests that each employee should have full autonomy over his or her immediate workspace, i think this view is too extreme, for it ignores two important problems that allowing too much freedom over workspace can create.
On the one hand. I agree that some aspects of workspace design are best left to the individual preferences of each worker. Location of personal tools and materials, style and size of desk chair, and even desk lighting and decorative desk items, can each play an important role in a worker's comfort, psychological well-being, concentration, and efficiency. Moreover, these features involve highly subjective preferences, so it would be inappropriate for anyone but the worker to make such choices.
On the other hand. control over one's immediate workspace should not go unchecked, for two reasons. First, one employee's workspace design may inconvenience, annoy, or even offend nearby coworkers. For example, pornographic pinups may distract some coworkers and offend others, thereby impeding productivity,

fostering ill-will and resentment, and increasing attrition?aall to the detriment of the company. Admittedly, the consequences of most workspace choices would not be so tar-reaching Still, in my observation many people adhere, consciously or not, to the adage that one person's rights extend only so far as the next person's nose (or ears. or eyes). A second problem with affording too much workspace autonomy occurs when workspaces are not clearly delineated?aby walls and doors?aor when workers share an immediate workspace. In such cases, giving all workers concurrent authority would perpetuate conflict and undermine productivity.
in conclusion, although employees should have the freedom to arrange their work areas, this freedom is not absolute. Managers would be well-advised to arbitrate workspace disputes and, if needed, assume authority to make final decisions about workspace design

69. Whether the ability to work with others is more important than specific knowledge and technical competence depends on the specific job as well as the complexity of the job's technical aspects. In general, however, social skills are more critical than technical competence to the ultimate success of an organizational unit.
Admittedly, some level of technical competence and specific knowledge is needed to perform any job. Without some knowledge of the systems, procedures, and vocabulary used in one's department or division, an employee cannot communicate effectively with peers or contribute meaningfully to team goals. By the same token, however, nearly every job?aeven those in which technical ability would seem to be of paramount importance?acalls for some skill in working with other employees. Computer programmers, for example, work in teams to develop products according to agreed-upon specifications and timelines. Scientists and researchers must collaborate to establish common goals and to coordinate efforts. Even teachers, who are autonomous in the classroom, must serve on committees and coordinate activities with administrators and other teachers.
Moreover, employees can generally learn technical skills and gain specific knowledge through on-the-job training and continuing education (depending on the complexity of the skills involved). Social skills, on the other hand, are more innate and not easily learned. They are, therefore, requisite skills that employees must possess at the outset if the organizational unit is to succeed.
In sum, specific knowledge does admittedly play a more critical role than social skills in some highly-technical jobs: nevertheless, the ability to work well with other employees is ultimately more important, since all jobs require this ability and since it is more difficult, to learn social skills on the job.

70. The speaker asserts that in creating and marketing products, companies act ethically merely by not violating any laws. Although the speaker's position is not wholly insupportable, far more compelling arguments can be made for holding businesses to higher ethical standards than those required by the letter of the law.
On the one hand, two colorable arguments can be made for holding business only to legal standards of conduct. First, imposing a higher ethical duty can actual harm consumers in the long term. Compliance with high ethical standards can be costly for business, thereby lowering profits and, in turn, impeding a company's ability to create jobs (for consumers), keep prices low (for consumers), and so forth. Second, limited accountability is consistent with the "buyer beware" principle that permeates our laws of contracts and torts, as well as our notion in civil procedure that plaintiffs carry the

burden or proving damage. In other words, the onus should be on consumers to protect themselves, not on companies to protect consumers.
On the other hand. several convincing arguments can be made for holding business to a higher ethical standard. First, in many cases government regulations that protect consumers lag behind advances in technology. A new marketing technique made possible by. internet technology may be unethical but nevertheless might not be proscribed by the letter of the laws which predated the Internet. Second, enforceability might not extend beyond geographic borders. Consider, for example, the case of "dumping." When products fail to comply with U.S. regulations, American companies frequently market?aor "dump"?asuch products in third-world countries where consumer-protection laws are virtually nonexistent. Third, moral principles form the basis of government regulation and are, therefore, more fundamental than the law.
In the final analysis, white overburdening businesses with obligations to consumers may not be a good idea in the extreme, our regulatory system is not as effective as it should be. Therefore, businesses should adhere to a higher standard of ethics in creating and marketing products than what is required by the letter of the law.

71. Has commercialism become too widespread, particularly in schools, churches, and other places which traditionally have been safe havens from commercialism? If so, does the government have a responsibility to curb the problem? The answer to both questions, in my view, is no.
There is no evidence that commercialism is creeping into our churches.
Admittedly, some commercial activity is present in our schools. Food service is increasing outsourced to fast-food chains; a plethora of goods and services is sold in college bookstores and advertised in their school newspapers; and students serve as walking billboards for the companies whose logos appear on clothing. However, this kind of commercialism does not interfere with school activities; to the contrary, in the first two cases they contribute to the efficient functioning of the organization. Outsourcing food service, for example, is a cost-cutting measure which provides additional funding for teaching materials, facilities, and teacher salaries.
I do agree that, in general, commercialism is becoming more widespread, and that one of the byproducts may be a decline in the quality of our culture. Electronic billboards now serve as backdrops for televised sporting events, and Web sites must sell advertising space to justify maintenance costs. Does this mean that government should step in and ban the sale of products in certain venues? No. This would require that government make ad hoc, and possibly arbitrary, decisions as to which products may be sold or advertised at which places and events. These are value judgments that are best left to individual schools, churches, and other organizations. Moreover, the expense of enforcing the regulations may well outweigh the cultural benefits, if any.
In sum, while commercialism is undeniably becoming more widespread, it is minimally intrusive and works to the net benefit of society. As a matter of public policy, therefore, government should not attempt to regulate the extent of commercialism.

72. Providing employee incentives can be a double-edged sword. On the one hand. the promise of bonuses or gifts can spur workers to higher achievement. On the other hand, incentives can create resentment and internal competitiveness that are damaging to morale and to the organization. Even so, I think a carefully designed incentive program can operate to the net benefit a company.
Incentive programs are counterproductive when the distribution of rewards

appears to be personally biased, when the program recognizes just one kind among many important jobs in the organization, or when there are too few rewards available. For example, if a manager regularly rewards an employee who is perceived to be a favorite, coworkers will be resentful. Or if the company decides to recognize high sales, while ignoring an especially precise cost-assessment from the accounting department, the accountants may feel their work is not valued. Finally, if rewards are too few, some employees will become overly competitive, while others may simply stop trying.
However, incentive programs can be designed to avoid such pitfalls. First, the company must determine that it can provide sufficient rewards to motivate all employees. Then it must set, and follow, clear and non-arbitrary guidelines for achievement. Finally, management should provide appropriate incentives throughout the organization, thereby sending the message that all work is valued. Admittedly, even a thoughtfully designed incentive program cannot entirely prevent back-stabbing and unfair competitive tactics. But watchful management can quell much of this behavior, and the perpetrators usually show their true colors in time.
In sum, I think that the productivity inspired by thoughtful incentive programs will very likely outweigh any negative consequences. In the final analysis, then, I disagree with the speaker's recommendation against their use.

73. The advice to act naturally or follow one's instincts can, admittedly, be helpful advice for someone torn between difficult career or personal choices in life. In most situations, however, following this advice would neither be wise nor sensible. Following one's own instincts should be tempered by codes of behavior appropriate to the situation at hand.
First of all, doing what comes naturally often amounts to impulsive overreaction and irrational behavior, based on emotion. Everyone experiences impulses from time to time, such as hitting another person, quitting one's job, having an extramarital affair, and so forth. People who act however they please or say whatever is on their mind without thinking about consequences, especially without regard to social situation, may offend and alienate others. At the workplace, engaging in petty gossip, sexual harassment, or back-stabbing might be considered "natural"; yet such behavior can be destructive for the individuals at the receiving end as well as for the company. And in dealings with foreign business associates, what an American might find natural or instinctive, even if socially acceptable here, might be deeply insulting or confusing to somebody from another culture.
Second, doing what comes naturally is not necessarily in one's own best interests. The various behaviors cited above would also tend to be counterproductive for the person engaging in them. "Natural" behavior could prove deadly to one's career, since people who give little thought before they act cannot be trusted in a Job that requires effective relationships with important clients, colleagues, and others.
Third, the speaker seems to suggest that you should be yourself, then act accordingly?ain that order. But we define ourselves in large measure by our actions. Young adults especially lack a clear sense of self. How can you be yourself if you don't know who you are? Even for mature adults, the process of evolving one's concept of self is a perpetual one. In this respect, then, the speaker's recommendation does not make much sense.
In sum, one should not follow the speaker's advice universally or too literally. For unless a person's instincts are to follow standard rules of social and business etiquette, natural behavior can harm others as well as constrain one's own personal and professional growth.

74. I strongly agree that rule-breakers are the most memorable people. By departing from the status quo, iconoclasts call attention to themselves, some providing conspicuous mirrors for society, others serving as our primary catalysts for progress. In politics, for example, rule-breakers Mahatma Ghandi and Martin Luther King secured prominent places in history by challenging the status quo through civil disobedience. Renegades such as Ghengus Khan, Stalin, and Hussein, broke all the human-rights "rules," thereby leaving indelible marks in the historical record. And future generations will probably remember Nixon and Kennedy more clearly than Carter or Reagan, by way of their rule-breaking activities?aspecifically, Nixon's Watergate debacle and Kennedy's extra-marital trysts.

In the arts, mavericks such as Dali, Picasso, and Warhol, who break established rules of composition, ultimately emerge as the greatest artists, while the names of artists with superior technical skills are relegated to the footnotes of art-history textbooks. Our most influential popular musicians are the flagrant rule breakers?afor example, be-bop musicians such as Charlie Parker and Thelonius Monk, who broke all the harmonic rules, and folk musician-poet Bob Dylan, who broke the rules for lyrics.

In the sciences, innovation and progress can only result from challenging conventional theories?ai.e., by breaking rules. Newton and Einstein, for example, both refused to blindly accept what were perceived at their time as certain "rules" of physics. As a result, both men redefined those rules, and both men emerged as two of the most memorable figures in the field of physics.

In conclusion, it appears that the deepest positive and negative impressions appear on either side of the same iconoclastic coin. Those who leave the most memorable imprints in history do so by challenging norms, traditions, cherished values, and the general status quo?athat is, by breaking the rules.

75. The speaker claims that people are motivated only by fear and self-interest. This claim relies on the belief that human beings are essentially selfish, or egoistic. In my view, the speaker oversimplifies human nature, ignoring the important motivating force of altruism.

On the one hand, I agree that most of our actions result in large part from self-interest and from our survival instincts, such as fear. For example, our educational and vocational lives are to a great extent motivated by our interest in ensuring our own livelihood, safety, health, and so on. We might perpetuate bad personal relationships because we are insecure?aor afraid?aof what will happen to us if we change course. Even providing for our own children may to some extent be motivated by selfishness?a satisfying a need for fulfillment or easing our fear that we will be alone in our old age.

On the other hand, to assert that all of our actions are essentially motivated by self-interest and fear is to overemphasize one aspect of human nature. Humans are also altruistic?athat is, we act to benefit others, even though doing so may not in be in our own interest. The speaker might claim that altruistic acts are just egoistic ones in disguise?adone to avoid unpleasant feelings of guilt, to give oneself pleasure, or to obligate another person. However, this counter argument suffers from three critical problems. First, some examples of altruism are difficult to describe in terms of self-interest alone. Consider the soldier who falls on a grenade to save his companions. It would be nonsensical to assert that this soldier is acting selfishly when he knows his action will certainly result in his own immediate death. Second, the argument offends our intuition that human motivation is far more complex. Third, it relies on a poor assumption: just because we feel good about helping others, it does not follow that the

only reason we help is in order to feel good.
In sum, the speaker oversimplifies human nature. All human motivation cannot be reduced to fear and self-interest. We can also be motivated by altruism, and the pleasure we might take in helping others is not necessarily an indication that our actions are selfish.

76. I agree that decisiveness is one clear mark of an effective leader. However, the speaker goes further to make the dual claim that decision-making is the most difficult and the most important aspect of a leader's job. In my view, this additional claim amounts to an overstatement that fails to consider other aspects of a leader's job that are either difficult or important.
First of all, decisiveness is not necessarily the most difficult aspect of a leader's job. In fact, leaders rise to their positions typically because decisiveness comes easily or naturally to them. In this sense, the speaker's claim runs contrary to actual experience. Also, for some leaders the stress and the burden of their job pose more difficulties for them than the mere act of making decisions. For other leaders, balancing professional and personal life, or even time management in general, may be the most challenging aspect of the job, since leaders are typically very busy people.
Secondly, decisiveness is not necessarily the key factor in determining the quality of leadership. Decisiveness does not guarantee a good decision. An effective leader must also have wisdom, perspective, clear vision, judgment, and courage. Moreover, other factors such as trust and respect for others may be equally or more critical, since subordinates may not be willing to devote themselves to the plans and goals of a leader they mistrust or hold in low regard. Even the best decision will be of little value without the commitment of others to carry it out. Simply put, without someone to lead. a person cannot be a leader.
To sum up, I agree with the speaker only insofar as the ability to make decisions is a necessary ingredient of successful leadership. However, decision-making is not necessarily the most difficult aspect of every leader's job; nor is it necessarily the most important factor in determining the effectiveness of a leader.

77. I strongly agree that true genius is the ability to see beyond conventional modes of thinking and to suggest new and better ones. This definition properly sets genius apart from lesser instances of critical acumen, inventiveness or creativity. Under this definition, a true genius must successfully (1) challenge the assumptions underlying a current paradigm, and (2) supplant the old paradigm with a new, better, and more fruitful one.
This two-pronged standard for true genius is aptly illustrated by examining the scientific contribution of the 15th-century astronomer Copernicus. Prior to Copernicus, our view of the universe was governed by the Ptolemaic paradigm of a geocentric universe, according to which our earth was in a fixed position at the center of the universe, with other heavenly bodies revolving around it. Copernicus challenged this paradigm and its key assumptions by introducing a distinction between real motion and motion that is merely apparent, in doing so, he satisfied the first requirement of a true genius.
Had Copernicus managed to show only that the old view and its assumptions were problematic, we would not consider him a genius today. Copernicus went on, however, to develop a new paradigm; he claimed that the earth is rotating while hurtling rapidly through space, and that other heavenly bodies only appear to revolve around the earth.

Moreover, he reasoned that his view about the earth's real motion could explain the apparent motion of the sun, stars and other planets around the earth. It turned out he was right; and his theories helped facilitate Galileo's empirical observations, Kepler's laws of planetary motion, and Newton's gravitational principle.
To sum up, I find the proposed definition of true genius incisive and accurate; and the example of Copernicus aptly points up the two required elements of true genius required by the definition.

78. The issue of whether to raze an old, historic building to make way for progress is a complex one, since it involves a conflict between our interest in preserving our culture, tradition, and history and a legitimate need to create practical facilities that serve current utilitarian purposes. In my view, the final judgment should depend on a case-by-case analysis of two key factors.
One key factor's the historic value of the building. An older building may be worth saving because it uniquely represents some bygone era. On the other hand, if several older buildings represent the era just as effectively, then the historic value of one building might be negligible. If the building figured centrally into the city's history as a municipal structure, the home of a founding family or other significant historical figure, or the location of important events, then its historic value would be greater than if its history was an unremarkable one.
The other key factor involves the specific utilitarian needs of the community and the relative costs and benefits of each alternative in light of those needs. For example, if the need is mainly for more office space, then an architecturally appropriate add-on or annex might serve just as well as a new building. On the other hand, an expensive retrofit may not be worthwhile if no amount of retrofitting would permit it to serve the desired function. Moreover, retrofitting might undermine the historic value of the old building by altering its aesthetic or architectural integrity.
In sum, neither modernization for its own sake nor indiscriminate preservation of old buildings should guide decisions in the controversies at issue. Instead, decisions should be made on a case-by-case basis, considering historic value, community need, and the comparative costs and benefits of each alternative.

79. This first part of this statement means that interpersonal?aor social?askills can be marketed as part of a bundle of assets that one might tout to a prospective client, customer, or especially employer. Presumably, the extent and value of these skills can be gauged by one's previous experience with clients and customers or at jobs requiring a significant amount of teamwork and cooperation among workers?aas measured by factors such as one's tenure in such a job and letters of reference from supervisors.
While this claim seems plausable in the abstract, it ignores critical valuation problems. Furthermore, the claim that the ability to deal with people exceeds the value of all other commodities is an overgeneralization, since relative values depend on particular circumstances.
The first problem with this claim is that it is far more difficult to quantify the value of interpersonal skills, or other human qualities, than the value of commodities such as coffee or sugar, which can be measured, weighed, or otherwise examined prior to purchase. To a large extent, the ability to work with people is a quality whose true value can be determined only after it is purchased, then tried and tested for a period of time. Additionally, its value may vary depending on the idiosyncrasies of the job. For example, a technically-oriented programmer or researcher might function well with a

team of like-minded workers, yet have trouble dealing with management or marketing personnel.
The second problem with this claim is that it overgeneralizes in asserting that the ability to work with people is "worth more than any other commodity." The relative value of this ability depends on the peculiarities of the job. In some jobs, especially sales, ambition and tenacity are more valuable. In other areas, such as research and development, technical skills and specific knowledge are paramount. Moreover, in some businesses, such as mining or oil-drilling, the value of raw materials and capital equipment might be far more important a commodity than the social skills, or most other skills, of employees?adepending on the economic circumstances.
In sum, the ability to deal with people is purchasable only to a limited extent, since its full value cannot be determined prior to purchase. Moreover, its full value depends on the organizational unit as well as the nature of the business.

80. Whether an individual saves too little or borrows too much depends on the purpose and extent of either activity. While appropriate and prudent in some circumstances, either can be irresponsible in excess. The evidence suggests that, on balance, people today tend to borrow irresponsibly and are on the brink of saving irresponsibly as well.
Traditionally, saving is viewed as a virtue, while borrowing is considered a vice. However, just the opposite may be true under certain circumstances. Foregoing saving in favor of immediate spending may at times be well justified. A serious hobbyist, for example, may be justified in foregoing saving to spend money on a hobby that provides great joy and fulfillment?awhether or not it also generates income. A relatively expensive automobile is justifiable if the additional expense provides added safety for the owner and his family. And foregoing saving is appropriate, and often necessary, for "rainy day" medical emergencies or unanticipated periods of unemployment. Borrowing can also be prudent?aif the loan is affordable and applied toward a sound long-term investment.
Were saving and borrowing limited to these types of scenarios, I would aver that people today save and borrow responsibly. However, the evidence suggests otherwise. Americans now purchase on credit far more expensive automobiles, relative to income, than ever before?avehicles that are far more than what is needed for safe transportation. Excessive credit-card debt, another type of unjustifiable borrowing, is at record levels?a and rising?aamong American households. Does the baby-boomers' current penchant for retirement investing compensate for these excesses? Probably not. This trend is fueled by unrealistic expectations of future returns; it may therefore, escalate to speculation and, at its height, widespread leveraging?ai.e., borrowing. Such speculation is more suited to highly sophisticated investors who can well afford to lose their entire investment than to average Americans and their nest eggs.
In conclusion, while people seem to be saving aggressively today, their investment choices and concomitant high spending and borrowing levels call into question the assertion that we are indeed a "nation of savers."

81. Whether a conformist can achieve lasting success or "get rich" in business depends primarily on the type of business involved. Iconoclasts rise to the top in newer industries and in those where consumer demand is in constant flux. Conformists ultimately prevail, however, in traditional service industries ensconced in systems and regulations.
In consumer-driven industries, innovation, product differentiation, and creativity

are crucial to lasting success, in the retail and media sectors, for example, unconventional products and advertising are necessary to catch the attention of consumers and to keep up with the vagaries of consumer tastes. Those who take an iconoclastic approach tend to recognize emerging trends and to rise above their peers. For example, Ted Turner's departure from the traditional format of the other television networks, and the responsiveness of Amazon.com to burgeoning Internet commerce, propelled these two giants to leadership positions in their industries. And in technology, where there are no conventional practices or ways of thinking to begin with, companies that fail to break away from last year's paradigm are soon left behind by the competition.

However, in traditional service industries?asuch as finance, accounting, insurance, legal services, and health care?alasting success and riches come not to nonconformists but rather to those who can deliver services most effectively within the confines of established practices, policies, and regulations. Of course, a clever idea for structuring a deal, or a creative legal maneuver, may play a role in winning smaller; battles along the way. But such tactics are those of conformists who are playing by the same ground rules as their peers; winners are just better at the game.

In conclusion, while non-conformists tend to be the wildly successful players in technology-driven and consumer-driven industries, traditionalists are the winners in system-driven industries pervaded by policy, regulation, and bureaucracy.

82. The issue here is whether business and government are doing enough to help meet the needs and goals of women in the workplace. I agree with the speaker insofar as many employers can do more to accommodate the special needs of women in their role as mothers. However, it seems to me that business and government are doing their fair share otherwise for women in the workplace.

Women differ fundamentally from men in their child-bearing ability. Related to this ability is the maternal instinct?aa desire to nurture that is far stronger for women than for men, generally speaking. At a minimum, then, businesses should acknowledge these fundamental differences and accommodate them so that a female employee's job and career are not jeopardized merely for fulfilling her instinctive role as a female. More and more businesses are providing maternal leave with full benefits, day-care facilities, and job-sharing programs to accommodate these special needs of women. In my observation, however, many businesses can do more in these respects.

However, beyond accommodating these fundamental differences, neither business nor government has a special duty to improve the status of women at the workplace. The government already has an obligation to enact and enforce anti-discrimination laws, and to provide legal means for seeking redress in cases of discrimination. Moreover, business and government both have a legal duty to abide by those laws by way of their hiring, salary, and job-promotion policies. Discharging this duty should, in my view, suffice to serve the special interests of women in the workplace. While many would argue that de facto double standards still run rampant and largely unchecked, this claim raises subjective perceptions about fairness that can neither be confirmed nor dispelled with certainty.

In sum, business and government can always do more to accommodate women in their special role as mothers. Otherwise, insofar as they are adhering to our current anti-discrimination laws, business and government are discharging their duty to help meet the needs and goals of women at the workplace.

83. I believe this statement should be interpreted broadly?ato mean that we are influenced by the exterior shape of buildings, as well as by the arrangement of multiple buildings and by a building's various architectural and aesthetic elements. While I doubt that buildings determine our character or basic personality traits, I agree that they can greatly influence our attitudes, moods, and even life styles.

On the structural and multi-structural scales, the arrangement of numerous buildings can shape us in profound ways. High-density commercial districts with numerous skyscrapers might result in stressful commuting, short tempers, a feeling of dehumanization, and so on. A "campus" arrangement of smaller, scattered buildings can promote health, well-being, and stress reduction by requiring frequent brisk outdoor jaunts. Buildings with multiple floors can also "shape" us, literally, by requiring exercise up and down stairs.

As for floor plans and internal space, physical arrangement of workspaces can shape workers' attitudes toward work and toward one another. Sitting in small, gray cubicles lined up in militaristic rows is demoralizing, leaving workers with the feeling that they are little more than impersonal cogs of some office machine. But creative design of workspaces in varied arrangements can create feelings of uniqueness and importance in each employee. Workspace relationships that suggest some sort of hierarchy may breed competitiveness among coworkers, and may encourage a more bureaucratic approach to work.

Finally, as for aesthetic elements, the amount of light and location of windows in a building can shape us in significant psychological ways. For most people, daily tasks are more enjoyable in settings with plenty of natural light and at least some natural scenery. Choice of colors can influence our mood, concentration, and efficiency. Numerous psychological studies show that different colors influence behavior, attitudes, and emotions in distinctly different ways. Yellow enhances appetite, blue has a tranquilizing effect, and gray is the color of choice for companies who want their workers to be subservient.

In sum, our buildings, the space around them and the space within them, can affect us in important ways that influence our outlook on life, relationships with coworkers, and even physical health and well-being.

84. Requiring businesses to provide complete product information to customers promotes various consumer interests, but at the same time imposes burdens on businesses, government, and taxpayers. On balance, the burdens outweigh the benefits, at least in most cases.

A threshold problem with disclosure requirements is that of determining what constitutes "complete" information. Admittedly, legislating disclosure requirements clarifies the duties of business and the rights of consumers. Yet determining what requirements are fair in all cases is problematic. Should it suffice to list ingredients, instructions, and intended uses, or should customers also be informed of precise specifications, potential risks, and results of tests measuring a product's effectiveness vis-a-vis competing products? A closely related problem is that determining and enforcing disclosure standards necessarily involves government regulation, thereby adding to the ultimate cost to the consumer by way of higher taxes. Finally, failure to comply may result in regulatory fines, a cost that may either have a chilling effect on product innovation or be passed on to the customers in the form of higher prices. Either result operates to the detriment of the consumer, the very party whom the regulations are designed to protect.

These burdens must be weighed against the interest in protecting consumers against fraud and undue health and safety hazards. To assume that businesses will voluntarily disclose negative product information ignores the fact that businesses are motivated by profit, not by public interest concerns. However, consumers today have ready access to many consumer-protection resources, and may not need the protection of government regulation. Although health and safety concerns are especially compelling in the case of products that are inherently dangerous?apower tools, recreational equipment, and the like?aor new and relatively untested products, especially pharmaceuticals, narrow exceptions can always be carved out for these products.

In conclusion, while stringent disclosure requirements may be appropriate for certain products, businesses and consumers alike are generally better off without the burdens imposed by requiring that businesses provide complete product information to all customers.

85. Advertising is dearly the most influential art form in this century. It is therefore tempting to think it is also the most important. However, great artistic achievement is determined by criteria beyond mere influence. And when examined against these criteria, the genre of advertising does not measure up as truly important.

To begin with, great art inspires us to look at the human situation from new perspectives. For example, early impressionist paintings challenge our thinking about visual perception and about the nature of the reality we assume we see. Other works, like Rodin's "The Thinker," capture for our reflection the essential value of human rationality, in stark contrast, advertising encourages people not to think or reflect at all, but simply to spend.

In addition, the significance of great artistic achievement transcends time, even when it reflects a particular age. Yet advertising, by its very nature, is transient; in an eye-blink, today's hot image or slogan is yesterday's news. Of course, the timelessness of a work cannot be determined in its own time. Still, it's hard to imagine even the most powerful advertisement living beyond its current ad campaign.

Admittedly, one ad?aAndy Warhol's painting of the Campbell Soup can?ahas achieved timelessness. But notice the irony; the packaging or advertising image was banal until it was elevated above mere graphic design to high art. The lesson here is that advertising, in itself, probably will not achieve great importance as art. But taken up by the artist as content in a larger commentary on society, it can become transcendent.

In sum, artists will no doubt continue to comment on advertising and on the materialistic values it reflects and promotes. But the ads themselves, however influential in marketing terms, fail to fulfill all the criteria for important art.

86. There are two traditional advertising tactics for promoting a product, event, candidate, or point of view. One is to provide reasons; the other is to bypass reasons altogether and appeal strictly to emotion. Considered in isolation, emotional appeals are far more effective. But many of the most influential ads combine slim reasons with powerful appeals to emotion.

To appreciate the power of emotional appeals we need only consider the promotion of sodas, beer, cigarettes, cosmetics and so on. This advertising is the most successful in the industry; and it trades almost exclusively on the manipulation of our desires, fears and senses of humor. In fact, it wouldn't make sense to offer up arguments, because there really aren't any good reasons for consuming such products.

Even so, some of these products are advertised with at least superficial reasoning.

For instance, in the promotion of facial moisturizers it has become popular to use the image of a youthful woman with fresh, unlined skin along with the claim that the product "car reduce the signs of aging." This is indeed a reason, but a carefully couched one that never really states that product users will look younger. Still, countless middle-aged women will pay twice as much for products that add this claim to the expected image of youthfulness that trades on their fears of growing old.
One of the most clever and ironic combined uses of reason and emotion is seen in the old Volvo slogan, "Volvo, the car for people who think." The suggested reason for buying the car is obvious: it is the intelligent choice. But the emotional snare is equally clear; the ad appeals to one's desire to be included in the group of intelligent, thoughtful people.
In conclusion. I agree that appeals to emotion are more powerful tools than arguments or reasoning for promoting products. It is no coincidence that advertising agencies hire professional psychologists, but not logicians. Still, in my view the most influential advertisements mix in a bit of reasoning as well.

87. As technology and changing social needs render more and more jobs obsolete, who is responsible for helping displaced workers adjust? While individuals have primary responsibility for learning new skills and finding work, both industry and government have some obligation to provide them the means of doing so.
l agree that individuals must assume primary responsibility for adjusting to job obsolescence, especially since our educational system has been preparing us for it. For decades, our schools have been counseling young people to expect and prepare for numerous major career changes during their lives. And concerned educators have recognized and responded to this eventuality with a broader base of practical and theoretical coursework that affords students the flexibility to move from one career to another.
However, industry should bear some of the responsibility as well. It is industry, after all, that determines the particular directions technological progress and subsequent social change will take. And since industry is mainly responsible for worker displacement, it has a duty to help displaced workers adjust?athrough such means as on-site training programs and stipends for further education.
Government should also assume some of the responsibility, since it is partly government money that fuels technological progress in industry. Moreover, government should help because it can help?afor example, by ensuring that grants and federally insured student loans are available to those who must retool in order to find new work. Government can also help by observing and recording trends in worker displacement and in job opportunities, and by providing this information to individuals so that they can make prudent decisions about their own further education and job searches.
In conclusion, while individuals should be prepared for future job changes, both government and industry shoulder obligations to provide training programs, funding and information that will help displaced workers successfully retool and find new employment.

88. The issue at hand is whether each generation is blameworthy for the hateful words and actions o' some of its members, and for the failure of others to denounce those hateful words and actions, in my view, it does not make clear sense to hold a vague abstraction like a generation responsible for anything. Nevertheless, each person has a duty to resist hateful words and actions, and to speak out against them.

Admittedly, up to a point we have no legal obligation to resist hateful words.
Given our First Amendament right of free speech, we are entitled to say whatever hateful things we wish, as long as our words do not harass, slander, libel, incite to riot, or otherwise cause significant harm. Even so, this legal entitlement does not absolve us of deeper moral duties. For example, all persons are morally bound not to harm others, and to se helpful where it is important and within our capacity. The rhetoric of hate violates both these duties by promoting attitudes and social climates in which those who are hated are refused help and often harmed.
Not so clear is the issue of whether we also have a moral duty to denounce the hateful rhetoric and conduct of others. I believe we do, for silence is perceived as tacit approval or at least indifference. Seen this way, silence helps foster hateful attitudes and related harm. In other words, not speaking out is just another way to fail in our obligations to be helpful and not harmful. Moreover, as individuals we are able to speak cut against hateful words and actions, in a variety of ways. By teaching tolerance to our children, for example, we can help them understand and appreciate differences among people, and therefore understand that hate-based responses to difference are simply wrong.
In sum, while it makes no sense to hold a generation responsible for anything as a group, I agree that every individual bears responsibility for speaking out against hateful words and behavior, as well as for resisting them.'

89. The speaker suggests that studying history is a waste of time because it distracts us from current challenges. Posed this way, the question carries the assumption that the study of history has no bearing on present problems or their possible solutions. On the contrary, history can provide examples, perspectives and insights that are directly relevant to contemporary challenges.
One way that studying history can help us face new challenges is by showing us inspirational examples of success. For instance, we can learn from the experience of the great inventor Thomas Edison that sometimes a series of apparent failures is really a precursor to success. Also consider the journey of Lewis and dark into the Northwest Territory. Understanding the motivations needed to overcome adversities they faced can help to inspire modern-day explorers and scientists.
Studying history can also help us avoid repeating mistakes. For instance, we can learn from the failure of Prohibition during the 1930s that it can be a mistake to legislate morality. And future generations might learn from the 1997 indictment of the tobacco industry that it is bad policy to trade off the well-being of consumers in order to secure profits.
Finally, the study of history is important because we cannot fully appreciate our present challenges without understanding their historical antecedents. Consider the issue of whether California should be officially bilingual. The treaty that transferred California from Mexico to the United States stipulated that California must embrace both Spanish and English as official languages. Those who view the current bilingual debate as purely a contemporary issue might bring to the debate a more enlightened viewpoint by appreciating this historical fact and the events that led to the treaty.
In sum, though the past might seem distant, it is far from irrelevant. Studying history can inspire us to achievement, help us avoid costly mistakes, and help us simply appreciate that in most cases we've been down this road before.