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A nation should require all of its students to study the same national curriculum until they enter college.

Outline

DISAGREE

1 Students have different talents

2 Some subjects are less important in college

3 It is easier for standard test

4 a national curriculum contributes to cultural cohesion

Some people may argue that the same curriculum is beneficial for students’ general education because it promotes cultural cohesion and standard test. However, in my point of view, the statement does not take a student’s personality, talents and the dimension of our society into consideration. Every student is unique, thus special education are more important.

A national curriculum is significant to the unifying of a country. If all the students study the same subjects and content, they can have the same topic and background knowledge to talk about. Of any student of the same grade of school, we can assume that they have learnt the same lessons and acquire the same knowledge. With a general curriculum, they also learn the same thing as their parents did, thus culture between generations can have a bridge over the gap.

A same curriculum is also beneficial for the fairness of the college entrance exam system. As everyone has studied the same thing, we can build a standard system to evaluate their acquittance of the knowledge and their ability to solve problems regardless of their personal differences. In this way, more resource can be used to focus on the specific area of investigating examination equality which meets the needs of multidimensional testing. The range of testing can also be augmented to meet the growing demands for students’ performance evaluation.

However, living in a multi-cultural society, I believe everyone possesses different identities. Therefore, they should have to chance to choose the course which they think suits best for their personalities. For example, a child especially skilled in math should not be required to study literature as much as a child who plans to be a writer in the future. Instead, he can choose courses like linear algebra, geometry and even coding to help him better solve the problems in math practices.

Studying in college is known as diving deep into a specific area, and therefore some subjects may be less important than others in the university. Students do not have to pay equal amount of attention to all subjects, because these less important subjects only play a role in helping the students become a better person, while they are not going to be specialists in these subjects

In sum, as long as the students do not share the same identity, the same curriculum is both harmful and unnecessary.

Teachers' salaries should be based on their students' academic performance.

Disagree

Outline

1 promote the teacher to care more for their students’ performance

2 competition allows the teacher to learn more knowledge

3 score is not everything

4 some teacher may use harsh punishment

5 some teacher may only focus on the good students

While some people may argue that we should pay teachers’ salary according to their students’ performance, I strongly disagree with this view because the academic performance of the students is not everything that the students learn at school or the teachers teach the students, and money remains a useful but bad motivation for everyone.

The most obvious advantage of rewarding the best teachers more money is that they will pay more attention to the performance of their students. They may try to prepare their lessons more carefully, keep the students more engaged in the class, and revise their homework more seriously because they are aware that the more diligent they are, the more money that can earn. In this way, it is good for both of them because the students learn more knowledge and the teachers can get more money.

It also promotes the competition between teachers, and competition results in stimulation and motivation. The teachers know that more knowledge about the subject and better skills at teaching than their peers can guarantee them more money. Therefore, they are motivated to study from each other and try different teaching methods to find out which one has better results.

However, the academic performance of the students may get improved, I have to argue that the score of the test is not everything students learn at school. At school, students learn a variety of things, such as facts about history, methods to solve linear algebra and equation, the appreciation of the literature and so on. Despite the knowledge of the textbooks, they also learn how to study a subject, how to remember facts, and develop a curiosity towards a certain field. I think any teacher who can teach the students any one of the above is an excellent teacher, and these things can not be measured in the academic evaluation because they are abstract, and they are an inner part of the students. My history teacher is one of my favourite teachers. He puts aside the dull textbook and presents us direct evidence of the past. He listens to our opinions rather than requiring us to remember the standard answers on the textbooks. I used to hate history class because I think history are the facts about the past and they are useless in the future. However, in the lessons of my history teacher, I see history as interesting stories and it is also inspiration and warning for the future. My passion for the history can not be measured in the exam, but I think my history teacher is awesome because with his guidance I change the view of a whole subject and develop my own opinions for it.

Using money as a motivation may result in the unhealthy teacher methods of the teacher. Some teachers may use harsh punishments on the students because of their bad performance or distraction in the class. For example, some teachers may require the students to write a word for a thousand times simply because they gave a wrong one during the class, which is both unnecessary and time-wasting for the students. I cannot deny the huge benefit of warning the students to preview the lessons before class, but the benefit of it cannot outweigh the cost.

In sum, I believe that the performance of teachers should be measured in a variety of ways, and students’ performance is only a part of it. What’s more, I believe rewarding teachers with small gifts is also better than paying them more money.

"We can usually learn much more from people whose views we share than from people whose views contradict our own."; “disagreement can cause stress and inhibit learning."

DISAGREE with the 1st statement

1 think in their shoes

2 find out our flaws

PARTLY AGREE with the 2nd statement

1 Phycology agree with this

2 think twice

Some people argue that we can learn much more from people who share the same views as us, and less from people who have opposite views. I disagree with the statement, because long ago I learnt that listening to different voices promotes multi-dimension understanding and steps out of our comfort zone. I partly agree with the second statement. While contradiction does give us more stress, I do not agree that it prevents us from learning.

Learning about different views is a great way to force us to gain more knowledge. If every book tells us the things we already know, why should we even spend time reading it? Talking with people who share the same view with us can provide a sense of belonging and understanding, because we know that we are not alone and there are people feeling the same thing as I do. However, all of my comprehension of a certain thing stays in the same zone, and without even realizing contract views, I can never jump out of it. However, communication with people who have contract views makes me nervous and stressed, and I am forced to think in their shoes. Why do they say so? Can their evidence confirm their views? Can my evidence support my views? Which one is correct? I keep asking myself because of my own desire to persuade someone. In this way, I gain more knowledge either by building up my examples with contraction, or by finding out my view is wrong and should move on in another direction.

Furthermore, people like to defend their own views, and debates with people who hold different views from us will be the most useful way to find flaws in each other's theories. To defend oneself, one would have to search for more and more evidence to support his own theory and find out the blemish of their opponents to defeat them. They try their best in the competition because they are enemies rather than companions. In this way, we are learning from both consequences-victory and failure-we have a more perfect theory or we have been wrong for a long time.

In sum, I think that communicating with people who do not share views with me is more beneficial because I cannot learn from the things that I already know and I have to be forced to think differently. Everyone can have different evidence to support their own views and we should respect every one of them. Disagreement promotes learning, rather than inhibits learning.

No field of study can advance significantly unless outsiders bring their knowledge and skills to that field of study.

Outline

Knowledge of natural language processing was introduced into the fields of computer vision, contributing to the researchers in those fields.

Literary critics borrow new ideas formulated by philosophers to further their studies.

When biology and chemistry met, biochemistry came into being.

Some people argue that study can only advance greatly with the knowledge and skills that outsiders bring into a specific field. I concede that some significant progress is made by the people in the field but I think most of the great ones do not. I completely agree with this view because I believe different fields always have something in common with each other and there will be sparks when they come across each other.

Some advancement is indeed made by the people in the field. In 2017, scientists in google proposed a method in the neural networks called attention, which was to multiply two matrixes in a fashion of key and value, and the specific method brought significant advancement in a lot of natural language downstream tasks. It had been a long time that traditional neural networks only achieve about 70 points in the evaluation. In 2018, Bert, bidirectional encoder representations from transformer, which combines attention with the architecture of transformers, achieved 85 points in the merit for the first time, and it soon became a must-learn neural network for everyone who wanted to pursuit further study in natural language processing. The original paper has about 20 thousand citations now.

Knowledge of natural language processing was introduced into the field of computer vision, contributing to the researcher in both fields. On the CIFAR classification task, the best neural network, Noisy-Student from Facebook research, achieved 85 percent of the accuracy. Although this is a relatively high result, the huge training and evaluation cost is beyond our imagination. In the last few months of 2020, the researchers from Google presents VIT, Vision Transformer, using the exact architecture as Bert from natural language processing, achieves only less than 1 percent behind Noisy-Student with 1/20 parameters. It has been to long that the researchers in computer vision only focus on the modification and training tricks of the convolution neural network to achieve a state-of-the-art result, rather than turn to natural language processing to search the solution.

To sum up, outsiders play a significant role in the advancement of a certain field. Most of the time, insiders have formed their way of thinking in their field and been unwilling to step out of their comfort zone. When outsiders come, they bring new knowledge, new skills, new ways of thinking, which appears unfamiliar to the in siders. Only with new blood can we make a great progress.

The video camera provides such an accurate and convincing record of contemporary life that it has become a more important form of documentation than written records.

Outline

Benefits of video document

1 vivid

2 easy

Benefit of written records

1 more formal

2 better crafted

Drawback

1 easy to varnish

Some people argue that video camera is more accurate and convincing than writing documents to record our lives. However, in my point of view, both video camera and pan are an excellent way to remind us of our days. Their different forms give them different characteristics and they both have some advantages and disadvantages.

Written records are more formal and they are better crafted. In the past, when the video cameras were not invented, the only way for people to record their lives is by pan and paper. At night, before they had to go to sleep, they could spend some time thinking about what they had done in the day and wrote down their feelings. Often these words were better selected, and the language was organized in a beautiful way. Using a video camera puts all the old-time feeling behind. People simply record what happens to them and what they see, rather than what they see and how they feel.

Written records are not perfect. They are easy to varnish. Some paper has in deed survived a long time, while most of them disappear if people move homes. Water may destroy them, fire may destroy them and bugs may destroy them. But video records can store in the cloud service providers, who have a lot of insurance methods to guarantee the safety of the data. They can use backups, storing the data in different data centers. Even in case of natural disasters, our data still remains safe.

Video camera has an advantage that written records cannot compare – it is live. It is a series of pictures with voices, from which we can see people throwing a party, birds sing on top of a tree and even wonderful moments of sports event. When we watch the videos again, we go through that emotion, and we remember how we feel that day. What’s more, shooting video is much easier than writing. I do not have to spend time worrying about the structure of my article, I can just turn on the button on the camera and everything is recorded. One of my favourite vlogger used to say freezing the moments was once the power of gods only, and video camera gives us a chance to do what gods can do.

To sum up, I believe video cameras and written records are both a good way to remember our everyday lives. They have different pros and cons, and that is what makes both of them are equally important.

It is often necessary, even desirable, for political leaders to withhold information from the public.

Outline

1 Something may cause the public panic

2 Political leaders must maintain status and power

3 Democracy requires most information to be transparent to the public

The speaker says it is both necessary and desirable for political leaders to hide information from the public. I partly agree with the statement, while I also believe democracy demands the government can not hide everything from the public.

I agree with the speaker that it is sometimes necessary, and even desirable, for political leaders to withhold information from the public. A contrary view would reveal a naivety about the inherent nature of public politics, and about the sorts of compromises on the part of well-intentioned political leaders necessary in order to further the public's ultimate interests. Nevertheless, we must not allow our political leaders undue freedom to with-hold information, otherwise, we risk sanctioning demagoguery and undermining the philosophical underpinnings of any democratic society.

Can you write the start paragraph in 4 sentences?

I agree with the speaker that it is sometimes necessary and desirable for political leaders to withhold information from the public. A contrary view would lead to unnecessary panic of the public and disadvantages against other countries in a competitive world. Nevertheless, we should not allow our government to withhold information as they please, otherwise, we put our democracy and own interests under threat.

Politicians will not be able to maintain his or her own figure, status and power if he tells everything to the public. Humans are not perfect – we have both advantages and disadvantages, and we have loves and hates. We want someone who is sublime to lead us and our country, rather than someone who we can count and have fun on his or her every con in daily chats. If every advantage and disadvantage is revealed to the public, I can not help wondering will people still elect he or she to be our president. The answer is likely to be no. Even he or she is elected to be the president, we may not follow him or her as we do not know so much about one do.

One reason for my fundamental agreement with the speaker is that in order to gain the opportunity for effective public leadership, a would-be leader must first gain and maintain political power. In the game of politics, complete forthrightness is a sign of vulnerability and naivete, neither of which earn a politician respect among his or her opponents, and which those opponents will use to every advantage to defeat the politician. In my observation some measure of pandering to the electorate is necessary to gain and maintain political leadership. For example, were all politicians to fully disclose every personal foible, character flaw, and detail concerning personal life, few honest politicians would ever by elected. While this view might seem cynical, personal scandals have in fact proven the undoing of many a political career; thus, I think this view is realistic.

Some social news must also withhold from the public to avoid eavesdropping from other countries. For example, some decisions made by the government are considered as national secrets which should be kept from public knowledge. If the government tells everyone the secrets, they are no longer secrets and the enemies as well as competitors will come up with certain strategy to deal with us. In this case, we will fail from time to time.

Another reason why I essentially agree with the speaker is that fully disclosing to the public certain types of information would threaten public safety and perhaps even national security. For example, if the President were to disclose the government's strategies for thwarting specific plans of an international terrorist or a drug trafficker, those strategies would surely fail, and the public's health and safety would be compromised as a result. Withholding information might also be necessary to avoid public panic. While such cases are rare, they do occur occasionally. For example, during the first few hours of the new millennium the U.S. Pentagon's missile defense system experienced a Y2K- related malfunction. This fact was withheld from the public until later in the day, once the problem had been solved; and legitimately so, since immediate disclosure would have served no useful purpose and might even have resulted in mass hysteria.

Although withholding information from the public is both beneficial and necessary, we should not allow political leaders to hide them as they like. In a democratic country, citizens have a right to know what is going on in their country and thus they can know where the government is leading the country. Many political leaders, who like to hide everything from their people, usually like to maintain their power by brute force, and people who live in those countries are leading a misery life. In World War Two, Hitler gained his power by controlling what people read, what they said, and even what they thought, and some secrets were hidden from the solders. They even had no idea about who they killed.

Having recognized that withholding information from the public is often necessary to serve the interests of that public, legitimate political leadership nevertheless requires forthrightness with the citizenry as to the leader's motives and agenda. History informs us that would-be leaders who lack such forthrightness are the same ones who seize and maintain power either by brute force or by demagoguery--that is, by deceiving and manipulating the citizenry. Paragons such as Genghis Khan and Hitler, respectively, come immediately to mind. Any democratic society should of course abhor demagoguery, which operates against the democratic principle of government by the people. Consider also less egregious examples, such as President Nixon's withholding of information about his active role in the Watergate cover-up. His behavior demonstrated a concern for self- interest above the broader interests of the democratic system that granted his political authority in the first place.

In sum, to maintain democracy and the interests of the public, while some information should withhold from the public, I believe citizens have a right to learn about other things in their country. To address this, maybe we can use laws to prevent withholding becoming dishonesty.

In sum, the game of politics calls for a certain amount of disingenuousness and lack of forthrightness that we might otherwise characterize as dishonesty. And such behavior is a necessary means to the final objective of effective political leadership. Nevertheless, in any democracy a leader who relies chiefly on deception and secrecy to preserve that leadership, to advance a private agenda, or to conceal selfish motives, betrays the democracy-and ends up forfeiting the political game.

Governments must ensure that their major cities receive the financial support they need in order to thrive, because it is primary in cities that a nation's cultural traditions are preserved and generated.

Outline

First yes

Financial support can do a lot of things.

Building up museums, facilities and so on.

Second no

Primary is mentioned above. Without these foundations we can not do a lot of things.

The speaker says that it is the responsibility of government to offer sufficient financial support for the cities so that they can develop and generate their cultural traditions. I agree with the first part of the statement, as a main function of the national government is to allocate the resources of the country for the prosperity of both the cities and the country. However, in my view, it is more significant to use the money to build up fundamental facilities in developing cities, and it is only in developed cities can we use it to preserve and generate cultural traditions.

Whether it is in federal or non-federal countries, it is the duty of national government to allocate resources between provinces or states. Therefore, the allocation should achieve a balance between cities, which means that every city gets enough financial support from the government. For example, rich cities have to pay more tax to the central government, and poor cities receive support from the government in China. It is healthy and beneficial for the development of the country.

How to spend the money depends on the condition of the development of the city. For a developing city, I would argue that building up public facilities is more important than spending money to preserve and generate cultural traditions. The best result is that the city can achieve a balance between cultural and foundations, but if it cannot, the foundations are more tangible to citizens and the benefits of developing them are greater than culture. People will be happier if they have more advanced hospitals, less traffic jams, and more convenient life. After the development of city reaches a certain stage, we should consider cultural preservation and generation.

It is more important to develop culture rather than public facilities in a development city. In both empirical and academic experience, the marginal gain will drop dramatically if the city is well-developed. Traditional culture is a valuable part of our country. It not only contributes to the diversity of our own country, but also to the world. It would be a great loss if the traditions varnish, as the ancient people make efforts through generations and they are finally passed to us. It is the most essential part of their wisdom. Without the traditional cultural, we might loss our own character in the globalization.

To sum up, government should function in the allocation of the financial resources of the country, and where the money goes depends on the development of the city.

All nations should help support the development of a global university designed to engage students in the process of solving the world's most persistent social problems.

Outline

Agree

1 A lot of problems require concerted efforts to solve.

2 Students from different backgrounds can learn a lot of things from each other.

However, a lot of problems need to solve.

1 How many students should be admitted to the university

2 define global problems

The speak says it is important from all countries to develop a global university and encourage its students to work on the most persistent social problems of the world. I agree with the statement, as they are many social problems unsolved and requires concerted effort from every country. However, building up such a university is likely to bring up many problems. Even so, I believe the benefits significantly outweigh the disadvantages.

Nowadays, even though we live in peaceful times, there are a lot of problems faced with human. For example, global warming is an inevitable problem that mankind needs to face. Such problems cannot be solved with a single country – if country A reduces its gas emission and country B increases gas emission, eventually both A and B need to face global warming. Only when two countries decrease their emission together can we slow the process down.

Secondly, students from different cultural backgrounds are likely to benefit from each other because of diversity. They can learn a lot of new things from their classmates, and they can also learn to think in different ways. For example, Chinese people like to talk about things indirectly and American people like to talk about them directly, so when they talk to each other, they can learn to see things in different people’ shoes.

However, a global university is also likely to bring up a lot of problems. For instance, how many students should be admitted to the university from different countries? Who could define global problems and decide which area to work on? The idea of global university is charming at the first glance, but the realistic problems cannot be ignore for the further development of the global university.

In sum, developing a global university is bewitching and amazing, which some problems remain for careful consideration.

Many of the world's lesser-known languages are being lost as fewer and fewer people speak them. The governments of countries in which these languages are spoken should act to prevent such languages from becoming extinct.

Outline

Agree

1 They contribute to the cultural diversity of the world.

2 They are an essential part of the tradition of a country.

3 in the process of globalization, it takes a lot of effort for the government to do this,

The speaker claims that some lesser-known languages are varnishing as fewer and fewer people speak them, and the governments of their countries should prevent the process of extinction. I completely agree with the statement, as these minor languages are also essential parts of human cultures, which not only belong to the countries that these languages are spoken, but also to the world. While preserving these languages takes a lot of costs, I would say the benefits significantly outweigh the costs.

The cost of the preservation may be a huge burden for the local governments. Most of the developed countries speak English or other languages used by a lot of people, which do not face the danger of varnishing. It is in those developing countries, often with quite a small population, that are likely to face the crisis. They are usually struggling with financial burdens, and preservation will make their situations worse. They need to pay salaries for people who are in charge of the preservation, and they also need to set up schools to educate the next generation.

However, every language has a unique character which is deeply related to the traditional culture of their original countries. The ancient people developed them to communicate with each other. They used it to deliver messages, to convey needs and emotion, to strengthen relationships and bonds with each other, and to pass knowledge through generations. The language already faced the danger of distinction when wars and catastrophe fell upon them, but somehow, they make it to pass the knowledge to today. Therefore, these local languages have unique values. When people from these countries leave their homes and live in different parts of the world, they often find joy and surprise if they happen to hear the language spoken in their hometown, which implies their connection and root in the same culture.

What’s more, these languages are also valuable parts of cultural diversity of the world. It is hard to imagine all the people from different parts of the world eventually share the same cultural backgrounds with each other during the process of globalization. We should accept and respect different cultures, as they give us a new way to view things differently and learn about the world.

There is an old saying, “A person who speaks a second language possesses a second sole”. So as the people from the lesser-known language spoken countries, they lost their sole when they lost their mother tongue. In the process of globalization, many countries use English either as their first or second language. This is fascinating for people to communicate with each other even when they come from different parts of the world and have different cultural backgrounds, but we also need to recognize the fact that lesser-known languages are just as important as English. If developed countries can give a hand to those developing countries, our cultural diversity can be maintained through generations.

Although many people think that the luxuries and conveniences of contemporary life are entirely harmless, they in fact, prevent people from developing into truly strong and independent individuals.

Outline

1 Luxuries are not harmless, they promote the trend towards purchasing goods of higher prices.

2 Conveniences are most of time harmless, they can improve our life quality.

3 They do influence people, but not in this way.

4 There are other things influencing people, such as self-discipline.

The speaker asserts that people believe that the luxuries and conveniences of daily life are harmful because they prevent people from developing into strong and independent individuals. This statement is two-fold, and I agree with the first half of the statement while I disagree with the second half part. In my opinion, luxuries and conveniences are two different things and they have different social functions. Luxuries reveal a person’ social status by indicating that a person is able to afford such expensive things. Conveniences allow people to live in an easier and happier way, and this often offers them more time to spend on other things. I believe the true reason that affects a person’s strength and independence is other qualities such as self-discipline and the ability to deal with difficulties.

Most cultures encourage individuals to sacrifice a large part of their own personalities in order to be like other people. Thus, most people are afraid to think or behave differently because they do not want to be excluded.

Outline

Agree

First part

In this way can culture pass on and prosper.

Second part

It is part of the nature of human. It is normal.

There are two types of laws: just and unjust. Every individual in a society has a responsibility to obey just laws and, even more importantly, to disobey and resist unjust laws.

Outline

1 The evaluation of the types of laws depends on a person’s value system.

2 Resisting unjust laws is likely to cause chaos.

The speaker claims that we have both just laws and unjust laws, and we should obey just laws and disobey unjust laws. The speaker’s assertion is two-fold and I strongly disagree with both of them. In my opinion, the justification of the law is based on a person’s value and it varies from people to people. Disobeying laws is likely to cause riots and chaos in the country, which are extremely dangerous.

The usage of laws is a great progress in t human political history and laws are born justified as most of the people write and vote them until they are ratified. In the past, human with no laws evaluated one’s action based on their values, and there were barely legal procedures. A number of people can be misjudged and proven innocent after harsh punishment. As the politics advanced, rulers realized that they needed a legal system for evaluation rather than their opinions. This is how laws are invented, and after hundreds of years, we still use them today. Time proves that it is a objective and unbiased way to justify people and most people agree with laws as tools to fight for their rights.

Laws are made to protect the rights of most people, but not everyone believes that laws are even. For example, some people believe the right of abortion belongs to the mother while some believe it is forbidden. I once watched a movie called Dallas Buyer Club, which reveals the conviction whether dying patients had a right to choose their own drug which was not approved by the FDA. Conviction is everywhere, and most of the time laws serve the interest of most people, and thus we should obey them.

Disobeying the laws is likely to cause crime, chaos and riots. If some one from indulgent background believes the law preventing stealing is to protect rich people, while he does what he believes it is right to steal from somebody, he breaks the order of society. The more people share the same belief with him, the more chaos we are likely to confront. Therefore, obeying laws is the best way to keep the society functioning well.

To sum up, I believe we should follow the laws, whether they are either just or unjust in our beliefs.

Anyone can make things bigger and more complex. What requires real effort and courage is to move in the opposite direction---in other words, to make things as simple as possible.

Outline

Agree

1 Complexity may improve the performance of things

They are made for now but not for the future

2 Simplicity is the final solution

Which we have not yet found

The speaker claims that it is much easier to make things bigger and more complex than to make them simpler. I completely agree with this statement, because I think the answers to the problems can always be in simple forms. Bigger and more complex solution can only represent the problem in a better way, while they are not the true solutions.

Most people would agree that buildings represent a valuable record of any society's past, but controversy arises when old buildings stand on ground that modern planners feel could be better used for modern purposes. In such situations, modern development should be given

precedence over the preservation of historic buildings so that contemporary needs can be

served.

Outline

Pros

Historical buildings represent the traditional culture

Reminds us of our past

Cons

They do not meet the current needs

Modern buildings are more efficient

The speaker asserts that though traditional buildings are valuable as a form of records of the past of our society, modern buildings meet the demands better of current purposes of the people. However, in my opinion, the traditional significance of modern buildings can not be overcome by the modern needs, we should preserve them with every effort.

Students should memorize facts only after they have studied the ideas, trends, and concepts that help explain those facts. Students who have learned only facts have learned very little.

Outline

I agree with the assertion

Ideas are very important for us to understand the facts.

Although this could be a little time-consuming, it is beneficial for us to apply the knowledge to other fields.

Unfortunately, the media tend to highlight what is sensational at the moment. Society would be better served if the media reported or focused more fully on events and trends that will ultimately have the most long-term significance.

Outline

Short-term events are important.

They reflect the most urgent things that happen around us.

We can share our opinions with people around us.

Long-term events are important.

Pollution

Global Warming

They are both important types that our media should cover.

If we ignore the long-term effects, it would be too late when we realize them.

The speaker asserts that it is better for media to address issues that is sensational in the future rather than events with short term effects. In my opinion, both events with short-term influence and long-term influence are equally important, as they reflect different levels of concerns and problems in our society. In fact, following the speaker’s claim makes us ignore a substantial number of significant issues in our society, which is more unacceptable.

People tend to value events at the moment more because they reflect something happening around us. For example, we respond more actively to the lockdown due to COVID-19 than the news about global warming. That is because lockdown affects our life at the moment-we can only stay in our homes and work at home. In contrast, the effects of global warming may begin to reveal after half a century. Although it may affect people’s life to a greater extent, such as moving to another city because of the increasement of sea level, people are more likely to pay less attention because it seems harmless at the moment.

Another factor would be the influence of social media. People are likely to get more comments and likes if they share their opinions on the current events rather than the future events, which encourage them to pay more attention on the current events. This is like a circle-The more you care about current events, the more interaction you get. The more interaction you get, you pay more attention to such events which are attractive to the public.

However, if we ignore the impact of long-term events, the outcome would be disastrous. If we do not set a limit on gas emission and allow the temperature to rise, I am afraid that we are about to see that millions of people lose their jobs and their homes, and diseases spread along the coast. Media focusing on the long-term-affect events will arouse the concern of more people so that people can make every effort to prevent such events from happening.

To sum up, I believe we should pay equal importance to both events, as they have significant impacts on our life.

Money spent on research is almost always a good investment, even when the results of that research are controversial.

I disagree with the assertion.

Outline

There are different types of research.

Some are beneficial for human. However

Some are harmful to human.

Some are simply a waste of money.

The speaker assert that money spend on research is always beneficial regardless of the types of research and the results of it. Research has long been considered as a fundamental approach for humans to gain an insight into the world and the future. While it seems that research is beneficial to the man kind, I have to argue that there are different types of research and they have different functions.

Some research is extremely harmful to the man kind, and it is definitely a waste of money. The research of nuclear weapons is about inventing something that can erase the whole city and make the land and water radioactive, which presents threat to human life even after hundreds of years.

The use of nuclear missiles actually stopped the World War Two, forcing the Japanese to surrender. What’s more, the nuclear technology accumulated during the war can be used to research nuclear power, which later proved to be a widely used energy. We can not only generate a large amount of power of the nuclear, but also it emits no gas into the atmosphere.

However, even when the initial motivation of some research seems beneficial to humans, as long as the results are harmful, the money invested is also a waste.

Creating an appealing image has become more important in contemporary society than is the reality or truth behind that image.

Outline

For

People tend to view the surface rather than the internal quality of people or things.

First impression is most likely based on appearance.

Courses, people, etc.

Against

The internal quality is much more important. Most successful figures rely on their quality.

The speaker asserts that the appealing image of something or someone has a more significant impact on the reality or truth behind the image.

The image of something or someone contributes more to people’s attitudes towards them. When people encounter something or someone for the first time, it is the surface that makes the first impression, and people tend to make judgement based on their first impression. The judgement is the most important factor for people to decide on how to deal with such things. For example, if someone meets a beauty and an ordinary woman for the first time, one is likely to presume that the beauty is more attractive and has better inner quality than the ordinary people because her appealing outlook has left great impression on him.

Public figures such as actors, politicians, and athletes should expect people to be interested in their private lives. When they seek a public role, they should expect that they will lose at least some of their privacy.

The primary goal of technological advancement should be to increase people's efficiency so that everyone has more leisure time.

Most of the people we consider heroic today were, in fact, very ordinary people who happened to be in the right place at the right time.

Outline

Ordinary people can be heroes.

Being heroes requires bravery and certain characteristics.

Some people argue that today we are living in an age of heroes, as it seems that everyone can be a hero if one happens to do the right thing at the right place in the right time. Another reason would be the changed meaning of hero. In ancient times, people usually considered those who fought against fierce monsters as heroes. However, nowadays, we regard those who are brave, kind-hearted, and have contribution to our society as heroes.

If an ordinary person does the right thing at the right place and in the right time, people will consider one as a hero. What differentiate this person from others is that he is the only one who is willing to do the right things. Other people may appear at the wrong place, miss the right time, or they are unwilling to do such things. Therefore, this person outstands from others and people talk about him as a hero. For example, when the first case of Covid-19 appeared in a hospital of Wuhan in December, 2019, Xingliang was the first person to report the case to the leaders of the hospital and publicize the news. He is regarded as a hero of our time, because he is the one who tried to inform the public that a deadly disease was on the way.

However, I would argue that not everyone can be a hero because a hero has some special characteristics that others do not process, and it is the personality and knowledge that makes one a hero while others are not. A hero has some special characteristics that allows him to see what other people cannot see, and makes him what other people cannot do. As he becomes the only person to do such things, we then take him as our hero. Consider the example above. A person needs to go through a lot of tests to identify his illness. However, during the tests, no other doctor than Xingliang was able to tell that the symptoms were quite similar to SARS and it would be deadly if it spread among the public. If the disease was some kind which was similar to SARS, the outcome would be disastrous. Some doctors who shared the diagnosing results with him were afraid that they might face punishment if the leaders did not allow them to tell the public and the disease was not as deadly as SARS. However, Xingliang was willing to take the responsibility and informed the public at the very beginning. It is his bravery and years of knowledge as an expert that makes him a hero who will be remembered forever.

In the final analysis, although it is much easier for people to become a hero in today’s world, being a hero also requires special characteristics and knowledge.

In any field—business, politics, education, government—those in power should step down after five years. The surest path for any enterprise is revitalization through new leadership.

Any authority needs fresh blood to maintain revitalization. If the members of the authority remain the same in such a fast-changing world, new knowledge, technologies and methods will have little chance to be applied, therefore the efficiency cannot be improved. For example, as the information technology advanced rapidly in the business field, many great companies broke off because they could not keep up with the trend and adapt to the new environment, such as Nokia, Motorola, etc. Therefore, the fresh blood from changing leadership seems to be the driving force for the development of an organization.

An organization needs revitalization indeed, but it does not mean that it has to change leadership. While an outdated organization may be the fault of the leader, some leaders are able to see their limitations and keep challenging themselves. On the contrary, the replacement of leadership does not guarantee new methods of organizing and innovation. For example, Steve Jobs never stopped to innovate when he was in Apple, but Apple was questioned lack of innovation after his death.

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

Outline

I disagree with the statement.

Some people take time to judge their achievement.

While contemporary heroes do not.

In the ancient time of China, the reliable version of history was generally written by the historians in the next dynasty. That is because kings like to modify the records, kill people who talk about their drawbacks, and the impact of policies takes time to reveal. However, things have changed a lot nowadays. As no one is ever powerful as a king any more, I believe everyone can be able to decide the greatness of individuals.

A lot of people have great influence in their field, but their greatness takes generations to reveal. Most of the time, people regard genius as freaks, and they cannot appreciate masterpieces beyond knowledge. Therefore, contemporary people cannot realize that certain individuals’ work can be the beginning of a new era. There are a lot of artists whose work was not recognized by the people of their time, and even the greatest artist we consider now could barely live on their own by selling their works. Picasso is a great artist, and his artworks are expressive. However, in his times, people loved oil paintings and showed no favor for impressionism. Picasso’s work was beyond the wildest imagination of the people in his times, so people tended not to consider him as a genius but as a freak. But now, our knowledge advances and we are more open to different kinds of art. Therefore, we are able to appreciate Picasso’s artwork and regard him as the one of the greatest artists in the twentieth century. As a result, some greatness of individuals needs to be judged by people who live after them.

While no one s able to modify history as kings used to do, their greatness can be decided by contemporary people. Contemporary people are much more open to different things than people in the past, and they will not be punished if they speak ill of someone, as information can be encrypted and private. Therefore, when we encounter a great person, we praise him and consider him as one the most outstanding persons of our time. For example, one of the greatest doctors in China in the century, was able to identify the deadly disease of Covid-19 and warn the public to take proper measures one month before the government made any further announcement. His achievement is remarkable and the outcome can be told by contemporary people, therefore, we consider him as one of the greatest doctors because he has further insight than others.

While it can be argued that every generation of people in their times have certain limitations and make biased judges, and some impact takes years to reveal, I believe the analysis is fundamentally correct while it leaves out some corner cases. Human’s knowledge has made such a great progress that I believe we are able to judge a sufficient amount of the great individuals.

In the final analysis, I believe people’s greatness can not only be judged by people who live after them, but also by people of their times.

In the age of television, reading books is not as important as it once was. People can learn as much by watching television as they can by reading books.

Outline

Reading books is an experience different from watching television.

Ancient books.

Some writers do not produce their knowledge in a video form.

Television has a lot of visual information.

Nowadays, almost everyone has a television in his home, and people generally spend more time watching TV rather than reading books. Television has become a popular way for people to gain knowledge because of its prevalence. Some people argue that people can learn as much as much by watching television as they can by reading books. While I believe that people can learn something from television, there is still some knowledge that people cannot acquire if they watch television only.

The main method for people to learn by television is to watch documentaries and educational programs. A lot of documentaries introduce a large amount of knowledge in various fields, and because television programs contain images and sounds, people find them more attractive than reading books. Watching educational programs is very similar to learning in a classroom, where a teacher would try one’s best effort to present knowledge to his students. Therefore, watching television has become an effective way of learning new knowledge.

However, I also have to argue that some knowledge cannot be acquired by watching television only. Some authors do not present their knowledge in videos—they write down their knowledge on paper only. A typical example would be most ancient books. In the past, the authors could not present their knowledge in videos simply because television had not been invented. Some people may argue that we can make these books into television programs so that everyone can learn from the books. However, translating such books into television programs takes huge effort, not to mention translating them into different languages. What’ more, for some literature work, the state of mind of people is different if they produce their work in a different way. Therefore, some knowledge can only be gained from reading books rather than television.

In the final analysis, although watching television has become an effective way of learning, there are still some kinds of knowledge can only be acquired from reading books.

Scholars and researchers should not be concerned with whether their work makes a contribution to the larger society. It is more important that they pursue their individual interests, however unusual or idiosyncratic those interests may seem.

Outline

Disagree with the statement.

This is a claim and reason. The statement is two-fold.

They should consider their contribution to the larger society.

Pursuing individual interest is important, but some unusual ideas should not be considered.

The direction and content that the scholars and researchers embark on have been a controversial topic for many people. The speaker claims that they should not concern about whether their work contributes to larger the society, instead, they should only pursue their own interests. What’s more, the speaker also asserts that they can research about unusual or idiosyncratic issues. I completely disagree with the statement. In my opinion, scientists should combine their own interests and the welfare of the society to conduct their research, and therefore, their topics should be significant to the development of the society, rather than their own weird interests.

A fundamental reason would be that most people do wish scientists to research for the benefits of the society. A fact is that most scholars and researchers receive funding from the government, and the funding generally coms from taxpayers. Therefore, the funding reflects the people’s wish that scientists’ research actually contributes to the larger society. Otherwise, I doubt whether taxpayers are willing to fund to research authority if they use it for their own purpose.

Another reason would be that research should somehow be beneficial to the society, otherwise it would be meaningless. If the research is not beneficial to the society, it means that it may make no contribution or even present harmful impact to the society. Some people may argue that some beneficial impact of research may reveal after years, but I believe some beneficial research have the same effect. For example, the research about nuclear weapons led to a lot of serious diseases in Japan after World War Two, which I believe it was totally unnecessary and harmful. Some people would like to say that military technology boosts the invention of nuclear power station. However, if we put nuclear technology into good use in the beginning, we still will be able to possess nuclear power technology.

Thirdly, if we allow researchers and scholars research on something unusual and idiosyncratic and do not impose restrictions on the topics and themes, they may actually make something violating the moral principles. Some topics are banned by the government because they present potential threats to the society, and if we allow researcher to work on whatever they like, it could be a disaster. For example, some scientists are crazy about cloning humans. Although cloning technology has a lot of benefits, such as replacing organs with a cloned organ, what if the scientists clone a whole human? There will be a huge problem about what we should do about him.

In the final analysis, I believe that we should impose regulations on scientists’ research and their research should be beneficial for the larger society.

Woven baskets.

Write a response in which you discuss what specific evidence is needed to evaluate the argument and explain how the evidence will weaken or strengthen the argument.

In this argument, the arguer advocates that the so-called Palean baskets were not uniquely Palean. Although this argument may seem reasonable at the first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, the arguer assumes that the only way to cross the river is by boat because the river is deep and wide. We need evidence of the information of local climate of geology at the time, such as an old map. If the map indicates that the river was once shallow and narrow and people can walk across the river, then it weakens the assumption that people need boat to across the river.

In the second place, the arguer assumes that no Palean people could not build boats because no Palean boats were found. We need evidence of the depth of caving, intermediate papers, and artistic things to help us identify if there were boats at the time. If the evidence indicates that the Palean people somehow possessed sailing technology and they had been to other places which required the usage of boats, the evidence weaken the assumption that Palean people did not have boats.

In the third place, the arguer assumes that it is the Palean People brought the baskets to Lithos at that time. We need evidence of the papers about other ancient towns near Palean and Lithos. If the papers indicates that there was evidence of trading and caving between the two places, it could be the merchants who brought the baskets to the other side years later. Therefore, such evidence weakens the assumption that the Palean People brought the baskets to Lithos.

To sum up, various evidences are still needed to infer the possible reason why the baskets appeared in Lithos in order to draw the conclusion in a more convincing way.

Such nonmainstream areas of inquiry as astrology, fortune-telling, and psychic and paranormal pursuits play a vital role in society by satisfying human needs that are not addressed by mainstream science.

Outline

Nonmainstream science plays a vital role in society.

They are important because they can satisfy human needs that mainstream science cannot.

To be an effective leader, a public official must maintain the highest ethical and moral standards.

Outline

Effective is not very connected to the highest ethical and moral standards.

It is good.

It is unrealistic.

We can strike a balance.

In the democratic world, we have higher requirement and expectation for our political leaders. There is no doubt that we want a perfect leader, who maintains the highest ethical standards and the most effective management ability at the same time. The speak asserts that a political official must maintain the highest ethical and moral standards in order to be an effective leader. In my opinion, the assertion is too extreme. As mentioned above, a political leader needs both leading power and moral standards. Therefore, we need to consider all the factors carefully, rather than ignoring some of them.

Maintaining the highest ethical and moral standards is very significant for being a political leader. Firstly, political leader is the representative of our country, and our relation with other countries depends mostly on the political leader’s opinion towards them. The better our relationship with other countries, the more effective we consider the political leader is. A high ethical leader is more likely to establish good relationship with other countries by shouldering the global responsibility and helping developing countries. For example, the president in China maintains a very high reputation for his ethical standards in the public. Since he became the president of China, China has improved relations significantly with other countries, and the Chinese people all regard him as one of the greatest leaders in Chinese history. Secondly, the political leader has been regarded as the model for people’s behavior. As everyone and the media are keeping a close eye on the political leader, his behavior has become more important than ever before. Thirdly, a political leader with high moral standards is more likely to make policies for the larger benefit of his people. As a political leader with lower standards is more likely to consider the short-term benefit and ignore the long-term impact, he could make policy only to maximize his political performance and interests rather than consider the future of the country carefully.

While some leaders in government, sports, industry, and other areas attribute their success to a well-developed sense of competition, a society can better prepare its young people for leadership by instilling in them a sense of cooperation.

Some people attribute their success to excellence in fierce competitions, while some people believe that cooperation leads to success. In my opinion, competition and cooperation are of equal importance to success.

Competition puts pressure on people and pressure is a key factor in motivating people to become better ones. Only when people become better ones can they overperform others and become successful. For example, in the Olympic Games every four years, people from all over the world gather together to compete with each other. To demonstrate one’s ability of mastering a certain sport to audience around the world, one must practice hard in the gap of every game. Only with the ambition to win can one do so many impossible things and challenge the limitation of human beings. Therefore, certain amount of pressure pushing people going further and grants them with success.

Cooperation allows people to work together. Only be assembling everyone’s advantages and avoiding disadvantages, people can exceed the limitation of oneself and become successful. Nowadays, a lot of projects require the cooperation of people from different fields. Apple launches a new iPhone every year and a lot of people focus on Apple Events because iPhone is one of the best cellphones in the world. However, the invention of new iPhone requires people from different fields working closely with each other. Take the camera as an example. People from optical department design the lens, people from electrical circuit department design the CMOS to turn the light signals into electrical signals, and people from the artificial intelligence department researches new algorithm to integrate the electrical signals and turn them into the best photos with accurate color and wide dynamic range. Therefore, with cooperation can people exceed the limitation of one’s knowledge and make great things together.

In conclusion, both competition and cooperation are important to the success of people.

In this argument, the author reaches the conclusion that birth order influences an individual’s levels of stimulation. Although the evidence he offered seems reasonable at the first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, the writer assumes that the birth order of the rhesus monkeys is relevant to producing up to twice as much as the hormone cortisol. Although this is entirely possible, the arguer ignores the variance that the monkeys’ ages are different. It is very likely that older monkeys tend to produce higher levels of hormone cortisol than younger ones. We need to do more controlled experiments to exclude the effect of age. In other words, we can use monkeys from the same age with different birth order to do the same experiment. If the stimulation level is still relevant with birth order, we have stronger evidence.

In the second place, the writer assumes that the birth order of humans is also relevant to the level of hormone cortisol. Nevertheless, there is no guarantee that it is necessarily the case, and it is quite likely that the writer is making the comparison based on the average level of producing hormone cortisol of the entire human life, and infancies are likely to produce higher levels in stimulation situations. To illustrate this point clearly, we need to conduct experiment of other stimulation hormones to exclude the effect of age. Without accounting for and ruling out these and other alternative explanations, the arguer cannot bolster the conclusion.

The last but not the least important, even if the evidence turns out to support the foregoing assumptions, the arguer just simply assumes that first-time mother monkeys having higher levels of cortisol illustrates that the birth order has an effect on the stimulation level. It is reasonable to doubt that what the arguer assumes will not happen in reality. It is just possible that first-time mothers have higher levels of hormones in all stimulation cases since it is their first pregnancy, and this will not affect the children at all. To reaches the cited conclusion, the arguer must provide evidence on the relevance of stimulation levels between mother and child.

To sum up, the arguer’s argument mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, neither of which is indispensable for a conclusive argument. In order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer could reason more convincingly, cite some evidence that is more persuasive, and take every possible explanation into account.

Signal

Inference

Assumption

Counterexample

Evidence

In this argument, the arguer advocates the city should prohibit skateboarding in Centra Plaza. Although this argument may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, the arguer assumes that the increase on skateboarding leads to the decrease of their business. Although this is entirely possible, the writer offers no evidence to substantiate this crucial assumption. Bad management of shop keepers, economic crisis and the growth of online shopping are likely to have the same effect. The arguer needs further evidence to exclude other factors which may lead to the same consequence. The arguer’s reasoning is definitely flawed unless the arguer can convince me that these and other possible scenarios are unlikely.

In the second place, the arguer assumes that prohibition of skateboarding can restore the original business. Nevertheless, there is no guarantee that this is necessarily the case, and the arguer does not supply any evidence to confirm this assumption. It is quite possible that the increase of skateboarding makes the consumer no longer interested in the Central Plaza, and business areas and consumer behaviors are formed elsewhere. To illustrate this point clearly, the writer needs further evidence to demonstrate that the original consumer will return as the shopping environment in Central Plaza improves. Without account for and ruling this and other alternative explanations, the arguer cannot bolster the recommendation.

The last but not the least important, even if the evidences turn out to support the foregoing assumptions, the arguer just simply assumes that skateboarding leads to the increasement of litter and vandalism and the decrease of litter and vandalism are able to restore the business. However, there is neither any conclusive scientific evidence nor any anecdotal evidence is provided to affirm the assumption. It is just as possible that management of the plaza become worse and the number of cleaners drops. To reach the cited conclusion, the arguer must explain either none of these alternatives is available or why none of them is able to sustain.

To sum up, the arguer’s argument mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, and neither of which is dispensable for a conclusive argument. In order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence that is more persuasive and take every possible consideration into account.

In this argument, the writer advocates that if you want to sell your house quickly and at a good price, you should use Adams Reality. Although this argument may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, even if Adam Reality has 40 estate agents, Fitch Reality has 25 estates agents and most of them are part-time, it does not necessary mean that Adam Reality is better at selling houses than Fitch Reality. Apparently, the author assumes that higher number of estate agents means higher quality for estate agency and full-time is better than part-time. However,

Perhaps the management in Adam Reality is poor and the efficiency is low. If so, more people and longer working hours are required to finish the job in time. Therefore, more evidence is needed with regard to the average working ability of agents in Adam Reality and Fitch Reality. The arguer’s reasoning is definitely flawed unless the arguer can convince me these and other possible scenarios are unlikely.

In the second place, even if the revenue of Adam Reality is twice as high as Fitch Realty, it does not entail that Adam Reality is better at selling the house than Fitch Reality. However, it is possible that Adam Reality charges more of their service. In this case, selling the same amount of house means Adam Reality earns more money than Fitch Reality. It is also possible that Adam Reality tends to sell more expensive and larger house than Fitch Reality. If so, selling the same number of houses also implies that Adam Reality earns more than Fitch Reality. To really prove Adam Reality is better at selling the house than Fitch Reality, the arguer should fully evaluate the service rate from both agencies and the original amount of money of the house they sell. Without accounting for and ruling out these and other possible explanations, the arguer cannot bolster the conclusion.

The last but not the least important, even if the evidence turns out to support the foregoing assumptions, building on the implication that it takes four months for Fitch Reality to sell a house and one month for Adam Reality to sell a house, the arguer simply suggests that Adam Reality is better at selling houses than Fitch Reality. He has not mentioned that there may be some significant differences between the two houses. For example, the house that Adam Reality sells locates in the downtown area and there are beautiful parks and lakes around it. In contrast, the house that Fitch Reality sells may locate in the countryside and there is neither stores nor schools in the area. Thus, evidence of situations of the two houses pointing to these possibilities would also serve to challenge the arguer’s argument.

To reach the cited conclusion, the arguer must explain why none of these alternatives is available or why none of them is able to sustain. To sum up, the arguer’s argument mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, neither of which is dispensable for a conclusive argument. In order to draw a better conclusion, the author should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence more persuasive, and take every possible consideration into account.

In this argument, the arguer advocates that Balmer Island should limit the number of mopeds rented by rental companies from 50 per day to 25 per day during the summer season. Although this may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, even if Seaville limit the number of mopeds in summer vocation and its annual accident rates reduce by 50 percent, it does mean that …

Write an issue today.

Scandals are useful because they focus our attention on problems in ways that no speaker or reformer ever could.

The prompt points to a general perception that scandal can be significant in attracting our attention to the problems in ways that others cannot. Indeed, people love to watch public figures get caught in scandals, as their embarrassment becomes people’s entertainment. Moreover, media disputes scandals because scandals are likely to please their readers and gain them higher selling copies.

The public love to see scandals. In most people’s traditional opinion, successful people are flawless and their achievements are beyond our imagination. However, scandals can pull their imagination of successful people back to us and make them realize that even the people enjoying a huge amount of admiration can make such a small mistake. In this way, people are satisfied and the scandals become jokes they share with everyone. For example, a famous Chinese actor, Yifan Wu, went into prison because he made a girl drunk and had sex with her. The girl was not his first victim, and many of his victims went into silent because of his huge popularity in China. However, he may not imagine that one day, a girl had the courage to publicize her experience and gained a lot of support from many people. In the joint effort of the public, it was the first time in China to get a famous actor in prison in this way. In the past, people used to think that Yifan Wu was so popular in China and he was not even one of the general publics, but now people can see that even such a popular figure has to stay in the prison for a few years and his career drop from the top to the bottom.

Some people may argue that too many scandals can make people get used to them, and people may not care about the consequences of the behavior but take the scandals as entertainment only. While this may be true for some people, but most people still care about social justice and want to set things right and give bad guys harsh penalty. While there are so many scandals every day, in Yifan Wu’s case, there were still many people stand by the side of the girl and speak for her, even some of his fans. Therefore, I believe social justice always exist and bad guys always end up in a bad result.

In the end, scandals are important in drawing people’s attention to the problem. In this way, the problem can be solved.

In this argument, the arguer advocates that the purported decline in deer population s is the result of the deer’s being unable to follow their age-old migration patterns across the frozen area. Although this may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, even if the global warming cause ice melting, it does not necessarily mean that the deer cannot migrate in their traditional route. Apparently, the arguer assumes that the ice are too weak to support the weight of a deer and connect the land. If a deer ever tries to walk on the ice, it is very likely to fall into the water. However, perhaps the ices at the North Pole is so thick that even the ice on the surface melt down, it is still able to support a number of deer running across the ice. Therefore, more evidence is needed with regard to supporting ability of the ice during the deer migration seasons. The arguer’s reasoning is definitely flawed unless he can convince me that these and other possible scenarios are unlikely.

In the second place, even if the hunters report the deer are declining, it does not entail the real number of deer is dropping. Obviously, the underlying rationale behind the arguer’s reasoning is that the report from the hunters are creditable. However, it is possible that the deer grow more familiar with the places that the hunters used to set up traps and shoot them. If so, they can avoid the hunters and therefore the hunters are less likely to see them. Moreover, the hunters nowadays may not be as good at hunting as the hunters in the past. In the past, if a hunter cannot hunt, he starves to death. But today, he only gets less money, and do not have the face the fate of death. Therefore, hunters today may become less skillful and cannot track the trace of the deer so that they are less likely to meet the deer. To really prove that the reports from the hunters reliable, the arguer should fully evaluate the sources of deer numbers and maybe using satellite to count the deer on the islands would be more trustable. Without ruling out these and other alternative explanations, the arguer cannot bolster his conclusion.

The last but not the least important, even if the evidence turns out to support the foregoing inferences, building on the implication that the deer cannot not migrate on the traditional route and the number of them decline, the arguer simply suggest that the decrease is the result of inability to travel on the traditional route. He has not mentioned that there may be a plague, decline in food and increase in predators. Thus, evidence pointing to these possibilities would serve to challenge the arguer’s argument.

To reach the cited conclusion, the arguer must explain neither why none of these alternatives is available or why none of them is able to sustain. To sum up, the arguer’s argument mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, neither of which is dispensable for a conclusive argument. in order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence that is more persuasive, and take every possible consideration into account.

Some people believe that government funding of the arts is necessary to ensure that the arts can flourish and be available to all people. Others believe that government funding of the arts threatens the integrity of the arts.

The prompt points to a general perception whether government should fund arts. Some people argue that fundings from the government can contribute to the prosperity of the art and some people argue that it may hurt the integrity of the arts. In my opinion, government funding is beneficial for the art, because in our current society, our artists do not receive enough fundings from the society and they could barely live a life on the arts. Moreover, government fundings can help preserve our cherish artworks, making them vivid and well-preserved in the flow of time.

The arguer advocates that Monarch Books should open a café in its store. Although this may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, even if national census indicates that the popularity of childish books is going to decline, it does not necessarily mean that the local popularity of books is going to decrease. Apparently, the writer assumes that the national trend is representative of the local trend and the decrease of children is going to cause the decline of childish books. However, perhaps that the number of children in this region increases because it has more educational resources, better hospitals and cleaner environment. Moreover, the decline of percentage does not mean the absolute number of children is suffering a decrease. Therefore, more evidence is needed with regard to the birth rate of the region and the age component of local residents. The arguer’s reasoning is definitely flawed unless he can convince me that these and other possible scenarios are unlikely.

To reach the cited conclusion, the writer must explain either why none of these alternatives is available or why none of them is able to sustain. To sum up, the arguer’s argument mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, neither of which is dispensable for a conclusive argument. in order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence more persuasive and take every possible consideration into account.

In any field-business, politics, education government-those in power should step down after five years. The surest path to success for any enterprise in revitalization through new leadership.

In this argument, the arguer advocates that Buckingham College should build a number of new dormitories. Although this may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

Even if the number of students that Buckingham is increasing today, it does not entail that in the number of students in Buckingham will double in the next fifty years. Obviously, the underlying rationale behind the arguer’ reasoning is that the increasing trend will not change in the next fifty years. However, it is possible that the increase results from the number of students at the right age is increasing. As the number of students reaches the peek, the trend is not likely to sustain. To really prove that the trend will sustain in the next fifty years, the arguer should fully evaluate the growth of the future population. Without accounting for and ruling out these and other possible explanations, the arguer cannot bolster the conclusion.

To reach the cited conclusion, the arguer must explain why none of these alternatives is available or why none of them is able to sustain. To sum up, the arguer’s argument mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, neither of which is dispensable for a conclusive argument. In order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence more persuasive and take every possible consideration intp account.

In the argument, the arguer advocates that the Nature’s way store that is opening in the town of Plainville should prove to be very successful. Although this may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

The last but not the least important, even if the evidence turns out to support the foregoing assumptions, building on the implication of the businessmen’s report, the arguer simply suggest that sales of sports shoes and suits reaches a new record. Evidently, the arguer assumes that reports from the businessmen are reliable and neither any conclusive scientific evidence nor any anecdote evidence is provided to affirm the assumption. He has not mentioned that businessmen tend to report the sales higher than the actual number. Therefore, people are likely to follow the trend and they can sell more goods. Thus, evidence of the actual selling numbers pointing to these possibilities would also serve to challenge the author’s argument.

To reach the cited conclusion, the arguer must explain why none of these alternatives are available or why none of them is able to sustain. To sum up, the arguer’ augment mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, neither of which is dispensable for a conclusive argument. In order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence more persuasive and take every possible consideration into account.

In this argument, the arguer advocates that to obtain accurate information on Tertian child-rearing practices, future research on the subject should be concluded via the interview-centered method. Although this argument may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, even if Karp found children talk more about their biological parents on the islands, it does not necessarily mean that the children from Tertia are reared by their parents. Apparently, the arguer assumes that children tend to talk more about the people who rear them and the investigation of the group of islands is capable of representing the Tertia island. However, maybe the children on the island talk about how much they miss their parents because their parents leave them to work in big cities. If so, children from the island are more likely to be reared by other adults. Even if the children are reared by other adults in the village, they might be the most intimate with their parents. Moreover, the results from other islands do not imply the situation of the Tertia and it may be the case that on Tertia, the children neither talk more of their parents nor other adults. Therefore, more evidence is needed regarding to direct official materials showing how the children are raised and investigation of the children on Tertia rather than a whole group of islands. The arguer’s reasoning is definitely flawed unless he can convince that these and other possible scenarios are unlikely.

In the second place, even if Field believes that children from Tertia are raised by other adults in the villages and Karp believes that children are reared by their biological parents, it does not entail that Field is wrong and Karp is right. Obviously, the underlying rationale behind the author’s reasoning is that the two results are contradictory. However, it is possible that the results are both correct because Field did his research twenty years ago and many traditions have changed over the twenty years. If so, it is likely that two researchers reach different results and they are both correct. To really prove that Field is wrong and Karp is right, the arguer should fully evaluate the changes of traditions on the Tertia over the twenty years. Without ruling out these and other evidence the writer cannot bolster the conclusion.

The last but not the least important, even if the evidence turns out to support the foregoing assumptions, building on the implication that interview-centered method is better than observation-centered method, the arguer simply suggest that future research on Tertian child-rearing practices should be conducted via interview-centered method. Evidently, the arguer assumes that there is no better solution to the child-rearing problem on the Tertian island and neither any conclusive scientific evidence nor anecdote evidence is provided to affirm this assumption. He has not mentioned that both methods have their own limitations and the best plan could be combining both methods to obtain a more accurate result. Thus, evidence pointing to the accuracy of the interview-centered method is need to find out whether other child-rearing practices can be obtained from it.

To reach the cited conclusion, the arguer must explain why none of these alternatives is available and why none of them is able to sustain. To sum up, the arguer’s argument mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, none of whichi is dispensable for a conclusive argument. In order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence that is more persuasive and take every possible consideration into account.

In the argument, the arguer advocates that preventing the development of existing farmland will result in a significant increase in the housing prices in Maple County. Although this may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, even if Pine County limits the development of houses fifteen years ago and the prices of housing doubled in Pine County, it does not necessarily mean that the limitation of housing development leads to the rising in housing prices in Pine County. Apparently, the arguer assumes that there is no other explanation to the increase in the housing price. However, perhaps traveling services increases in Pine County during the fifteen-year period. If so, Pine County attracts more people to visit its scenic spots. Therefore, its residency increased and economy developed. Therefore, more evidence is needed to exclude other factors that may cause the rising in housing prices in Pine County. The arguer’s reasoning in definitely flawed unless he can convince me that these and other possible scenarios are unlikely.

In the second place, even if the limitation of development of housing caused the rise in house prices fifteen years ago in Pine County, it does not entail that the limitation of developing agriculture is likely to cause increase in pricing in Maple County. Obviously, the underlying rationale behind the arguer’s reasoning is the limitation of agriculture is likely to have the same effect as the limitation of housing. However, it is possible that the restriction in Pine County is pretty harsh, which impose on selling and buying houses, and therefore the supply of houses cannot catch up with demand.

The last but not the least important, even if the evidence turns out to support the foregoing assumptions, building on the implication that the limitation in Pine County causes rise in housing prices, the arguer simply suggest that the same thing will take place in Maple County. Evidently, the arguer assumes that it is very similar in Pine County fifteen years ago with Maple County nowadays and neither conclusive scientific conclusion nor anecdote evidence is provided to affirm the assumption. He has not mentioned that perhaps housing industry reaches its peek in Pine County fifteen years ago and limitation caused the supply falls behind demand. However, Maple County could be at the economic bottom and limitation will only have the modest change. Thus, evidence pointing to the situation of Pine County at that time and the current situation of Maple County pointing to these possibilities is served to challenge the argument.

To reach the cited conclusion, the arguer must explain why none of these alternatives is possible or why none of them is able to sustain. To sum up, the arguer’s reasoning is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, neither of which is dispensable for a conclusive argument. In order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence that is more persuasive and take every possible consideration into account.

In the argument, the arguer advocates that to enable the graduates from Omega University to secure better jobs, the university should terminate student evaluation of professors. The argument may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, even if Omega professors have begun to assign higher grades in their class and the overall student grade averages at Omega have risen by 30 percent, it does not mean that the grades at Omega are inflated and do not accurately reflect the student achievement. Apparently, the arguer assumes that the student studies as hard as before and the rise in their grades is completely contributed from their professors’ over-grading. However, perhaps that the students did study harder than before. For example, the professors from Omega want their students to achieve better grades and outperform the students from other classes, they assign more homework to them. Therefore, the students spend less time on playing and more time on their study. As a result, they get better grades. Therefore, more evidence is needed with regarding to the time students spend on their studies. The arguer’s reasoning is definitely flawed unless he can convince me that these and other possible scenarios are unlikely.

In the second place, even if Omega graduates have not been as successful at getting jobs as have graduates from nearby Alpha University, it does not mean that the evaluation of professors in Omega is problematic. Obviously, the underlying rationale behind the arguer’s reasoning is that the students from Omega University and Alpha University get the same level of job before Omega University started to ask its students to evaluate their professors. However, it is likely that the before the entrance of university, the students entering Alpha University have better academic performance and are more promising to find better jobs in the future. Moreover, it is also possible that the students from Alpha University have better education resources and are more diligent than the students from Omega University. To really prove that the evaluation of professors in Omega is problematic, the arguer should provide further evidence relating to the performance of the students before and after they enter the university and the educational resource in the two universities mentioned above.

The last but not the least important, even if the evidence turns out to support the foregoing assumptions mentioned above, building on the implication that the students cannot secure better jobs because of the evaluation of professors, the arguer simply suggest that Omega University should terminate student evaluation of the professors. Evidently, the arguer assumes that the evaluation of professors leads to the students’ poor performance at job market and no alternative solutions exists and neither conclusive scientific evidence nor anecdote evidence is provided to bolster the conclusion. However, he has not mentioned that imposing restrictions on the professors’ over-grading and introduce more educational resource will also serve to solve the problem. If so, the students in Omega University can become more competitive in job market and get better jobs than they used to have. Evidence regarding to the performance of other methods are needed to find out the real impact of the evaluation of professors in Omega University.

Nation should pass laws to preserve any remaining wilderness areas in their natural state, even if these areas could be developed for economic gain.

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

Outline

Wilderness areas are important.

Economic development is also important.

Preserve and develop.

In this argument, the arguer advocates that either these customers do not distinguish butter from margarine or they use the term butter to refer to either butter or margarine. Although this may seem reasonable at first glance, it is in fact ill-conceived. The reasons are stated as follows.

In the first place, even if only 2 percent of customers have complained about the change of butter, it does not necessarily mean that 98 percent of customers are happy about the change. Apparently, the arguer assumes that the default opinion of customers is happy. However, perhaps the customers are not happy about the changes but they rather stay silent than complain it. It is also possible that the procedure of complaining is very troublesome and the customers do not want to waste their time on complaining about it. Moreover, the customers who are not satisfied with the change do not want to come to the store again so the servers do not learn about their true opinions. Therefore, more evidence is needed with regard to the feelings of the rest of customers. The arguer’s reasoning is definitely flawed unless he can convince me that these and other possible scenarios are unlikely.

In the second place, even if many servers have reported that a number of customers who ask for butter do not complain when they are given margarine instead, it does not mean that customers are happy about the change. Obviously, the underlying rationale behind the arguer’s reasoning is that the report of the servers are correct and if the customers do not complain about the change, then they are happy with the change. However, it is possible that the report of the servers is not correct. To really prove that the customers are happy about the change, the arguer should fully evaluate that the customers’ true opinions. Without ruling out these and other alternative explanations, the arguer cannot bolster his conclusion.

The last but not least important, even if the evidence turns out to support the foregoing assumptions, building on the implication that two percent of customers accept the change, it does not mean that they are happy about the change. Evidently, the arguer assumes that most of the customers order bread with butter and neither any conclusive scientific evidence nor anecdote evidence is provided to affirm this assumption. However, he has not mentioned that maybe only a small amount of customers buy bread of butter and two percent of total customers could be a large percent of original bread butter customers. Thus, the number of butter bread customers and the numbers of customers who complain about this change would also serve to challenge the arguer’s argument.

To reach the cited conclusion, the arguer must explain either why none of these alternatives is available or why none of them is able to sustain. To sum up, the arguer’s argument mentioned above is not based on valid evidence or sound reasoning, neither of which is dispensable for a conclusive argument. In order to draw a better conclusion, the arguer should reason more convincingly, cite some evidence that is more persuasive, and take every possible consideration into account.