Additional Text Question: Using specific reference(s) to the text, write an extended response in which you:

(a) identify and explain what you consider to be a main idea of this text and (b) discuss how the idea connects with your understanding of conflict between people.

A)I believe the main idea of the text is that conflicts can be categorized into “principal” and secondary” contradictions. The “Principal” contradictions are usually the broader picture of “secondary” contradiction. The arrest of HUAWEI financial officer in Canada for breaking US sanctions, for instance, is a secondary conflict of a principal conflict-the dominance of worldwide digital hardware and software. For most of the time, secondary contradictions are influential, attention-seeking, controversial, life-disrupting incidents that provide a portal into the broad underlying concepts that affect bigger economical or political systems. Many conflicts our society faces in the present time are secondary contradictions that arise from the secondary frame and seems troublesome to find solutions within the”secondary” framework. For example, as the author mentions in the text, the Yellow Vest conflict in France is a secondary contradiction in which people’s demands “are inconsistent and impossible to meet within the existing economic system.” To find a solution, we need to identify the underlying “principal” contradiction and start from there. The principal contradiction in the Yellow Vest movement is between “our entire social-political system and a new society in which the demands...no longer arise.” In this case, the solution is to create a new system in which the demands of the people is no longer a demand. For example, one demand from the protesters is to lower fuel cost, and the solution inspired by the “principal” contradiction is to create a new system in which the prices of fuel doesn’t matters anymore, a system that prioritizes public transportation, for instance. To sum up, seeking solutions from a broader perspective is the key to solve contemporary issues.

B) I find minor conflicts between people hard to resolve because people get so caught up in the emotion that they usually oversimplify things into bigger concepts that are, in its natural, hard to find the absolute right or wrong. In small arguments between individuals, evaluating facts using a broader perspective seems only to make things more unresolvable: people often neglect the most basic facts since they’re too focused on grand concepts. The neglect of fundamental truths only pushes people further from finding practical solutions. Sometimes a conflict arisen from inappropriate jokes can be taken as far as to be about the concept of “joke” itself than the intention of the person or the context the joke is spoken, which are more critical when seeking solutions to the conflict. Moreover, people make more bad arguments when they try to generalize things since concepts can be easily distorted in the process. An example could be sexual harassment. Sexual harassment, which can be “secondarily” blamed for the vulgar behavior of the offender, is sometimes described as the “war between male and female,” or the evil nature of male. When people generalize “sexual harassment” into “male vs female,” people are distorting sexual harassment, a more of a context and society based incident, into a matter of nature, sex-based problem. The big ideas can drive lots of attention and debates, but practical solutions is not one of them. To find solutions to a small conflict, we need to look at the basic facts and decide whether new legislation needs to be added to prevent sexual harassment from happening. When people generalize simple facts into abstract concepts, people are getting nowhere near what matters. For more influential events such as the Yellow Vest movement, using the “principal contradiction” may help provide novel solutions; but in conflicts between people, staying in the secondary frame seems to be the most effective way to find solutions.