

**In many countries, people now wear western clothes such as suits and jeans rather than traditional clothing.**

**Why is this the case?**

**Is this a positive or negative development?**

As the fashion industry has become increasingly closer, it is now more common for individuals to wear western-style attire instead of their own traditional clothing. In my opinion, this is a natural result of globalization and is a negative on the whole given its lack of diversity.

Many countries now adopt western fashion trends due to the effects of globalization. In past centuries, consumers were limited to the clothes that they either made themselves or could procure from their local area. Today, it is possible to efficiently transport vast quantities of goods by air, land, and sea. These fashion products are often made by famous brands such as Nike and Calvin Klein and can undercut local manufacturers' prices. The global nature of media, particularly with the rise of the internet and social media, has also accelerated this process. Most people watch and listen to western movies and music and are subconsciously influenced by western fashion.

In my opinion, the pervasiveness of western fashion is decidedly detrimental as it concentrates wealth in unimaginative corporations. There are thousands of traditional styles of fashion around the world that have now been subsumed into a limited range of western aesthetic preferences. For instance, the Hmong communities in the North of Vietnam are famous for their vibrant design and the use of sustainable, textured fabrics such as hemp. If their cultural contributions were to be lost, it would necessarily mean a blander fashion world. The companies that now have the most power in terms of fashion tend to be concerned with profit over creative expression, and therefore create clothing without artistic merit.

In conclusion, wearing similar, typically western, clothing is a result of the spread of consumerism and impairs cultural diversity. Consumers should strive to embrace more traditional and environmentally-friendly fashion trends.

**Some believe that money for education should mainly be spent on better computers while others believe it would be better spent on teachers.**

**Discuss both views and give your own opinion.**

Many feel that funding allocated for education should be primarily spent on computers rather than paying the teaching staff higher salaries. In my opinion, though technology is important today, teachers are still considerably more valuable and deserving of prioritization.

Proponents argue increased funding for computer technology reflects shifts in modern society. Expertise with computers is becoming essential not only for one's daily life but also most careers. At the moment, schools focus on a wide range of subjects that may not have any direct applicability later in a student's life such as history, biology, physics, literature, art, and so on. It is logical that focusing more on a useful area such as new computers will maximize funding for schools. However, this thinking neglects the key finding in numerous studies that a wide base of knowledge is more important than early specialization.

Moreover, teachers can potentially be a crucial influence on their pupils. Most adults are grateful to at least one teacher who serves as a lifelong role model. This is because students can connect with a teacher emotionally and intellectually. For example, a teacher may introduce and elucidate a number of great thinkers and writers that later shape a student's political or moral philosophy. By providing greater funding for teachers, this simply ensures that more qualified teachers will apply for jobs. Additionally, teachers who are passionate about their work, and are underpaid at the moment, are likely to feel more motivated and appreciated with higher salaries.

In conclusion, those who argue in favor of computers are short-sighted as teachers have greater overall impact. Naturally, it is more difficult to measure and study the value of quality teachers and provide definitive evidence for this viewpoint.

**Young people committing crimes should be treated the same as adults by the authorities.**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

There are reformers today who argue that adults and young people should be treated equally under the law. In my opinion, despite the ostensible fairness of this proposal, it disregards crucial psychological differences.

Those who believe all ages should receive equal treatment, point out that this will engender a greater deterring effect. The main reason that all individuals in society are punished is not for justice alone, but as a means to ensure others will not commit similar crimes. Young people learn in school and the world generally that their actions will have consequences and that crimes are punishable with prison time and other penalties. If these censures are weakened, then the chances a young person will attempt to commit a crime will logically increase, even if the total number of young people engaging in criminal behavior today is lower than at any point in human history.

However, age is a just mitigating factor. Adults who commit crimes have had more time to develop socially and intellectually while young people might not fully grasp the consequences of their choices for themselves and others. For instance, there have been recent cases where young people were influenced by extremist elements now pervasive in social media. Young people are more impressionable in these situations and often lack the confidence and maturity to think for themselves. This vulnerability extends to their emotional and intellectual development and justifies laws that protect young people from receiving overly harsh sentences.

In conclusion, though there are practical reasons to support equal punishments for all ages, this alteration would be unfair to young people. Courts should consider a range of factors before selecting an appropriate punishment.

**Some people believe that increasing tax on various industries will reduce pollution whereas others believe that there are better alternative ways.**

**Discuss both views and give your opinion.**

Many today argue that the environment can be best protected by heavily taxing various industries. In my opinion, though this has worked in certain cases, taxation is not as effective as more positive reforms.

The case for the taxing industry is that it will discourage the worst practices of companies. This has been evidenced in the European Union where enterprises are taxed at higher rates, oftentimes depending on their relative carbon footprints. The result is that businesses are incentivized to adopt cleaner energy practices. The companies that are greener can therefore enjoy both the benefits of reduced taxes and the public opinion boost concomitant with eco-friendly initiatives. The caveat to this approach is that many multinationals are able to simply move their production facilities and waste to nearby nations.

Moreover, there are more positive policies that can encourage, rather than discourage, the corporate world. Taxation is a fundamentally reactive measure that supposes companies would not wish to inherently protect the planet. A more proactive approach would involve funding green industries. For example, companies such as Tesla have received billions in government subsidies to build stability for the green industry. Over time, more companies will be able to establish themselves and turn profits and there will be less of a need to use taxes to discourage industries from polluting. This solution will be long-lasting as it rewards good behavior instead of punishing bad behavior.

In conclusion, despite taxing industries having an immediate effect, a greater impact would result from subsidies for various companies. Governments should pursue this more positive strategy.

**It is important for people to take risks, both in their professional lives and their personal lives.**

**Do you think the advantages of taking risks outweigh the disadvantages?**

With the growing impact of global ups and downs on common man, a certain amount of reaction to this evolution has been witnessed. Decisions are taken both, by individuals and

organizations, based on different factors, may it be political dynamite or a fatal disease. Impacts aside, but there are more people interested in knowing the facts behind this maturity and sustainability.

It is becoming more common these days, that young enthusiasts are setting examples in their domain by taking steps that acquire a lot of mental and emotional energy. The force that leads them through this, could be either, their personal goals, extraordinary talent they have, or a global concern, but the results are auspicious. For instance, if Mark Zuckerberg, have never had that one step, world would have never witnessed, a growing chain of young and courageous leaders, who are inspiration for many. Most recent, are the names of Vitali Nakamoto, a nineteen-year-old genius who created Ethereum, which is a new type cryptocurrency.

However, there is always a probability of failure with every initiative, especially when it directly affects personal life. For example, choosing the next school of a child is possibly tricky, or for a family to move to a new place might have to undo later on. Also, resigning from a job for personal business, perhaps retarding effect on the career growth. Regardless of these reversing impacts, the hidden lesson in every collapse should be enlightened. This is a modern world trend, where startups leading to failure, step-up with an enhanced approach.

In conclusion, it is indeed true that, there more positive outcomes in stepping up for a change in our personal or professional life. The motivation that enforces us to take steps, will definitely take us to new heights, even if we fail during our first stance.