# MY PRACTICE

# unpaid work, 2. waste material, 3. women equality, 4, reoffend, 5. free house, 6. learning tradition, 7. education target, 8. history

# 一：

**It has been suggested that all young adults should be required to undertake a period of unpaid work helping people in the community. Would the drawbacks of such a requirement be greater than the benefits to the community and the individual young adults?**

Someone argue that volunteer works should be a compulsory work for all young people where they live in. While I think the disadvantages of serving communities compulsorily do outweigh the advantages.

On the one hand, serving communities where inhabitants live themselves can improve the quality of daily lives and environment and broaden the volunteers' skill set. Firstly, there are some people such as old man living alone, the disable and the poor, who are not able to finish some basic housework lonely or need professional advice. For example, some people with disease of their legs will avoid considerable inconvenience when shopping because the long distance to market if there are service in communities. Secondly, volunteers also can gain experience of communication and practise the skill of teamwork. When helping others, young man would face a range of challenges such as planting a wall and cleaning a house that only can be done with collaboration. Therefore, in order to finish the works, they can learn how arrange their work and how to get along well with others.

On the other hand, there are some drawbacks of compulsory community servicing work. Firstly, some young people are unwilling to participate voluntary activities so they may not devote their patience and sympathy in them, which would have a negative effect on volunteer events. Secondly, the activities may use up the time when young people can spend on learning, working or entertainment, particularly the students, who need to devote their valuable time to studying hard to get a degree. Finally, people have the rights do whatever they want to do in legal limit and laws should not dictate what people must undertake freely for communities.

In conclusion, while there are some benefits of doing servicing community activities, it seems to me that people should have right to make decision whether they should take part.

**Revised vision:**

Someone argues that volunteer work should be compulsory for all young people in their respective communities, whereas I believe that the disadvantages of mandatory community service outweigh the advantages.

On the one hand, serving communities where inhabitants live themselves can improve the quality of daily lives and environment and broaden the volunteers' skill set. Firstly, t there are individuals, such as the elderly, those living alone, the disabled, and the poor, who struggle with basic household tasks and may require professional assistance. For example, individuals with leg ailments often face significant challenges when shopping due to the long distances to markets in their communities.Providing services within these communities can alleviate such inconveniences. Secondly,volunteering offers valuable opportunities for communication and teamwork. For example, When assisting others, young individuals encounter diverse challenges, such as building walls or cleaning houses, which require collaborative efforts. Consequently, they learn how to organize their tasks effectively and work harmoniously with others to accomplish these tasks.

On the other hand, there are several drawbacks to compulsory community service. Firstly, when young individuals are coerced into participating in activities they do not willingly choose, they may not invest their patience and sympathy wholeheartedly, potentially undermining the effectiveness of volunteer events. Secondly, these mandatory activities can monopolize valuable time that young people might otherwise dedicate to learning, work, or leisure activities. This is especially problematic for students who need to allocate their precious time wisely to excel academically. Finally, it's important to recognize that individuals have the right to pursue their interests within the bounds of the law, and laws should refrain from mandating unpaid work for communities.

In conclusion, while there are certainly benefits to engaging in community service activities, I believe that individuals should have the right to decide for themselves whether they want to participate.

**我的改版：**

Someone argue that volunteer works should be compulsory for all young people in their respective communities. But I think the disadvantages of serving communities compulsorily do outweigh the advantages.

On the one hand, serving communities where inhabitants live themselves can improve the quality of daily lives and environment and broaden the volunteers' skill set. Firstly, there are many individuals, such as the elderly living alone, the disable, and the poor, who struggle with basic household tasks and may require professional assistance. For example, individuals with leg diseases often face significant challenges when shopping due to the long distances to markets in their communities. Providing services within these communities can alleviate such inconveniences. Secondly, volunteering offers valuable opportunities for communication and teamwork to young people. For example, when assisting others, young individuals encounter diverse challenges, such as building walls or cleaning houses, which require collaborative efforts. Consequently, they learn how to organize their tasks effectively and work harmoniously with others to accomplish these tasks.

On the other hand, there are some drawbacks of compulsory community servicing work. Firstly, some young people are unwilling to participate voluntary activities so they may not devote their patience and sympathy, which would have a negative effect on volunteering events. Secondly, the activities may use up the time when young people can spend on learning, working or entertainment, particularly the students, who need to devote their valuable time to studying to get a degree. Finally, it's important to recognize that individuals have the right to pursue their interests within the bounds of the law, and laws should refrain from mandating unpaid work for communities.

In conclusion, while there are some benefits of engaging in community service activities, I firmly believe that people should have right to make decision whether they want to participate in unpaid work.

# 二：

**In some countries there are not enough recycling of waste materials (eg. Paper, glass and cans). What are the reasons and solutions?**

Some waste, such as paper, glass and cans, that can be reused are end up in landfill which leads to damage to environment in some regions. They are several reason why these materials are thrown away directly and governments and local people can address it in some way together.

Three factors contribute to the insufficient recycling of waste. Firstly, the waste treatment plants do not have enough advanced technologies to reuse the waste effectively and therefore processing the waste recyclable could come a huge cost to them. Secondly, the government do not provide enough information about damage caused by disposed waste to the public. Finally, many people do not have the awareness of recycling waste. For example, people may drop garbage directly and do not split it into two types, recyclable one and not recyclable one, therefore, it is impossible for waste treatment plants to recycle them.

However, there are several solutions can be utilized to solve the problems mentioned above, which need helps from environment groups, government and citizens. Firstly, government should introduce laws to punish the plants which take no actions to recycle waste that can be reused. Secondly, government should subsidy universities and research institutions and encourage them to invent new technologies to cut down the cost of dealing with recycling of waste materials. Finally, environment groups should raise peoples' awareness of protecting environment essential to every lives in the earth. Otherwise, the cities or towns will be big landfills.

In conclusion, government and local people contribute to waste of recycling rubbish and them can address it with law and actions together.

**Revised vision:**

**我的句子chatgpt修改**：

Some waste materials, such as paper, glass, and cans, which can be reused, end up in landfills, leading to environmental damage in various regions. There are several reasons why these materials are discarded directly, and governments, along with local communities, can work together to address this issue.

Three factors contribute to the insufficient recycling of waste. Firstly, waste treatment plants lack advanced technologies necessary for effective waste reuse, making recycling a costly process for them. Secondly, governments do not provide sufficient information to the public about the damage caused by improperly disposed waste. Finally, many people lack awareness about recycling. For instance, individuals often dispose of garbage without sorting it into recyclable and non-recyclable types, making it impossible for waste treatment plants to recycle them.

However, there are several solutions that can be utilized to solve the problems mentioned above, which require help from environmental groups, the government, and citizens. Firstly, the government should introduce laws to punish plants that take no actions to recycle waste that can be reused and should provide subsidies to the ones that do so. Secondly, the government should subsidize universities and research institutions and encourage them to invent new technologies to cut down the cost of dealing with the recycling of waste materials. Finally, environmental groups should raise people's awareness of the essential importance of protecting the environment for everyone's lives on Earth. Otherwise, cities and towns will become large landfills.

In conclusion, both the government and local communities contribute to the waste of recycling rubbish, and they can address this issue through laws and collective actions.

**Chatgpt版：**

The improper disposal of recyclable materials such as paper, glass, and cans into landfills is causing extensive environmental damage in various regions. This issue persists due to several factors, which can be addressed through collaborative efforts by governments and local communities.

Insufficient recycling of waste materials is influenced by multiple factors. Firstly, outdated waste treatment plants lack the advanced technologies required for effective recycling, making the process economically burdensome. Secondly, governments often fail to disseminate adequate information to the public regarding the environmental consequences of improper waste disposal. Lastly, a lack of awareness among individuals leads to haphazard disposal, with people often failing to segregate recyclable and non-recyclable waste, rendering it unsuitable for recycling facilities.

However, viable solutions exist to tackle these challenges, necessitating cooperation among environmental organizations, governments and citizens. To begin with, governments should enact stringent laws penalizing plants that neglect recycling opportunities while offering subsidies to those adopting recycling practices. Furthermore, governments can allocate funds to universities and research institutions, encouraging them to innovate cost-effective technologies for waste recycling. Lastly, environmental groups play a vital role in raising awareness about the critical importance of environmental conservation for the well-being of all inhabitants on Earth. Without such efforts, urban areas could inevitably transform into colossal dumping grounds.

In conclusion, the responsibility for inadequate recycling practices lies with both governments and local communities. By implementing strict laws and fostering collective awareness, this pressing issue can be effectively addressed, ensuring a sustainable future for our planet.

**我的改版：**

Some waste materials, such as paper, glass and cans, that can be reused end up in landfill leading to extensive environmental damage in some regions. This issue persists due to several factors, which can be addressed through collaborative efforts by governments and local communities.

Three factors contribute to the insufficient recycling of waste. Firstly, the outdated waste treatment plants lack the advanced technologies required for effective recycling, making the process economically burdensome. Secondly, the government often fail to disseminate adequate information to the public regarding the environmental consequences of improper waste disposal. Finally, a lack of awareness of recycling among individuals leads to haphazard disposal, with people often failing to segregate recyclable and non-recyclable waste, leading to it unsuitable for recycling facilities.

However, there are several solutions can be utilized to tackle these challenges mentioned above, necessitating cooperation among environmental organizations, governments and citizens. Firstly, government should enact stringent laws penalizing plants that neglect recycling opportunities while offering subsidies to those adopting recycling practices. Secondly, governments can allocate funds to universities and research institutions, encouraging them to innovate cost-effective technologies for waste recycling. Finally, environmental groups play a vital role in raising awareness about the critical importance of environmental conservation for the well-being of all inhabitants on Earth. Without such efforts, urban areas could inevitably transform into colossal dumping grounds.

Strict

In conclusion, the responsibility for inadequate recycling practices lies with both governments and local communities. By implementing strict laws and fostering collective awareness, this pressing issue can be effectively addressed, ensuring a sustainable future for our planet.

# 三：

**Women should have an equal role alongside men in both police and armed forces.To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

In my opinion, women should have the same career opportunities, compared to men, in police and armed forced. I disagree with the idea that women are not able to formulate the effective policies and complete army missions.

On the one hand, there is no dependency on gender for police. A politician need to make decisions to tackle numerous problems, based on his or her professional knowledge comprehension on the industry where the issue in. For example, to reduce unemployment rate, politicians should investigate the industry structure to know where lack labour and invest in career training to tech unemployed people. Obviously, policies making do not rely on gender.

Furthermore, women have the advantages of listening, which can help them find the what the people real need.

On the other hand, while it is true that the physical condition of women is weaker than that of men, there are some factors that . Firstly, army lays emphasis on leadership irrespective to gender. A good instructor can improve the capacity of a military team. For example, when suffering enemies, a excellent leader can provide the most effective order to protect his or her teams and complete missions. If a woman has the talent of instruction and accept highly training, she will be qualified to lead a team in army. Secondly, some technological jobs like radar operator, rely more on specific knowledge and experience, not gender.

In conclusion, I think there is no gap between women and men in military and political field and therefore women should be given equal chances as men.

**Chatgpt版：**

In my view, women should have equal career opportunities compared to men in the police and armed forces, as well as in political roles. I disagree with the notion that women are incapable of formulating effective policies or successfully completing military missions.

On one hand, gender should not be a determining factor in one's ability to serve in the police or hold political positions. Policy making mainly relies on a person's professional knowledge and comprehension of the issues. hand, rather than their gender. For example, addressing the unemployment rate requires politicians to investigate industry structures, identify areas with labor shortages and invest in relevant career training for those who are jobless. Clearly, the ability to make effective policies does not hinge on gender. Furthermore, women often possess strong listening skills, which can help them understand and address the genuine needs of the people they serve.

On the other hand, while it is true that physical fitness can be a consideration in the armed forces, leadership qualities are emphasized regardless of gender. Exceptional leadership can significantly impact a military team's capacity to succeed. For instance, during combat, a proficient leader can provide precise orders to protect their team and accomplish missions effectively. If a woman possesses leadership talents and undergoes rigorous training, she can certainly qualify to lead a team in the armed forces. Additionally, certain roles in the military, such as radar operators, prioritize specific knowledge and experience over gender.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that there should be no gender disparity in the military and political fields. Women should be provided with equal opportunities as men because their abilities, skills, and dedication are not defined by gender. Gender equality is essential for ensuring that society benefits from the full spectrum of talent and potential.

**我的改版：**

In my opinion, women should have the equal career opportunities, compared to men, in police and armed forced. I disagree with the idea that women are incapable of formulating the effective policies and completing army missions.

On the one hand, gender should not be a determining factor in one's ability to serve in the police or hold political positions. A politician need to make decisions to tackle numerous problems, based on his or her professional comprehension on industries. For example, reducing the unemployment rate requires politicians to investigate industry structures, identify areas with labor shortages and invest in relevant career training for those who are jobless. Obviously, policies making do not depend on gender but on politicians' ability. Furthermore, women often possess strong listening skills, which can help them understand and address the genuine needs of the people they serve.

military

On the other hand, while it is true that physical fitness can be a consideration in the armed forces, there are more important factors that should be taken into account. Firstly, army lays emphasis on leadership as exceptional leadership can significantly impact a military team's capacity to succeed. For example, during combat, a excellent leader can provide the most precise order to protect his or her teams and accomplish missions effectively. If a woman possesses the leadership talent and undergoes rigorous training, she can certainly qualify to lead a team in the armed forces. Secondly, roles in the military, such as radar operators, prioritize specific knowledge and experience over gender.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that there should be no gender disparity in the military and political fields and therefore women should be given equal chances as men.

# 四：

**Many ex-prisoners continue to commit crimes even after being punished for it. Why do you think this happens? How can we solve this problem?**

Some people imposed prison sentences break the law again after released. I think that various reason causing this phenomena and governments and communities can tackle this issue effectively.

There are several reason why the criminals commit crimes repeatedly after punishment. Firstly, during imprisoning, prisoners can not engage in social activities and therefore when them get out jail, they could feel unfamiliar about the circumstances where they lives. Secondly, criminal record could cast a long shadow on offenders' careers and many employers require applicants a clear criminal record. For example, police and lawyer are not applicable for these people. Finally, a lack of professional skills and knowledge among criminals may lead to the difficulty of earning enough money for their survival, so that lead to finding easy money by doing crimes.

Obviously, governments and communities can help ex-prisoners by a variety of activities. Firstly, governments should provide vocational training in prisons, encouraging those in them to learn the specific skills. Secondly, government should introduce laws to offer financial concessions to those companies willing to recruit the ex-offenders. Finally, communities can provide some jobs such as cleaning the local streets. This can prevent reoffending as these people may become accustomed to acting as meaningful members of communities, rather than individuals who do something harmful or destructive to society

In conclusion, ex-prisoners can not be accustomed to normal social live and cannot find jobs to earn the live and governments that are main reasons of reoffending and communities can address this problem with several methods

**GPT版：**

The issue of ex-prisoners reoffending after their release is a concerning phenomenon, driven by various factors. However, there are effective ways in which governments and communities can address this problem.

One reason for ex-prisoners returning to a life of crime is the social disconnection experienced during incarceration. Upon release, they often find it challenging to readjust to society, feeling unfamiliar with their surroundings. Moreover, having a criminal record significantly hampers their career prospects. Many employers demand a clean background, closing doors to jobs in law enforcement or legal fields. Additionally, a lack of professional skills and knowledge makes it difficult for ex-prisoners to earn a livelihood, pushing them towards criminal activities for quick money.

Governments and communities can play a vital role in reintegrating ex-prisoners into society. Firstly, providing vocational training within prisons equips inmates with valuable skills, enhancing their employability upon release. Secondly, governments can incentivize companies to hire ex-offenders by offering financial benefits or tax concessions. This encourages businesses to give these individuals a chance, breaking the cycle of unemployment and criminal activity. Furthermore, communities can create employment opportunities, such as street cleaning projects, offering ex-prisoners a chance to contribute positively. By engaging in meaningful work, they become valued members of society, reducing the likelihood of reoffending.

In conclusion, ex-prisoners face significant challenges in reintegrating into society, leading to the issue of reoffending. However, with targeted efforts from governments and communities, providing training, employment opportunities, and social support, it is possible to address this problem effectively and pave the way for a successful reintegration of ex-prisoners into the community.

**我的改版：**

The issue of ex-prisoners reoffending after their release is a concerning problem. I think that this phenomena is driven by various factors and governments and communities can tackle this issue effectively.

There are several reason why the criminals commit crimes repeatedly after punishment. Firstly, during incarceration, prisoners can not engage in social activities, therefore upon release they find it challenging to readjust to society, feeling unfamiliar with their surroundings. Secondly, having a criminal record significantly hampers ex-prisoners’ career prospects. Many employers demand applicants a clear criminal record. For example, those with criminal history are not eligible to be police and lawyer. Finally, a lack of professional skills and knowledge makes it difficult for ex-prisoners to earn a livelihood, which leads to finding easy money by doing crimes.

Obviously, governments and communities play a vital role in reintegrating ex-prisoners into society. Firstly, governments should provide vocational training in prisons, encouraging those in prison to learn the specific skills and enhancing their employability upon release. Secondly, governments can offer tax concessions to those companies willing to hire ex-offenders. This encourages businesses to give these individuals a chance, breaking the cycle of unemployment and criminal activity. Finally, communities can create employment opportunities such as street cleaning projects. This can prevent reoffending as these people may become accustomed to acting as meaningful members of communities, rather than individuals who do something harmful or destructive to society

In conclusion, ex-prisoners face significant challenges in reintegrating into society, leading to the issue of reoffending. However, governments and communities can address this problem with several methods.

# 五：

**As housing is a basic need for people, the government should provide free housing for everyone who cannot afford it. To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

Some people argue that government should provide council property to meet the basic demand for those whose can not buy it. While I can understanding the idea that the homeless people really need a place to live, I do not agree that government should provide free housing.

On the one hand, it is necessary for everyone to have a house to live, because without it, individuals would experience considerable inconvenience or even danger. Firstly, it is unsafe to sleep outside as there are some criminals or thieves in the street, which can pose a threat to personal life or money security. Secondly, a comfortable house can provide a place to take a rest. For example, in winter, a cozy bed and warm stove can release peoples' stress and contribute to a good night. Finally, houses can improve a sense of happiness, because it is a memorable place where we live with our family, sharing our experience and feeling love. So it can be understood that people require government to provide free housing.

However, I agree with those who argue that the house price should not be undertook by government. Firstly, there are various expenses government should pay, such as education or healthcare, which have tremendous impact on our daily life. For example, education can give our children a better job prospect and healthcare can provide medical treatment for all of us. Such service cannot be made available without government fund. Furthermore, those who can afford the price of houses can rent a one. Finally, the house provided by government often are made of poor materials and not well designed.

In conclusion, while someone advice government take the responsibility for providing free house, I believe people should rely on themselves to solve the problem and government should invest in other more beneficial services for citizens.

**GPT版：**

The idea of the government providing free housing for those who cannot afford it raises important questions about social responsibility and public resources. While I empathize with the urgent need for shelter, I do not agree with the concept of governments offering free housing for several reasons.

On one hand, having a secure place to live is undeniably crucial, ensuring safety, rest, and happiness. Living on the streets exposes individuals to various dangers, and a comfortable home provides not only physical security but also emotional well-being, especially in the warmth of family bonds. However, the financial burden of providing free housing places strain on government resources, which could otherwise be allocated to essential services like education and healthcare.

Governments have a plethora of responsibilities, including providing education and healthcare, which are fundamental to societal progress. Quality education offers future prospects for individuals, enhancing their employability and enabling social mobility. Healthcare services ensure the well-being of citizens, providing necessary medical treatments. These services, supported by government funding, have a direct and significant impact on people's lives.

Additionally, the idea of government-provided housing raises concerns about the quality of living conditions. Public housing often faces challenges such as subpar construction materials and inadequate design, which could compromise the residents' quality of life.

Additionally, the idea of government-provided housing raises concerns about the quality of living conditions. Public housing often faces challenges such as subpar construction materials and inadequate design, which could compromise the residents' quality of life.

In conclusion, addressing homelessness requires a holistic approach, focusing on accessible education, healthcare, and affordable housing initiatives. By investing wisely and addressing socioeconomic disparities, governments can pave the way for societal progress and enhance the quality of life for all citizens.

**我的改版：**

Some people argue that government should provide council properties to meet the fundamental demand for those whose can not buy it. While I can understanding the idea that homeless people really need a place to live, I do not agree that government should provide free housing.

On the one hand, it is necessary for everyone to have a house to live, because without it, individuals would experience considerable inconvenience or even danger. Firstly, sleeping outdoors is unsafe due to the presence of criminals and thieves on the streets, posing threats to personal safety and financial security. Secondly, a comfortable house can provide a place to take a rest. For example, in winter, a cozy bed and warm stove can alleviate accumulated stress and contribute to a good night's sleep. Finally, houses can improve a sense of happiness, because it is a memorable place where we live with our family, sharing our experience and feeling love. So it can be understood that people expect governments to provide free housing.

However, I agree with those who argue that governments should not be responsible for providing free housing. Firstly, there are various expenses governments need to cover, such as education or healthcare, both of which have tremendous impact on our daily lives. For example, education can give our children a better job prospect and healthcare ensures medical treatment for all of us. Such services cannot be made available without government funding. Furthermore, those who can afford the price of houses can temporarily rent one. Finally, houses provided by the government are often made of poor-quality materials and lack proper design.

In conclusion, while someone advice government to take the responsibility for providing free house, I believe people should rely on themselves to solve the problem and government should invest in other more beneficial services for citizens.

# 六：

**If people go to live in another country, they should follow the local customs and traditions. To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

It is debatable that whether foreign people should learn local customs and traditions. I completely agree with the idea that immigrants should follow the traditions to integrate into local communities and society.

On the one hand, if foreign inhabitants do not follow the local customs and habits, they may experience tremendous inconvenience. Firstly, a sense of community come from the shared experience of some collaborative events. If immigrants do not participate some local activities like volunteering which enable to raise the quality of living in their community, they would be recognized a isolated stranger in such area. Secondly, some behaviour may be impolite, when foreign inhabitants do not follow the local cultural customs. For example, in Chinese marriage, people wear red cloth to show their respect to the host. But a foreign person wearing withe cloth would be not appropriate, because in china, withe means misfortune.

On the other hand, there are various reason why immigrants should integrate into local society by following the local traditions. Firstly, it is beneficial to both local and foreign people that taking part in some collective events. Such events can provide chances for all to be familiar with each others. For example, some countryside would hold some festival in winter, such as BBQ, to celebrity the harvesting. This is a good opportunity to make friends who may help you when you trouble and communicate. Secondly, following the local customs and tradition can accelerate the speed of integrating into society, which is important for studying and working in local area.

In conclusion, I think that it is true that do not follow local follow the local customs and traditions is inconvenient and has a negative impact on foreign people.

**GPT版：**

The debate over whether foreign individuals should adopt local customs and traditions is a contentious issue. I firmly agree with the idea that immigrants should embrace the cultural norms of their new communities to facilitate integration.

On one hand, failure to assimilate into local customs can lead to significant challenges for immigrants. Engaging in shared activities and traditions fosters a sense of community, while non-participation may result in social isolation. Moreover, cultural insensitivity can inadvertently lead to misunderstandings or offense. For instance, wearing inappropriate attire during local ceremonies might convey disrespect, hindering meaningful interactions and acceptance.

On the other hand, there are compelling reasons for immigrants to embrace local traditions. Participation in collective events provides opportunities for mutual understanding and camaraderie. Festivals and communal activities serve as platforms for forging connections and friendships, crucial for building a support network. Additionally, adhering to local customs expedites the process of integration, enabling immigrants to acclimate swiftly to their new environments, which is vital for their personal and professional growth.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that immigrants should adopt local customs and traditions as a means of fostering harmonious relationships and societal integration. Failure to do so can impede social bonds and create barriers, while cultural assimilation enhances mutual understanding and enriches the multicultural fabric of communities. Embracing the traditions of a new homeland is not merely a choice but a vital step towards building a cohesive and inclusive society.

**我的改版：**

It is debatable that whether foreign people should learn local customs and traditions. I firmly agree with the idea that immigrants should embrace the cultural norms of their new communities to facilitate integration.

On the one hand, embracing the customs of a new land is an essential step for immigrants seeking genuine integration and failing to assimilate into local customs can lead to significant challenges for immigrants. Firstly, engaging in shared activities and traditions fosters a sense of community, while non-participation may result in social isolation. If immigrants do not participate some local activities like volunteering which enable to raise the quality of living in their community, they would be recognized a isolated stranger in such area. Secondly, cultural insensitivity can inevitably lead to misunderstandings or offense. For example, wearing inappropriate clothing during local ceremonies might convey disrespect, hindering meaningful interactions and acceptance.

On the other hand, there are compelling reasons why immigrants should integrate into local society by following the local traditions. Firstly, participation in collective events provides opportunities for mutual understanding, providing immigrants with open channels for communication, cooperation and acceptance. For instance, festivals and communal activities serve as platforms for forging connections and friendships, crucial for building a support network. Secondly, following the local customs and tradition enables immigrants to acclimate swiftly to their new environments, which is vital for their personal and professional growth.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that immigrants should adopt local customs and traditions as a mean of fostering harmonious relationships and societal cohesion.

# 七：

**Some people believe the purpose of education is to prepare individuals to be useful to society. Others say the purpose of education is to achieve personal ambitions. Discuss both views and give your opinion**

People have mixed views on whether the function of education should aim at teaching people to be helpful to society or helping people to achieve individual success. I think that the two ideas are not a paradox and education can be multi-functional.

A educated person can make a great contribution to society. Society can benefit from the work of education people especially those with training to the highest level. For example, numerous medicine is created through the collaborative efforts by biologists and doctors, which help patience to reduce the plan from illnesses, cure diseases and improve life expectancy of people. Without education, there could not be engineers, nurses, architectures, and so on, who play important roles in the running of society.

Education is also crucial to individual success. It is true that children or adults can acquire knowledge and skills, which are indispensable to the personal achievement, through many educated way such as schooling or self-study. For example, a child who aspire to be politician to improve the happiness of people, should learn some core subjects such as history and economy, because without these, he or she can not develop a in-deep understanding of what people really need and how to address the associated problems in the future.

In my opinion, education are critical and crucial to both individual and society. Individual and social success are compatible because when people are working for their ambitions, they are also promoting the advancement of society.

In conclusion, education prepare people to benefit society and to achieve their ambitions simultaneously.

**Chaetgpt版：**

The role of education in society has long been debated, with some arguing it should mold individuals to be beneficial to society, while others stress its importance in fostering personal success. In my view, these ideas are not mutually exclusive; education can serve both purposes effectively.

A well-educated individual can significantly contribute to society's advancement. Highly trained professionals such as doctors, engineers, and architects, thanks to their education, innovate medical treatments, design sustainable infrastructure, and enhance our living standards. For instance, breakthroughs in medical science, achieved through collaborative efforts of educated researchers and practitioners, have led to the eradication of diseases and increased life expectancy globally. Without education, these accomplishments would remain unattainable.

Simultaneously, education plays a pivotal role in personal success. Acquiring knowledge and skills through formal education or self-study equips individuals to pursue their ambitions effectively. For example, a student aspiring to be a politician needs a deep understanding of subjects like history and economics. This knowledge base enables them to comprehend societal needs comprehensively, thus formulating effective policies for the greater good.

Moreover, education acts as a catalyst for societal progress. Educated individuals often become agents of change, addressing social issues, fostering innovation, and promoting inclusivity. Consider the contributions of influential figures like Marie Curie in science or Nelson Mandela in social justice, both of whom harnessed their education to transform societies positively.

In conclusion, education is not a dichotomy between societal benefit and personal success; it is a dynamic force capable of achieving both. Educated individuals are not only better equipped to contribute meaningfully to society but also more empowered to realize their personal aspirations. By recognizing the multifaceted nature of education, societies can foster a generation of knowledgeable, compassionate, and successful individuals, ensuring progress on both individual and societal fronts.

**我的改版：**

Some people argue that the function of education should aim at teaching people to be beneficial to society, while others stress the importance of education in fostering personal success. I think that the two ideas are not a paradox and education can serve both purposes effectively.

A educated person can significantly contribute to society's advancement. Society can benefit from the work of educated people especially those with highly training. Highly trained professionals such as doctors, engineers, and architects, thanks to their education, innovate medical treatments, design sustainable infrastructure, and enhance our living standards. For example, breakthroughs in numerous medicine through the collaborative efforts by biologists and doctors, have led to the eradication of some diseases and increased life expectancy globally. Without education, these accomplishments would remain unattainable.

Education is also crucial to individual success. Acquiring knowledge and skills through formal education or self-study equips individuals to pursue their ambitions effectively. For example, a child aspiring to be a politician to improve the happiness of people, should learn some core subjects such as history and economics, because this knowledge base enables them to comprehend genuine social needs comprehensively, thus formulating effective policies.

In my opinion, education are critical and crucial to both individual and society. Individual and social success are compatible because educated individuals often become agents of change, addressing social issues and fostering innovation. Consider the contributions of influential figures like Marie Curie in science or Nelson Mandela in social justice, both of whom harnessed their education to transform societies positively.

In conclusion, educated individuals are not only better equipped to contribute meaningfully to society but also more empowered to realize their personal aspirations. By recognizing the multifaceted nature of education, societies can foster a generation of knowledgeable, compassionate, and successful individuals, ensuring progress on both individual and societal achievement.

# 八：

**Some people believe that studying the past can teach nothing about life today. Others believe that history is a valuable source of information for life today. Discuss both views and give your opinion.**

There are many people argue that human can learn nothing from the history, while their opponents believe that modern development come from the previous experience and practice. In my opinion, information from history can be a necessary source of what today we achieve and promote social evolution continually.

On the one hand, some people believe the idea that the knowledge we learn from history is completely useless. Firstly, we should admit that some previous incorrect theories had led to many human-made disasters. For example, previous people considered diseases as a punishment from the divine and the only solution was to gain God's forgiveness . Secondly, past technologies, tools and management style are outdated, and not suitable for modern industry. The productivity rate of today is much more efficient than that of past. For instance, the time and labour spent on producing a car are 0.5 day and 5 people, but in 18th century, such process need 2 days and 10 people. Finally, the social structure has changed drastically, and many policies used are incompatible.

On their other hand, I totally agree with those who believe that the history is the most precious material for all human, which is indispensable to cultural, social and economic development. Firstly, all correct theories derive from the experiment and analysis from the past. For example, in the medical field, doctors and biologists recognized all bacterial was harmful to health and should be eliminated. However, after decades, most medical researchers found that some peoples' health became bad after eating anti-bacterial drugs, therefore such situations forced them to analyze the consequences and propose some theories, which still benefit modern people. If no historic data, medical advancement can not be achieved and we could suffer more from some illnesses which have the adverse impact on our health. Secondly, politicians can draw inspiration from history to govern their state and avoid make similar mistake like past.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that while there were some wrong guidelines and theories from past, experience and information from history are the most valuable fortune for human.

**我的改版：**

Many people argue that human can learn nothing from the history, while their opponents believe that modern development stems from the previous experience and practices. In my opinion, information from history serves as a crucial source of our achievements, promoting social evolution continually.

On the one hand, some people believe the idea that studying history is completely useless. Firstly, history is a subject that is rarely used in daily live so it would be better to focus on science and technology which is more relevant to the future and today's society. For example, most people memorized dates, names and facts during their schooling years, but this information is not useful in most of jobs, such as programmer, accountant and athlete, which rely on math and science. Secondly, each historical event has different perspectives, making learning history a waste time and energy. Because events can be viewed in different way which make what we learn less valuable. Finally, the challenges, technologies and social norms of the past were fundamentally different, making historical knowledge obsolete in the face of current issues.

On the other hand, I totally agree with those who believe that the history is the most precious resource for all human, which is indispensable to cultural, social and economic development. Firstly, history records and helps us understand change because it shows patterns of behaviour and events in the past and their outcomes which serve as reminder for us to avoid similar outcomes in the future. For example, in the field of medicine, researchers have learned from historical data, allowing them to develop more effective treatments and medicines. Secondly, past experience guides us to success. For example, politicians and businessman can draw inspiration from past errors. So they can make informed decisions, steering their nations and businesses away from repeating costly mistakes and guiding them toward success.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that while sometimes the past knowledge has few impact on our daily lives, it remains the most valuable treasure for human as by learning from the past, we can avoid the similar mistakes.

# 九：

**Students should be allowed to choose academic courses or practical courses, e.g. carpenters. To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

Some people argue that students should have the right to choose their lessons whether is practical or academic. While I think it is important for young children to learn academic courses, for elderly student, they can their own choice about whether should be continue to stick to learn academic courses or turn to practical courses.

One the one hand, basic knowledge is indispensable for young children because without it, children may experience tremendous inconvenience and loss some job opportunities. Firstly, some academic subjects, such as math and law, are crucial for daily lives and some careers. I can not imagine that a aircraft engineer can not calculate the max speed of plane or an adult do not the consequences of breaking laws. Secondly, the academic studying can benefit they by developing critical thinking. When taking part in academic courses. children would be taught about some theories and the relevant researches. In such courses, children they would encourage to develop a in-depth understanding of knowledge, which is the process of developing the critical thinking.

On the other hand, senior students should make their own decisions about what courses they aspire to attend because they have enough experience and basic knowledge to make a choice. Firstly, it is not necessary for some profession to learn some academic subject. For example, lawyers rely on their comprehension on law rather than theories of technology. Therefore, time is wasted for them to learn technological courses. Secondly, some careers lay emphasis on practical experience, most academic knowledge is not suitable to real working. For example, the consumer managers who often deal with complaints and requirement from clients depend on experience on interaction with people from different background.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that young children should learn academic subject and elderly students should be given rights to choose the courses they want to attend.

**GPT版：**

The question of whether students should have the freedom to choose their courses has been a matter of ongoing debate. Some argue that young students should be guided towards academic subjects, while others contend that older students should be allowed to make choices based on their interests and experience. I agree with the notion that basic academic knowledge is crucial for young children. However, I also believe that elderly students should have the right to choose their courses based on practicality and personal inclination.

For young children, a foundation in academic subjects is essential. Basic knowledge, especially in fields like mathematics and law, is indispensable for daily life and various careers. Imagine an aircraft engineer unable to calculate the maximum speed of a plane or an adult ignorant of the consequences of breaking laws. Academic learning not only equips them with essential life skills but also nurtures critical thinking. Engaging in academic courses exposes children to theories and research, encouraging them to develop a deep understanding of knowledge, thereby honing their critical thinking abilities.

Conversely, senior students possess experience and a foundational understanding of basic subjects, enabling them to make informed decisions about their course choices. Certain professions do not necessitate academic knowledge in specific areas. Lawyers, for instance, rely on their comprehension of law rather than intricate technological theories. For them, investing time in learning subjects unrelated to their field is unproductive. Additionally, many careers prioritize practical experience over theoretical knowledge. Consumer managers, dealing with diverse client complaints and requirements, rely heavily on their ability to interact with people effectively – an aspect honed through practical experience rather than academic study.

In conclusion, I firmly advocate for a balanced approach. Young children should be exposed to fundamental academic subjects to build a strong foundation for their future. Simultaneously, elderly students should be empowered to select courses aligned with their career paths and personal interests, recognizing the value of practical experience in shaping their expertise. Granting students the autonomy to choose their courses fosters a learning environment where both foundational knowledge and practical skills are valued, preparing them comprehensively for the challenges of the modern world.

**我的改版：**

Some people argue that students should have the right to choose practical lessons or academic lessons. While I think it is important for young children to learn basic academic courses, for elderly student, they should have the right to choose their courses based on practicality and personal inclination.

One the one hand, basic knowledge is indispensable for young children because without it, children may experience tremendous inconvenience and loss some job opportunities. Firstly, some academic subjects, such as mathematics and law, are crucial for daily lives and various careers. I can not imagine that an aircraft engineer can not calculate the max speed of a plane he design or an adult do not know the consequences of breaking laws. Secondly, the academic studying can benefit they by nurturing critical thinking. Engaging in academic courses exposes children to theories and research, encouraging them to develop a deep understanding of knowledge, which is the process of developing the critical thinking.

On the other hand, senior students should make their own decisions about what courses they aspire to attend because they have enough experience and basic knowledge to make a choice. Firstly, it is not necessary for some professions to learn some academic subject. For example, lawyers rely on their comprehension on law rather than intricate technological theories. Therefore, time is wasted for them to learn technological courses. Secondly, some careers lay emphasis on practical experience and most academic knowledge is unsuitable for real working. For example, the customer managers who often deal with complaints and requirements from clients depend heavily on experience on interaction with people from different background.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that young children should learn academic subject and elderly students should be given rights to choose the courses they want to attend.

# 十：

**Scientific research should be carried out and controlled by government rather than private companies. To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

There are some arguments that government should dominate scientific research. I completely disagree with idea that private sector should be excluded from scientific research, and I therefore believe that some researches are suitable for private companies while others for government, which can maximize their merits.

Grandly, the government has a crucial role to play in scientific research. Scientific researches would take tremendous manpower, time and money, many of which have no directly economic value. In some scientific field such as physics and biology, many scientific breakthroughs need years of commitment, constant financial input and sympathy from researchers. For example, in 19th century, Darwin collected many biological materials from all over the world and spent many years to constantly study and formed the famous theory Evolutionism, which has great impact on microorganism and food industry, providing us with sufficient food and crucial medical treatment. Because these researches yielded few financial benefits, meaning that no one private sector would invest their money in these projects, without government funding, all these achievements are not made available.

However, corporate scientific research also holds many inherent advantages. To begin with, given the profit-pursuing nature of business, companies have more efficient regulation and clear research objective, promoting research process strongly and reaching research goal more quickly. For example, problems companies face in their products may hinder their sale, further threatening the company survival. So, under such pressure, managers and experts would be motivated to solve the issues and get a substantial financial rewards. Moreover, funding from firms can alleviate the financial stress of government that provides the public with basic and necessary services and facilities which consuming considerable budget.

In conclusion, I believe that government and private companies have their own advantages to do scientific researches and we should promote this trend.

**GPT版：**

The question of whether government should exclusively dominate scientific research is a subject of ongoing discourse. I firmly disagree with the notion that the private sector should be excluded from scientific endeavors. Instead, I advocate for a nuanced perspective that recognizes the strengths of both government and private involvement in research, maximizing the potential benefits derived from each.

Governments play a pivotal role in scientific research, especially in fields where the economic returns are not immediately apparent. Many scientific breakthroughs, particularly in areas like physics and biology, demand extensive resources, time, and manpower without immediate economic applications. A notable historical example is Charles Darwin's meticulous collection of biological materials worldwide, spending years developing the groundbreaking theory of evolution. This theory, despite its initial lack of direct economic value, has had profound implications on fields such as microorganisms, agriculture, and medicine. Without sustained government funding for such endeavors, vital contributions to our understanding of the world and advancements in critical industries might not have materialized.

However, it is equally important to recognize the inherent advantages of corporate involvement in scientific research. Private companies operate under a profit-driven model, fostering efficient regulation and clearly defined research objectives. This orientation often leads to a more streamlined research process and quicker attainment of research goals. For instance, companies facing product-related challenges are under constant pressure to resolve issues that could impact sales and, ultimately, their survival in the market. This inherent motivation drives managers and experts to address problems swiftly, with the promise of substantial financial rewards upon success. Additionally, private sector funding can alleviate the financial burden on governments, allowing them to allocate resources to essential public services and facilities that require significant budgetary commitments.

In conclusion, I contend that a collaborative approach, involving both government and private companies, is essential for the progress of scientific research. While governments can provide the necessary resources for long-term, high-risk projects that may not yield immediate economic benefits, the private sector's profit-driven focus ensures efficiency, rapid problem-solving, and financial sustainability. Embracing both these approaches can lead to a synergistic relationship, fostering innovation and maximizing the overall impact of scientific research on society.

**我的改版：**

There are some arguments that whether government should exclusively dominate scientific research. I completely disagree with idea that private sector should be excluded from scientific endeavors. Instead, I advocate strengthening the advantages of government and private involvement in research, maximizing the potential benefits derived from each.

Governments play a crucial role in scientific discovery, especially in fields where the economic returns are not immediately apparent, meaning that no private companies would invest money in them. Many scientific breakthrough, particularly in areas like physics and biology, demand extensive resources, time and manpower without immediate economic applications. For example, in 19th century, Charles Darwin collected many biological materials from all over the world, spending years developing the groundbreaking theory of evolution. This theory, despite its initial lack of direct economic value, has had profound implications on industries such as microorganisms, agriculture, and medicine. Without sustained government funding for such endeavors, all these achievements are not made available.

However, it is equally important to recognize the inherent advantages of corporate involvement in scientific research. To begin with, given the profit-pursuing nature of business, companies have more efficient regulation and clear research objective, promoting research process and reaching research goal more quickly. For example, companies facing product-related challenges are under constant pressure to resolve issues that could impact sales and, ultimately, their survival in the market. So such situation drives managers and experts to solve the issues swiftly, with the promise of substantial financial rewards upon success. Moreover, funding from firms can alleviate the financial stress of government, allowing them to allocate resources to essential public services and facilities that require significant budgetary commitments.

In conclusion, I believe that government and private companies have their own advantages to do scientific researches and we should promote this trend.