



ISSUE 范文精析

路莎



2021-4-21

Issue 70

Claim: Governments must ensure that their major cities receive the financial support they need in order to thrive.

Reason: It is primarily in cities that a nation's cultural traditions are preserved and generated.

The speaker's claim is actually threefold: ensuring the survival of large cities and, in turn, that of cultural traditions, is a proper function of government; government support is needed for our large cities and cultural traditions to survive and thrive; and (3) cultural traditions are preserved and generated primarily in our large cities. I strongly disagree with all three claims.

First of all, subsidizing cultural traditions is not a proper role of government. **Admittedly**, certain objectives, such as public health and safety, are so essential to the survival of large cities and of nations that government has a duty to ensure that they are met. **However**, these objectives should not **extend tenuously to preserving** cultural traditions. Moreover, government cannot possibly play an evenhanded role as cultural patron. Inadequate resources call for restrictions, priorities, and choices. It is unconscionable to relegate normative decisions as to which cities or cultural traditions are more deserving, valuable, or needy to a few legislators, whose notions about culture might be misguided or unrepresentative of those of the general populace. Also, legislators are all too likely to make choices in favor of the cultural agendas of their home towns and states, or of lobbyists with the most money and influence.

Secondly, subsidizing cultural traditions is not a necessary role of government. A lack of private funding might justify an exception. However, culture--by which I chiefly mean the fine arts--has always depended primarily on the patronage of private individuals and businesses, and not on the government. The Medic, powerful banking family of Renaissance Italy, supported artists Michelangelo and Raphael. During the 20th Century the primary source of cultural support were private foundations established by industrial magnates Carnegie, Mellon, Rockefeller and Getty. And **tomorrow cultural support** will come from our new technology and media **moguls**-- including the likes of Ted Turner and Bill Gates. In short, philanthropy is alive and well

Claim 是这道题目的重点，决定了我们的态度

公式是 N 对 M 有影响

N 是 financial support

M 是 thrive

也可以是 N 应该做某事，讨论影响

1. 这个开头比较特别，考生对题目进行了三个角度的分析，我们一般不做这样的要求

2. 这两句话的逻辑衔接的很好

3. Extend A to doing B 延伸到做 B

4. 本段逻辑：制定保护什么文化不是政府的责任，同时这样做也不公平

5. 同时，政府也不需要这么做；因为有人资本的介入

6. 未来的文化支持

7. Mogul; 重要人物

today, and so government need not intervene to ensure that our cultural traditions are preserved and promoted.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the speaker unfairly suggests that large cities serve as the primary breeding ground and sanctuaries for a nation's cultural traditions.

Today a nation's distinct cultural traditions--its folk art, crafts, traditional songs, customs and ceremonies--burgeon instead in small towns and rural regions. Admittedly, our cities do serve as our centers for "high art"; big cities are where we deposit, display, and boast the world's preeminent art, architecture, and music. But big-city culture has little to do any- more with one nation's distinct cultural traditions. After all, modern cities are essentially multicultural stew pots; accordingly, by assisting large cities a government is actually helping to create a global culture as well to subsidize the traditions of other nations' cultures.

In the final analysis, government cannot philosophically justify assisting large cities for the purpose of either promoting or preserving the nation's cultural traditions; nor is government assistance necessary toward these ends. Moreover, assisting large cities would have little bearing on our distinct cultural traditions, which abide elsewhere.

8. 大城市也不是保护文化最好的地方

9. 这个概念很重要，文化分成了大城市文化和一个国家独特的文化；这种分类很细腻，大家膜拜一下就好，模仿难度很大

10. 通过政府做的不好，没有必要和文化的分类考生很好的支持了自己的观点。

Issue 24

Governments should not fund any scientific research whose consequences are unclear.

I agree with the speaker's broad assertion that money spent on research is generally money well invested. However, the speaker unnecessarily extends this broad assertion to embrace research whose results are "controversial," while ignoring certain compelling reasons why some types of research might be unjustifiable.

My points of contention with the speaker involves the fundamental objectives and nature of research, as discussed below. I concede that the speaker is on the correct philosophical side of this issue. After all, research is the exploration of the unknown for true answers to our questions, and for lasting solutions to our enduring problems. Research is also the chief means by which we humans attempt to satisfy our insatiable appetite for knowledge, and our craving to understand ourselves and the world around us. Yet, in the very notion of research also lies my first point of contention with the speaker, who illogically presumes that we can know the results of research before we invest in it. To the contrary, if research is to be of any value it must explore uncharted and unpredictable territory. In fact, query whether research whose benefits are immediate and predictable can break any new ground, or whether it can be considered "research" at all.

While we must invest in research irrespective of whether the results might be controversial, at the same time we should be circumspect about research whose objectives are too vague and whose potential benefits are too speculative. After all, expensive research always carries significant opportunity costs--in terms of how the money might be spent toward addressing society's more immediate problems that do not require research. One apt illustration of this point involves the so-called "Star Wars" defense initiative, championed by the Reagan administration during the 1980s. In retrospect, this initiative was ill-conceived and largely a waste of taxpayer dollars; and few would dispute that the exorbitant amount of money devoted to the initiative could have gone a long way toward addressing pressing social problems of the day--by establishing after-school programs for

匹配公式; N 应该做某事, 讨论影响

1. Introduction 的主要任务之一就是表明自己的观点; 这篇文章整体是不同意, 所以这个 agree 会起到误导作用, 因此大家在写文章的时候, 不要出现多个观点, 在开头段不要出现让步的内容
2. 这句话是这段的只要内容, 言外之意, 如果想要让研究发挥作用, 就要接受它的不可预测性; 这个内容写到中心句会更完美
3. 不管不顾
4. 这个是段让步
5. 机会成本
6. 考生这里的解释太好啦, 机会成本在这里就是钱可以花到解决眼前的社会问题, 而这些问题是不需要做研究的
7. Championed by 被……支持的

delinquent latchkey kids, by enhancing AIDS awareness and education, and so forth. As it turns out, at the end of the Star Wars debacle we were left with rampant gang violence, an AIDS epidemic, and an unprecedented federal budget deficit.

The speaker's assertion is troubling in two other aspects as well. First, no amount of research can completely solve the enduring problem of war, poverty, and violence, for the reason that they stem from certain aspects of human nature--such as aggression and greed. Although human genome research might eventually enable us to engineer away those undesirable aspects of our nature, in the meantime it is up to our economists, diplomats, social reformers, and jurists--not our research laboratories--to mitigate these problems. Secondly, for every new research breakthrough that helps reduce human suffering is another that serves primarily to add to that suffering. For example, while some might argue that physics researchers who harnessed the power of the atom have provided us with an alternative source of energy and invaluable "peace-keepers," this argument flies in the face of the hundreds of thousands of innocent people murdered and maimed by atomic blasts, and by nuclear meltdowns. And, in fulfilling the promise of "better living through chemistry" research has given us chemical weapons for human slaughter. In short, so-called "advances" that scientific research has brought about often amount to net losses for humanity.

In sum, the speaker's assertion that we should invest in research whose results are "controversial" begs the question, because we cannot know whether research will turn out controversial until we've invested in it. As for the speaker's broader assertion, I agree that money spent on research is generally a sound investment because it is an investment in the advancement of human knowledge and in human imagination and spirit. Nevertheless, when we do research purely for its own sake without aim or clear purpose--we risk squandering resources which could have been applied to relieve the immediate suffering of our dispirited, disadvantaged, and disenfranchised members of society. In the final analysis, given finite economic resources we are forced to strike a balance in how we allocate those resources

8. 这段考生的态度又回到了不同意；莎莎老师建议大家我们写把2段态度统一的段落写完，不要在中间插入让步段
9. 这段话真心长，赞叹这位考生的积累，他认为研究还具有以下特点：研究的结果不明确可能是人性有关，也和人们的使用相关；换言之，这个结果本身就是不明确的
10. 研究结果本来就是不可测的，或者是出乎意料的
11. 整体是“质疑”的态度
12. 核心原因；不试试怎么知道结果？

Issue 29

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

Can a person's greatness be recognized only in retrospect, by those who live after the person, as the speaker maintains? In my view the speaker **unfairly** generalizes.

In some areas, especially the arts, greatness is often recognizable in its nascent stages. However, in other areas, particularly the physical sciences, greatness must be tested over time before it can be confirmed. In still other areas, such as business, the incubation period for greatness varies from case to case. we do not require a rear-view mirror to recognize artistic greatness--whether in music, visual arts, or literature. **The reason for this is simple: art can be judged at face value.** There's nothing to be later proved or disproved, affirmed or discredited, or even improved upon or refined by further knowledge or newer technology. History is replete with examples of artistic greatness immediately recognized, then later confirmed. Through his patronage, the Pope recognized Michelangelo's artistic greatness, while the monarchs of Europe **immediately recognized** Mozart's greatness by granting him their most generous commissions. Mark Twain became a best-selling author and household name even during his lifetime. And the leaders of the modernist school of architecture marveled even as Frank Lloyd Wright was elevating their notions about architecture to new aesthetic heights.

By contrast, in the sciences it is difficult to identify greatness **without the benefit of historical perspective**. Any scientific theory might be disproved tomorrow, thereby demoting the theorist's contribution to the status of historical footnote. Or the theory might **withstand centuries of rigorous scientific scrutiny**. **In any event, a theory may or may not serve as a springboard for later advances in theoretical science.** A current example involves the ultimate significance of two opposing theories of physics: wave theory and quantum theory. Some theorists now claim that a new so-called "string" theory reconciles the two opposing theories--at least mathematically. Yet "strings" have yet to be confirmed empirically. **Only time** will tell whether string theory indeed provides the unifying laws that all matter in the universe

匹配公式; N 对 M 有影响

1. Unfairly 直接体现态度
2. In some areas 体现典型的领域拆分
3. 前面列举的不同的情况, 但就篇幅来讲, 这段核心是艺术领域—艺术领域的成就是可以得到很快的认可的
4. 这个表达非常好, 在科学领域, 我们必须观察一段时间才可以, 所以只能是后世人才认可
5. 经过几百年的验证—妥妥后世了呀
6. 有可能不是跳板, 所以就不“伟大了”
7. 只能靠时间啦, 所以是长期

obeys. In short, the significance of contributions made by theoretical scientists cannot be judged by their contemporaries--only by scientists who follow them.

In the realm of business, in some cases great achievement is recognizable immediately, while in other cases it is not. Consider on the one hand Henry Ford's assembly-line approach to manufacturing affordable cars for the masses. Even Ford could not have predicted the impact his innovations would have on the American economy and on the modern world. On the other hand, by any measure, Microsoft's Bill Gates has made an even greater contribution than Ford; after all, Gates is largely responsible for lifting American technology out of the doldrums during the 1970s to restore America to the status of economic powerhouse and technological leader of the world. And this contribution is readily recognizable now--as it is happening. Of course, the DOS and Windows operating systems, and even Gates' monopoly, might eventually become historical relics. Yet his greatness is already secured.

In sum, the speaker overlooks many great individuals, particularly in the arts and in business, whose achievements were broadly recognized as great even during their own time. Nevertheless, other great achievements, especially scientific ones, cannot be confirmed as such without the benefit of historical perspective.

8. 再来一个领域，这篇文章核心段落的结构非常整齐，值得大家学习
9. 有些可以，有些不可以获得短期的认可；虽然可以这么说，但莎莎老师更倾向整体是可以还是不可以；因为这样我们的逻辑会更清晰，语言表述难度更小
10. 考生丰富的积累允许他进行例子之间的对比，我们举一个例子就可以了
11. 再次重申态度，整体不同意

Issue 41

If a goal is worthy, then any means taken to attain it are justifiable.

The speaker asserts that if a goal is worthy then any means of attaining that goal is justifiable. **In my view this extreme position misses the point entirely.** Whether certain means are justifiable in reaching a goal must be determined on a case-by-case basis, **by weighing the benefits of attaining the goal against the costs, or harm,** that might accrue along the way. This applies equally to **individual goals and to societal goals.**

Consider the goal of completing a marathon running race. If I need to reduce my working hours to train for the race, thereby jeopardizing my job, or if I run a high risk of incurring a permanent injury by training enough to prepare adequately for the event, then perhaps my goal is not worth attaining. Yet if I am a physically challenged person with the goal of completing a highly-publicized marathon, risking financial hardship or long-term injury might be worthwhile, not only for my own personal satisfaction but also for the inspiration that attaining the goal would provide many others. Or consider the goal of providing basic food and shelter for an innocent child. **Anyone would agree that this goal is highly worthy--considered apart from the means used to achieve it. But what if those means involve stealing from others?** Or what if they involve employing the child in a sweatshop at the expense of educating the child? Clearly, determining the worthiness of such goals requires that we confront moral dilemmas, which we each solve individually—based on our own conscience, value system, and notions of fairness and equity. **On a societal level we determine the worthiness of our goals in much the same way**—by weighing competing interests. For instance, any thoughtful person would agree that reducing air and water pollution is a worthy societal goal; clean air and water reduce the burden on our health-care resources and improves the quality of life for everyone in society. Yet to attain this goal would we be justified in forcing entire industries out of business, thereby running the risk of economic paralysis and widespread unemployment?

Or consider America's intervention in Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Did our dual interest in a continuing flow of oil to the

匹配公式; N 应该做某事, 讨论影响

1. 观点的表明非常清晰
2. 权衡利弊
3. 分两个维度讨论影响
4. 对应 personal goal, 但是中心句最好不要提及一个具体的例子; 可以显进行 2-3 句话的理论论述
5. 这个例子很好: 目标是好的, 但是手段不对
6. 这里我们最好分段; 讨论的内容已经不一样的, 可以通过中心句进行区分
7. 这种例子我们就不要举了

West and in deterring a potential threat against the security of the world justify our committing resources that could have been used instead for domestic social-welfare programs-- or a myriad of other productive purposes? Both issues **underscore** the fact that the worthiness of a societal goal cannot be considered apart from the means and adverse consequences of attaining that goal.

In sum, the speaker begs the question. The worthiness of any goal, whether it be personal or societal, can be determined only **by weighing the benefits of achieving the goal against its costs**--to us as well as others.

8. 证明了一个事实

9. 做事要经过认真思考，
权衡利弊；所以题目观点不对

Issue 45

The main benefit of the study of history is to dispel the illusion that people living now are significantly different from people who lived in earlier times.

I concede that basic human nature has not changed over recorded history, and that coming to appreciate this fact by studying history can be beneficial in how we live as a society. However, I disagree with the statement in two respects. First, in other ways there are marked differences between people of different time periods, and learning about those differences can be just as beneficial. Second, studying history carries other equally important benefits as well.

I agree with the statement insofar as through the earnest study of human history we learn that basic human nature---our desires and motives, as well as our fears and foibles---has remained constant over recorded time. And through this realization we can benefit as a society in dealing more effectively with our enduring social problems. History teaches us, for example, that it is a mistake to attempt to legislate morality, because humans by nature resist having their moral choices forced upon them. History also teaches us that our major social ills are here to stay, because they spring from human nature. For instance, crime and violence have troubled almost every society; all manner of reform, prevention, and punishment have been tried with only partial success. Today, the trend appears to be away from reform toward a "tough-on-crime" approach, to no avail.

However beneficial it might be to appreciate the unchanging nature of humankind, it is equally beneficial to understand and appreciate significant differences between peoples of different time periods---in terms of cultural mores, customs, values, and ideals. For example, the ways in which societies have treated women, ethnic minorities, animals, and the environment have evolved over the course of human history. Society's attitudes toward artistic expression, literature, and scientific and intellectual inquiry are also in a continual state of evolution. And, perhaps the most significant sort of cultural evolution involves spiritual beliefs, which have always spun themselves out, albeit uneasily, through clashes between established traditions and more enlightened viewpoints. A heightened awareness of all these

匹配公式; N 对 M 有影响

1. 提出让步的内容
2. 表明整体的观点—不同意
3. 很多北美范文都是先写让步内容，但是莎莎老师比较推荐最后写让步的内容，这样更有助于我们梳理自己的写作逻辑
4. 这段里面虽然有 history，但是并没有直接提及和人们的关系，我们可以说的更明白一点
5. 提出人们之间的不同，In terms of 就……而言，这个词组可以积累一下
6. 剩下部分都是谈及不同，但是问题是没有和 history 有什么关系

aspects of cultural evolution help us formulate informed, reflective, and enlightened values and ideals for ourselves; and our society dearly benefits as a result.

Another problem with the statement is that it undervalues other, equally important benefits of studying history. Learning about the courage and tenacity of history's great explorers, leaders, and other achievers inspires us to similar accomplishments, or at least to face own fears as we travel through life. Learning about the mistakes of past societies helps us avoid repeating them. For instance, the world is slowly coming to learn by studying history that political states whose authority stems from suppression of individual freedoms invariably fall of their own oppressive weight. And, learning about one's cultural heritage, or roots, fosters a healthy sense of self and cultivates an interest in preserving art, literature, and other cultural artifacts--all of which serve to enrich society.

To sum up, history informs us that basic human nature has not changed, and this history lesson can help us understand and be more tolerant of one another, as well as develop compassionate responses to the problems and failings of others. Yet, history has other lessons to offer us as well. It helps us formulate informed values and ideals for ourselves, inspires us to great achievements, points out mistakes to avoid, and helps us appreciate our cultural heritage.

7. 这段从另一维度否定了题目：学习历史的好处还会有别的

8. Tenacity 韧性

9. 这个可以换个更具体的例子，比如我们从华盛顿的个人经历中可以学习到什么

10. 重申让步的内容，人性是不变的

11. 重申自己的观点

12. 为了避免不必要的麻烦，建议大家可以优先总结自己的观点，让步的内容一笔带过就可以了

Issue37

Claim: We can usually learn much more from people whose views we share than from those whose views contradict our own.

Reason: Disagreement can cause stress and inhibit learning.

Do we learn more from people whose ideas we share in common than from those whose ideas contradict ours? The speaker claims so, for the reason that disagreement can cause stress and inhibit learning. I concede that undue discord can impede learning. Otherwise, in my view we learn far more from discourse and debate with those whose ideas we oppose than from people whose ideas are in accord with our own.

Admittedly, under some circumstances disagreement with others can be counterproductive to learning. For supporting examples one need look no further than a television set. On today's typical television or radio talk show, disagreement usually manifests itself in meaningless rhetorical bouts and shouting matches, during which opponents vie to have their own message heard, but have little interest either in finding common ground with or in acknowledging the merits of the opponent's viewpoint. Understandably, neither the combatants nor the viewers learn anything meaningful. In fact, these battles only serve to reinforce the predispositions and biases of all concerned. The end result is that learning is impeded. Disagreement can also inhibit learning when two opponents disagree on fundamental assumptions needed for meaningful discourse and debate. For example, a student of paleontology learns little about the evolution of an animal species under current study by debating with an individual whose religious belief system precludes the possibility of evolution to begin with. And, economics and finance students learn little about the dynamics of a laissez-faire system by debating with a socialist whose view is that a centralized power should control all economic activity.

Aside from the foregoing two provisos, however, I fundamentally disagree with the speaker's claim. Assuming common ground between two rational and reasonable opponents willing to debate on intellectual merits, both opponents stand to gain much from that debate. Indeed it is

匹配公式：N 对 M 有影响

1. 先表明让步的观点
2. 自己的核心观点——我们从争议中学的更多
3. 很多老美写作的时候倾向于先写让步，但其实我们最后让步也是可以的
4. Counterproductive 适得其反，对学习不好，很好的词组积累一下
5. 这个解释很好，阐述了为什么没有意义
6. 这个表否定含义的词组大家都很熟悉，但是有时候想不起来用，这个积累一下呦
7. 除了……
8. 写完让步，直接进入到自己观点阐述的段落，

primarily through such debate that human knowledge advances, whether at the personal, community, or global level.

At the personal level, by listening to their parents' rationale for their seemingly oppressive rules and policies teenagers can learn how certain behaviors naturally carry certain undesirable consequences. At the same time, by listening to their teenagers concerns about autonomy and about peer pressures parents can learn the valuable lesson that effective parenting and control are two different things. At the community level, through dispassionate dialogue an environmental activist can come to understand the legitimate economic concerns of those whose jobs depend on the continued profitable operation of a factory. Conversely, the latter might stand to learn much about the potential public health price to be paid by ensuring job growth and a low unemployment rate. Finally, at the global level, two nations with opposing political or economic interests can reach mutually beneficial agreements by striving to understand the other's legitimate concerns for its national security, its political sovereignty, the stability of its economy and currency, and so forth.

In sum, unless two opponents in a debate are each willing to play on the same field and by the same rules, I concede that disagreement can impede learning. Otherwise, reasoned discourse and debate between people with opposing viewpoints is the very foundation upon which human knowledge advances. Accordingly, on balance the speaker is fundamentally correct.

9. 这段其实是个过度段，总起了下面的核心段落

10. 这段话从两个方面讨论了 disagreement 的好处；但莎莎老师推荐同学们最好可以分段讨论

11. 这里直接举例子，缺少了理论解释部分。

我们反复强调，范文有时候直接举例子，是因为考生对这个例子掌握的非常扎实，有很大的拓展空间。

我们平时在写作时，老师建议一定要添加理论解释部分，让我们文章的逻辑更饱满

12. 在结尾部分，再次重申观点

Issue 40

The best way to teach is to praise positive actions and ignore negative ones.

The speaker suggests that the most effective way to teach others is to praise positive actions while ignoring negative ones. **In my view, this statement is too extreme.** It **overlooks** circumstances under which praise might be inappropriate, as well as ignoring the beneficial value of constructive criticism, and sometimes even punishment.

The recommendation that parents, teachers, and employers praise positive actions is generally good advice. **For young children** positive reinforcement is critical in the development of healthy self-esteem and self-confidence. **For students** appropriate positive feedback serves as a motivating force, which spurs them on to greater academic achievement. **For employees**, appropriately administered praise enhances productivity and employee loyalty, and makes for a more congenial and pleasant work environment overall.

While recommending praise for positive actions is fundamentally sound advice, this advice should carry with certain **caveats**. **First**, some employees and older students might be immersed in excessive praise and become patronizing or paternalistic. **Secondly**, some individuals need and respond more appropriately to praise than others; those administering the praise should be sensitive to the individual's need for positive reinforcement in the first place. **Thirdly**, praise should be administered fairly and evenhandedly. **By issuing more praise to one student than to others**, a teacher might cause one recipient to be labeled by classmates as teacher's pet, even if the praise is well deserved or badly needed. If the result is to **alienate other students**, then the praise might not be justified. Similarly, at the workplace a supervisor must be careful to issue praise fairly and evenhandedly, or risk accusations of undue favoritism, or even discrimination.

As for ignoring negative actions, I agree that **minor peccadilloes** can, and in many cases should, be overlooked. Mistakes and other negative actions are often part of the natural learning process. Young children are naturally curious, and parents should not scold their children for every

匹配公式：N 应该做某事

1. 开头段直接给出自己的观点
2. 给出 general 的理由
3. 很多老美都习惯先写让步段，但是让步段的先后对分数没有影响
4. 这段强调了表扬的好处
5. 分人讨论
6. Caveats 这里指有问题
7. 这段论述了过度表扬的坏处
8. 这里有个小问题，题目中并没有提出不公平的表扬，所以这里直接讨论这个，容易偏题，大家不要轻易尝试
9. Alienate other students 疏远其他同学

10. 小的过失

broken plate or precocious act. Otherwise, children do not develop a healthy sense of wonder and curiosity and will not learn what they must do in order to make their own way in the world. Teachers should avoid rebuking or punishing students for faulty reasoning, incorrect responses to questions, and so forth. **Otherwise, students might stop trying to learn altogether.** And employees who know they are being monitored closely for any sign of errant behavior are likely to be less productive, more resentful of their supervisors, and **less loyal to their employers.**

At the same time, some measure of constructive criticism and critique, and sometimes even punishment, is appropriate. Parents must not **turn a blind eye** to their child's behavior if it jeopardizes the child's physical safety or the safety of others. **Teachers** should not ignore behavior that unduly disrupts the learning process; and of course teachers should correct and critique students' class work, homework and tests as needed to help the students learn from their mistakes and avoid repeating them. Finally, **employers** must not permit employee behavior that amounts to harassment or that otherwise undermines the overall productivity at the workplace. Acquiescence in these sorts of behaviors only serves to sanction them.

To sum up, the speaker's dual recommendation is too extreme. Both **praise and criticism serve useful purposes in promoting a child's development,** a student's education, and an employee's loyalty and productivity. Yet both must be appropriately and evenhandedly administered; otherwise, they might serve instead to defeat these purposes.

思路总结

1. 作者分开只表扬积极行为和忽略错误行为，分别讨论影响
2. 每个做法都分开老师，学生，和雇员讨论
3. 但是有个小问题，作者在讨论表扬积极行为和忽略错误的时候，都带有让步段落；老师建议把让步段写到一起比较好

11. 这里又插入了一个让步段，说明了忽视错误行为的好处

12. 这段论述了过度忽视错误的消极影响

13. 无视

14. 这篇文章虽然没有举例，但是每一段都分开不同的人群讨论，特别具体

15. 这个总结很到位

Issue 52

The human mind will always be superior to machines because machines are only tools of human minds.

This statement actually consists of a series of three related claims: (1) machines are tools of human minds; (2) human minds will always be superior to machines; and (3) it is because machines are human tools that human minds will always be superior to machines. While I concede the first claim, whether I agree with the other two claims depends partly on how one defines "superiority," and partly on how willing one is to humble oneself to the unknown future scenarios.

The statement is clearly accurate insofar as machines are tools of human minds. After all, would any machine even exist unless a human being invented it? Of course not. Moreover, I would be hard-pressed to think of any machine that cannot be described as a tool. Even machines designed to entertain or amuse us--for example, toy robots, cars and video games, and novelty items--are in fact tools, which their inventors and promoters use for engaging in commerce and the business of entertainment and amusement. And, the claim that a machine can be an end in itself, without purpose or utilitarian function for humans whatsoever, is dubious at best, since I cannot conjure up even a single example of any such machine. Thus when we develop any sort of machine we always have some sort of end in mind a purpose for that machine.

As for the statement's second claim, in certain respects machines are superior. We have devised machines that perform number-crunching and other rote cerebral tasks with greater accuracy and speed than human minds ever could. In fact, it is because we can devise machines that are superior in these respects that we devise them--as our tools--to begin with. However, if one defines superiority not in terms of competence in performing rote tasks but rather in other ways, human minds are superior. Machines have no capacity for independent thought, for making judgments based on normative considerations, or for developing emotional responses to intellectual problems.

Up until now, the notion of human-made machines that

匹配公式: $N > M$

1. 这个写法比较少见，作者从三个层面分析了题目内容
2. 虽然内容很好，但是我们在写作中不要使用(1)这样的标号，显的不正式
3. 这个观点的表述不是特别清晰，最好直接可以看出是否同意
4. 老美的模式，上来先让步
5. 结尾再次强调，机器就是人脑的工具
6. 先承认机器有时候比人做的好
7. 但是是人让这些机器这么有效率的---所以人脑更好
8. 机器没有独立思考能力，没有判断能力

develop the ability to think on their own, and to develop so-called "emotional intelligence," has been pure fiction. Besides, even in fiction we humans ultimately prevail over such machines--as in the cases of Frankenstein's monster and Hal, the computer in 2001: A Space Odyssey. Yet it seems presumptuous to assert with confidence that humans will always maintain their superior status over their machines. Recent advances in biotechnology, particularly in the area of human genome research, suggest that within the 21st Century we'll witness machines that can learn to think on their own, to repair and nurture themselves, to experience visceral sensations, and so forth. In other words, machines will soon exhibit the traits to which we humans attribute our own superiority.

In sum, because we devise machines in order that they may serve us, it is fair to characterize machines as "tools of human minds." And insofar as humans have the unique capacity for independent thought, subjective judgment, and emotional response, it also seems fair to claim superiority over our machines. Besides, should we ever become so clever a species as to devise machines that can truly think for themselves and look out for their own well-being, then query whether these machines of the future would be "machines" anymore.

思路分析

1. 作者从三个维度分析的题目，这个点非常好
2. 但是作者在一段话中的态度不统一，导致观点略显不清晰，我们在写作文的时候，每段话的态度必须一致

9. 这些反驳了机器具有情感

10. 但是人也不能太自信，说不定哪天人家机器就超过我们了

这段的内容有些凌乱，作者认为现在机器是不如人的，但是以后就不好说了；所以这个观点就不是特别清晰

11. 整体观点：人还是更厉害

Issue 60

Knowing about the past cannot help people to make important decisions today.

The speaker claims that since so much in today's world is new and complex the past provides little guidance for living in the present. I agree with this assertion insofar as history offers few foolproof panaceas for living today. However, I disagree with the speaker's claim that today's world is so unique that the past is irrelevant. One good example that supports my dual position is the way society has dealt with its pressing social problems over time.

Admittedly, history has helped us learn the appropriateness of addressing certain social issues, particularly moral ones, on a societal level. Attempts to legislate morality invariably fail, as illustrated by Prohibition in the 1930s and, more recently, failed federal legislation to regulate access to adult material via the Internet. We are slowly learning this lesson, as the recent trend toward legalization of marijuana for medicinal purposes and the recognition of equal rights for same-sex partners both demonstrate.

However, the only firm lesson from history about social ills is that they are here to stay. Crime and violence, for example, have troubled almost every society. All manner of reform, prevention, and punishment have been tried. Today, the trend appears to be away from reform toward a "tough-on-crime" approach. Is this because history makes clear that punishment is the most effective means of eliminating crime? No; rather, the trend merely reflects our current mores, attitudes, and political climate.

Another example involves how we deal with the mentally-iii segment of the population. History reveals that neither quarantine, treatment, nor accommodation solves the problem, only that each approach comes with its own trade-offs, also undermining the assertion that history helps us to solve social problems. The fact is that, despite the civil-rights efforts of Martin Luther King and his progenies, the cultural gap today between African-Americans and white Americans seems to be widening. It seems that racial prejudice is a timeless phenomenon.

匹配公式：N 对 M 有影响

1. 正反观点都有，如果不结合写文，很难判断作者整体的态度，建议大家在开头段只提及一种观点即可
2. 首先让步，提及历史对人们在解决社会问题方面还是有作用的
3. 但是历史的作用是有限的
4. 这里作者用设问的方式明确了自己的观点，现在的解决方案和历史无关，只代表当今人们的态度
5. 重点推荐 another 这个单词，可以非常有效的连接两个段落
6. 这个结果伴随大家可以学习一下，用法地道，表意清晰
7. 这句话很哲学，有些问题一直存在，历史也告诉不了我们什么

To sum up, in terms of how to live together as a society I agree that studying the past is of some value; for example, it helps us appreciate the futility of legislating morality. However, history's primary sociological lesson seems to be that today's social problems are as old as society itself, and that there are no panaceas or prescriptions for solving these problems---only alternate ways of coping with them.

思路总结

1. 整篇文章语言非常自然，流畅
2. 伴随状态用的非常好，这个强烈建议大家模仿
3. 但问题也是存在的：
 - ✧ 开头段观点不够清晰
 - ✧ 理论论述不够，全文例子占了很大的篇幅；如果同学们没有大量素材的积累，整篇文章就会显的很空，所以我们在写作中一定要注意添加必要的 reasoning

8. 提出让步的内容
9. 但历史提供给我们的东西也是有限的，不能直接帮助我们解决的问题

Issue 86

Universities should require every student to take a variety of courses outside the student's field of study.

I fundamentally agree with the proposition that students must take courses outside their major field of study to become "truly educated." A contrary position would reflect a too narrow view of higher education and its proper objectives. Nevertheless, I would caution that extending the proposition too far might risk undermining those objectives.

The primary reason why I agree with the proposition is that education amounts to far more than gaining the knowledge and ability to excel in one's major course of study and in one's professional career. True education also facilitates an understanding of one- self, and tolerance and respect for the viewpoints of others. Courses in psychology, sociology, and anthropology all serve these ends. "True" education also provides insight and perspective regarding one's place in society and in the physical and metaphysical worlds. Courses in political science, philosophy, theology, and even sciences such as astronomy and physics can help a student gain this insight and perspective. Finally, no student can be truly educated without having gained an aesthetic appreciation of the world around us -- through course work in literature, the fine arts, and the performing arts.

Becoming truly educated also requires sufficient mastery of one academic area to permit a student to contribute meaningfully to society later in life. Yet, mastery of any specific area requires some knowledge about a variety of others. For example, a political-science student can fully understand that field only by understanding the various psychological, sociological, and historical forces that shape political ideology. An anthropologist cannot excel without understanding the social and political events that shape cultures, and without some knowledge of chemistry and geology for performing field work. Even computer engineering is intrinsically tied to other fields, even non-technical ones such as business, communications, and media.

Nevertheless, the call for a broad educational experience as the path to becoming truly educated comes with one important caveat. A student who merely dabbles in a

匹配公式：N 应该对 M 做某事

1. 全文开门见山，清晰表达了自己的观点
2. 暗示后面可能会有让步
3. 通过定义什么是教育，整段话引出了跨专业选课对学生的影响
4. 作者从自我认知，社会定位，美学等角度，对跨专业的积极影响进行了分析，同时还提及了具体的专业，这个很好
5. Also 这个词用的很自然，和 another 一样可以自然的连接两个中心段落
6. 这段提及的跨专业学习对社会的积极影响——是对学生影响的延申，学生只有跨专业学习才可以真正学好自己的专业，进而推动社会的进步
7. 和 however 一样可以用于让步，提及对立面的观点
8. Call for 建议，号召

hodgepodge of academic offerings, without special emphasis on anyone, becomes a **dilettante** lacking enough knowledge or experience in any single area to come away with anything valuable to offer. Thus, in the pursuit of true education students must be careful not to overextend themselves----or **risk defeating an important objective of education.**

In the final analysis, to become truly educated one must strike a proper balance in one's **educational pursuits**. Certainly, students should **strive to excel in** the specific requirements of their major course of study. However, they should **complement those efforts** by pursuing course work in a variety of other areas as well. By earnestly pursuing a broad education one gains **the capacity not only to succeed in a career, but also to find purpose and meaning in that career as well as to understand and appreciate the world and its peoples.** To gain these capacities is to become "truly educated."

这篇文章语言着实很华丽，但是逻辑上侧重点相对比较单一，莎莎老师建议大家补充一段，重点讲述对社会的影响，即 N 的责任是什么，和跨专业选课有什么关系。

9. GRE 词汇，学了个大杂烩，都不精通
Dabble in 浅尝辄止
Dilettante 业余爱好者
这篇文章的用词是一大亮点
10. 这段整体逻辑：太多就
不好啦，还是要以本专
业学习为主
11. 求学过程
12. 努力满足专业要求
13. 也要努力选择其他课
程
14. 这里总结的时候还是
侧重于对学生的积极
影响，我们最好把对社
会的影响也简单提及，
形成多维度的论述