
Some people believe that if the police force carries guns, it would encourage a higher level of violence in the society. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

立场：

中立。警方合理用枪，则能起到积极作用

正方：带枪对罪犯起到震慑的作用

反方：带枪或者用枪会激起罪犯用暴力方法予以还击，给社会增加了更多不安全因素

Many people believe that a police force armed with guns encourages the level of violence in society. Other people maintain that an armed police force deters the level of violence. I think it really depends on how the guns are used by the police.

The obvious argument for having armed police centers around the idea that the show of guns by police is in itself a deterrent to violence. Citizens who may be contemplating an act of violence will be reminded that their own safety and welfare may be jeopardized if they are caught committing a violent crime by police. Thus, having an armed police force can in fact discourage the committing of crimes and the violence within a society.

On the other hand, armed police officers' use of guns may escalate violence instead of deterring it. If a police officer shoots at a suspected criminal, that violence may breed more violence, as the criminal might shoot back and then the police officers, the criminals, and even innocent bystanders could be injured or killed with the gunfire.

To sum up, most citizens expect the police to protect them by any means necessary, including guns. If citizens are not confident that the police are protecting them, those citizens might then decide to obtain guns to protect themselves against other citizens and the police. So, in those instances guns will lead to more guns and violence will breed more violence. However, if police officers are properly trained as to how and when to use guns, the guns they carry should provide a deterrent to the level of violence in a society.

其他观点

In some countries, the police force carries guns to fight against lawbreakers and protect the innocent. However, some people hold the view that it would give rise to a higher level of violence. As far as I am concerned, only when guns are used properly under certain supervision, can they serve to protect citizens.

Undoubtedly, guns are one of the most powerful weapons that the police can use to maintain social security and stability as it is the best deterrent to potential lawbreakers and scare off the would-be criminals. If police force carries guns in the public, there is a possibility that the potential criminals may give up their plans, thus reducing the crime rate. In addition, the police can use guns to protect themselves as police officers are one of the most dangerous jobs in the world. They need to protect themselves when they face criminals who are using weapons.

However, the application of guns can pose potential risks. First of all, it may lead to the abuse of weapons, especially in some western countries where ordinary people have the right to buy guns. Secondly, there is a possibility that the police may hurt innocent citizens accidentally when they pick the wrong targets, which also leads to social chaos. Thirdly, if every police officer carries a gun and walks in the street, people will lack the sense of security and the society will have a horrifying atmosphere.

To conclude, the police can hold guns, but they should be very careful to avoid the abuse of guns. At the same time, the police must be trained strictly before being allowed to carry weapons.

Some people think most crimes are the result of circumstances like poverty and other social problems. Others believe that they are caused by people who are bad in nature. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

立场：很多罪犯出于生活所迫或者一时的错误决定而犯错，并非希望故意给社会造成危害
正方：确实有人因为经济问题不得不犯罪以生存下去
反方：人生来是好人，但是因为环境变化，从而本质已经变得完全反社会了

As a society, we are always trying to determine why crimes are committed. Some people believe that poverty or other social problems are the reason for most crimes. Other people maintain that some people commit crimes because they are simply bad people by nature. I would agree with former opinion.

There is no doubt that some crimes are the result of poverty or social disadvantage. Some people become so desperate with their financial or social situation that they feel they have no choice but to commit crimes. They are aware of the consequences of committing the crime, but they are willing to take the chance of committing the crime because they are desperate to improve their situation and feel that they have nothing to lose.

On the other hand, there are people who commit crimes just because they are bad people. As humans, we all like to believe that our fellow humans are good at heart. But with some crimes that are committed, we are reminded that some people are just not good people. Maybe at some point in time these criminals were good people, but now circumstances and events in their lives have made them bad people with no empathy for others.

To conclude, most of the people who commit crimes out of desperation are still good people at heart. In other words, they are good people committing bad acts or making bad decisions. However, there are some people who are committing crimes just for the sake of committing crimes. It is difficult to feel an pity for those criminals, as they will often exhibit a total disregard for their fellow citizens with the crimes they commit.

其他观点

There are numerous reasons contributing to crimes. Some people hold the view that most crimes are the result of poverty and other social problems, while others assume that those who are innately bad cause crimes. From my perspective, I would go along with the former opinion.

Those who blame crimes on social problems have their reasons. For many criminals, crimes originate from lack of proper education from both parents and schools. If they get guidance from their parents and receive education about law, the possibility of violating laws will probably decrease. In addition, it is reported in news that many people commit crimes due to poverty. These people have few options in life and may long for things that they cannot afford. They do not have essential skills to make money and purchase these items, so they take a short cut and then crimes like theft happen.

However, others think oppositely. It is reported in some famous periodicals that some psychological characteristics related to crimes can be inherited and people can be influenced by these factors since childhood. But I cannot agree with the opinion. I believe human nature makes little sense in judging whether people can commit crimes or not and people's behavior is mostly influenced by their surroundings, including their economic conditions, education background and social relationships.

To conclude, it is social problems rather than genes that lead to most crimes, human beings might have some characteristics that could do harm to the society, but these can be tamed early with education.

In many parts of the world, children and teenagers are committing crimes. Why do you think it is the case? How should children or teenagers be punished?

原因：媒体和网络传播大量和暴力有关的信息

惩罚方法

1. 部分无知青少年不应该接受和成年人一样的惩罚
2. 对于部分心智成熟的少年犯，加重刑罚也是有必要的。

Statistics show that children and teenagers are committing more crimes at a higher rate than ever before. I think that increased exposure to crime and violence is the main cause of increased crime among the very young. There are many different thoughts regarding how these young people should be punished for their crimes.

There is no doubt that movies, television shows, Internet news stories, and video games now show more violence than ever before. Children are often exposed to this violence at ages younger than ever before. Some of the violence is fictional and some of the violence is real. Either way, exposure to violence can give children and teenagers the idea that violence is acceptable and commonplace in society.

When children and teenagers are caught and convicted of crimes, I tend to disagree with the idea that all young people should receive the same penalties as adults for the crimes they commit. Young brains are not developed enough for some young people to fully understand the consequences of the crimes they commit. Moreover, everyone deserves a second chance and the loss of a young life to the punishment for a crime is not always reasonable.

However, the more serious the crime is and the older the child committing the crime is, the more serious the penalty is likely to be. Many juvenile delinquents are now being treated as adults, because society believes they are aware of the consequences of the crime crimes they commit.

In conclusion, mass media and the Internet are the main ways that violence spreads. Meanwhile, what penalties we should apply for those mistakes are certainly debatable.

其他观点

Juvenile delinquency has become a common problem in many countries these days. I think there are a few reasons that cause this.

The disharmonious relationship between family members is one of the most important factors leading to juvenile delinquency. Some children lack proper guidance, love and care from parents as they live in single-parent families, so they tend to take a revenge on the society. In addition, some children are likely to be influenced by their peers to challenge legal systems. The exam-oriented educational system is also to blame because it lays too much pressure on adolescents. Under such circumstance, they intentionally or unintentionally do the wrong things to let off some steam. Apart from that, due to the fact that children and teenagers lack self-control, they are easy to be lured by temptations like stealing for more pockets money, thus violating the law.

As to punishment methods, I think those who commit minor crimes like theft can be sent to do some voluntary work, which enables them to reconnect with the society and make some contribution. However, others should accept more serious punishment such as sending them to jail. However, no matter what the punishment is, the final purpose is to help them realize the mistakes and make them better people.

To conclude, the problem of juvenile delinquency has to do with parents, schools and governments. As to the punishment, we must be clear that our final aim is to educate them and make them better citizens rather than torture them mentally or physically.

Some people who have been in prison become good citizens later. Some people think that they are the best people to talk to school students the danger of committing a crime. Do you agree or disagree?

立场：倾向于让重获新生的罪犯给学生科普犯罪的危害

正方：罪犯能更形象的描述犯罪给一个人带来的巨大变化（家庭事业等）震慑听众。

反方：担心有些罪犯会夸大犯罪的好处，误导学生

It is not unusual for prisoners or ex-prisoners to speak to school students about the perils and consequences of committing a crime. It is believed that the firsthand knowledge offered by these prisoners or ex-prisoners is very valuable in informing young people about the consequences of crime. I agree with this opinion to a large extent as these people are likely to be anxious to counsel others to not make the same mistakes they did.

On one hand, a prisoner or ex-prisoner is best-equipped to tell others about the negative consequences of committing crimes. They have experienced firsthand the perils of committing a criminal act. Students are much more likely to listen to and believe a person who has direct knowledge of the consequences of a crime. If a prisoner or former prisoner tells stories of losing his freedom or his family to a prison sentence a student is much more likely to heed the advice.

Some people will contend that if a person is a criminal, their standing in the community is tarnished and irreparable and they should not be allowed to give advice to students who have not experienced those consequences.

Although some people may be afraid that these criminals or ex-criminals will glorify a life of crime in talking to students, the general feeling is that most prisoners or ex-prisoners will impart knowledge and experience that is unknown to many people. Prisoners and ex-prisoners can be effective messengers in informing students about the consequences of crime and the negative experiences from time spent in prison.

其他观点

It is believed that people who used to be prisoners but now have become good citizens can be the best teacher to help children understand crimes' harm to the society. I partly agree with this opinion.

These people who have a criminal record could use their own experience to convey the consequences of their wrong behavior to children, which might be more effective than other ways of teaching. The process might be quite interactive as children would ask questions and these teachers would answer with real stories happened to themselves rather than explain with complicated terms which do not make much sense to the children. Expectedly, the shocking information can leave a deep impression on children and be a long-lasting warning sign.

However, we cannot completely rely on these teachers and their personal experience. My top concern is that some of these people are poorly educated and they have limited teaching ability, so they are not able to train children to understand how the legal system functions and why it is dangerous to commit a crime. Besides, stories based on one's

memory could be unreliable or not vivid enough to pass the message to children. Therefore, the unprofessional teaching should at least be supervised by professional teachers otherwise the influence may turn negative.

Overall, having children educated by people who have served sentence in prison can be a good choice as life experience may work wonders to improve children's understanding in the danger of crimes. But this way of teaching may not be satisfying due to the fact that these people are not trained teachers and thus the positive impact on children could be limited.