
Developing countries require help offered by international organizations to ensure healthy and sustainable development. Some people think that financial aid is important. Others believe that practical aid and advice is more important. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

立场：两者都很必要，同时给出指导和帮助更能有效改善这些国家的状况

正方：经济援助帮助这些国家修缮基础设施

反方：真正需要的人不一定能拿到经济援助，而建议和指导会让这些国家更好的运用援助

Some people think that financial aid will benefit these developing countries more than practical aid and advice. I believe that both financial and practical aid are important, however I think that practical aid is more important, as developing countries must be taught how to best use the financial aid they receive.

There is no doubt that developing countries can benefit from financial aid. This aid can help fund the building of schools and education systems, the construction of roads and bridges, and the financing of business start-ups and expansions. On the other hand, detractors will point out that financial aid from international organizations often times does not reach the people or parties for whom it is intended. That financial aid, without the practical aid to accompany it, may be subject to wasteful spending or worse, corruption.

Practical aid and advice can provide the groundwork for a more sustainable economy, also for the more efficient use of funds and resources. As an example, an international organization that provided corn to a developing country in the hopes that the people there would plant the corn and create a sustainable food source. Instead, the people ate the corn. What was intended to be a sustainable food source instead became a one-time food donation. The people of the developing country were lacking the practical knowledge regarding what to do with the corn and how to make it a sustainable food source.

Although financial aid is certainly beneficial to a developing country the benefit of that aid will not be sustainable unless it is accompanied by practical advice and knowledge in regards to how to use those funds.

其他观点

It is quite common to provide international aid to poor countries these days. Some people think financial support is more important than practical aid. I believe that if these aids should be combined with each other in order to achieve the best beneficial results.

Financial funds given directly to developing countries may pose a threat to the society and cause many related problems, like corruption. Countries that receive funds on a regular basis may develop a reliance on this source of finance. Also, authorities will take advantage of this opportunity and try to use the money for other purposes. In the end, citizens in developing countries cannot enjoy the benefit of these financial aids.

Practical aid and advice, on the other hand, may contribute more. International organizations can build public facilities schools, libraries to offer locals opportunities to receive education in order to find jobs in the future. The positive effects may not be seen in a short period of time, but in the long run, the educated workforce will break their country's reliance on financial aid from other countries and boost their economy independently.

In my opinion, I believe that financial aid and for sustainable development are equally important for people in developing countries. International organizations can support these financially struggling countries with funds especially when their citizens are suffering from serious problems like famine. While if it is not in an emergent situation. Instead of asking for money, many of these countries truly need technicians to teach them how to build power plants and dams. So, donators may double check with recipients and make sure that the aid is what they really need.

Some people believe that rich countries should provide poorer countries with other types of help rather than financial aid. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

立场：强烈赞成

正方：经济援助使用妥当，会让贫穷国家的经济更健康的发展

反方：长期来看，单给钱不一定是最好的，应辅以其他的援助，比如：科技，财政指导

Some people believe that it would be better for rich countries to provide poorer countries with types of aid other than just financial aid. I agree strongly with that premise.

There is no doubt that poorer countries can benefit from financial aid. Money is required to build and maintain a healthy economy in any country. Financial aid, if used wisely and effectively, can become the lifeblood of any economy that aims to be self-sustaining.

That being said, other forms of aid may be more effective in guaranteeing the long-term success and sustenance of the developing country's economy. Other forms of aid might include technological aid or expertise, manpower, financial and educational expertise etc. Countries would be able to use technological aid to become more relevant in the worldwide market. They could use educational expertise to develop education systems which will allow for the country to educate its young people and eventually reap the economical benefits of an educated society. The developing countries could use the financial expertise offered by other countries to determine how best to use their financial resources and how best to develop financial plans and systems that will encourage a prosperous economy.

In conclusion financial aid offered by richer countries to poorer countries can be vital for those poorer countries as they try to develop vibrant and sustainable economies. However, that being said, richer countries might be better served to offer other types of help other than just financial help, or relevant help to accompany the financial aid they are offering.

其他观点

Financial aids to developing nations provided by developed countries are quite common in the world. Although financial support, I believe other forms of support could be more helpful.

Other kinds of aid, such as education can be a great approach to solve problems in developing countries. In many poor nations, the social problems are very severe due to the fact that most people are under-educated. If rich countries can provide scholarship or build public schools for the children there, crimes would be mitigated, and in the long run, the well-educated workforce can develop the economy of their country by themselves.

Also, providing construction material and technology for public facilities is effective. The improvement of public infrastructure, such as libraries, water and electricity supply system and public transport system, in a way contributes to higher productivity as people would less likely be affected by bad public services and save more time and energy for their work.

On the other hand, direct financial support may not benefit people in poorer countries as expected. The government in these countries might use the donating money for other purposes. Consequently, the people in need will still suffer. Moreover, some nations try to interfere with other countries' politics by aiding them financially. So, financial support is not the perfect way to solve social problems in poorer nations.

In conclusion, the money donated to developing countries cannot completely solve poor countries' problems, so international aids should be provided in other forms, such as education or the construction of public facilities.

Most of the urgent problems can only be solved with international cooperation. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

立场：同意

- 1.以环境问题为例，环境问题已经是全球化问题。如果各国相互分享解决办法，解决的速度会更快
- 2.以恐怖主义为例，如果受害国只是自己在努力，其他国家不管不问，那恐怖主义永远不能禁止。

The world has urgent problems which need to be solved, preferably sooner than later. I believe that if countries work together, they can solve problems faster than if they tried to solve these problems independently.

There is an old saying: "Two heads are better than one." This applies to the attempts to solve world problems. For example, pollution is a problem which is affecting all of us, regardless of what country we live in. In working together, countries can combine their financial and

intellectual resources to solve these problems faster and more economically. If one country has already developed techniques and processes to prevent or reduce pollution, it will benefit all of us if that country will share its resources on that.

On the other hand, if a country tries to solve a problem independently, that country is likely to spend more time and money in its attempts to do so and the solutions may not be as effective as the solutions from working in cooperation with other countries. For example, if one country is determined to solve the problem of terrorism, many of those efforts will go to waste if the neighboring country is not working to do the same. Some terrorists may take shelter in those countries which hardly care about the crimes and harm that they have done, and this would never put an end to terrorism.

Countries will be better served to solve the world's problems through cooperation. In doing so, countries will be able to share information and expenditures that will allow for the problems to be solved in a quicker, more efficient, and less expensive manner.

其他观点

In the ever-accelerating process of globalization, the relationship among countries in getting closer and closer and international cooperation is more frequent than before. Some people believe that most of the urgent problems can only be tackled by cooperation of different countries, but I think not all problems need to depend on international cooperation.

Admittedly, international cooperation can handle many urgent problems. For example, global warming has caused many serious problems and needs international cooperation urgently, so it is necessary for foreign countries to work together. Moreover, when it comes to extreme circumstances like tsunami and earthquake, domestic help is far from enough. International help, including food, tents and rescue equipment are in great demand. For example, after a devastating earthquake happened in China in 2008, over 20 countries offered help timely and avoided more casualties.

However, not all problems can be solved by international cooperation. For instance, in some developing countries where people starve to death and die from epidemics, food and medical equipment are in great demand. However, this problem cannot be solved by merely accepting assistance from other countries, which is not a long-term solution. Instead, people there should depend on themselves to improve technology and economy. Additionally, some problems are related to religion and policy which are too sensitive that foreign countries' help may make the situation worse, so it is much better to leave the problems to themselves.

In conclusion, most countries are now closely connected with each other and many urgent problems can be better handled with international cooperation. However, some problems can only be solved by people from their own countries. It is crucial to distinguish different problems and then decide how to solve them.

Some people believe famous people's support towards international aid organizations draws the attention to problems, while others think celebrities make the problems less important. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

立场：有明星参与帮助会很大

正方：明星有自己的平台和影响力，往往会让他们的粉丝和相关媒体关注

反方：有些粉丝只是为了取悦他们的偶像，并非真正关心这些问题

Some people believe that famous peoples' support to international aid organizations helps to raise people s awareness of certain problems. I agree with this opinion to a large extent.

There is no doubt that celebrities can help make people aware of problems. As celebrities, they have a platform that others who are not celebrities might not have. If a musical group such as the world famous Irish rock band U2 wants to create awareness for a problem, they will have a much better chance of creating awareness and securing support for the cause than non-celebrities would have. If U2 is willing to perform a benefit concert to promote a cause, the media is likely to be interested in the story and the cause. Television networks might be willing to broadcast the concert. People will be willing to attend the concert to benefit the cause.

Some people maintain that celebrities detract from the problem, as people may then tend to focus on the celebrities instead of the problem itself. It is possible that their fans are not genuinely interested in offering help, rather they just do as told to please their idols.

In conclusion, it is important to note that there might be no awareness for the cause or the problem if the celebrities were not involved. If the celebrities are sincere in aiding the cause, their support will bring more positives than negatives. People are much more likely to show support if they know that some of their favorite celebrities are willing to donate precious time to support.

其他观点

In recent years, many celebrities become actively involved in helping international aids organizations. Some people think it is a great way to encourage more people to involve in the problem-solving. However, others just see the support as a tool to draw more attention on the celebrities themselves.

To be fair, a celebrity's involvement in charity-related activities does catch a wider range of attention. They use a variety of media platform to publicize what they promote to support. As a result, their fans or sponsoring companies are likely to respond to the problems with money or other forms of support.

Of course, some people can argue that these famous people may not genuinely mean to

help solve problems. Some celebrities only appear in the press conference and give a glamorous speech about why they decide to do. But after the publicity event, some never go back or follow up with the helping progress. Their fans probably would not bother asking for the progress either. After all, charity is just a tool to better these well-known figures' images.

Personally speaking, I would stand up for those celebrities who take international aids seriously. Some of them go to poor countries regularly and offer help in person while others keep donating because they sincerely care, which encourages more people to follow their footsteps to offer assistance. As for those who just show up to look good, they do not deserve our respect. In a word, we should not forget the real heroes among them just because of some clowns.

Many countries believe that international tourism has harmful effects. Why do they think so? What can be done to change their views?

原因:

- 1.不确定利处是什么
- 2.认为国际游客只会导致环境污染或者社会不稳定

解决办法 :

- 他们应该做足够的调查, 看看其他国家如何受益
- 2.制定相应的法律法规并引导游客做正确的事情

Some countries believe that international tourism is not beneficial. I believe the exact opposite and many of these countries should be able to reap the benefits of international tourism if their attitudes change.

For the countries that believe that international tourism is harmful, it seems that some of those countries are not sure what benefits foreign tourists can bring. They simply regard international tourists countries are not sure what benefits foreign tourists can bring. They simply regard international tourists as people who either cause pollution or chaos to their countries, so they do not want to be inconvenienced by tourists who are traveling throughout the country.

In terms of solutions, first of all, these countries should objectively analyse how other countries are benefited from international tourism before making any judgment. Soon they will see that it offers tremendous economic benefits to the host countries. People who travel to other countries are almost certain to spend money on hotels, restaurants, and local attractions. The money these tourists spend is money that was not previously circulating in the host country' s economy, so those financial contributions can provide a major economic boost for the host country. Second, governments can set rules to regulate tourists behavior. For those who seriously affect local environment or social order, they will be blacklisted and deported for good. Also, educational programs can be made for teaching new comers what they can do and what is not allowed to do.

Countries who discourage international tourism should learn to analyse the economic benefits of it. Certain rules can be set to make sure that international tourists respect local culture and environmental regulations.

其他观点

Many people have a belief that there are harmful consequences from the popularity of international tourism. It leads to negative effects on domestic tourism industry and attracts trouble-making tourists from other countries.

Some people tend to associate the development of international tourism with the decline of domestic tourism. As people nowadays may expect more on traveling abroad for fresh-new experience, this change of preference in a way will first affect local tour companies' business and then local economy. After all, these companies could not duplicate foreign cultures and environment in their own countries to cater for people's expectation.

Another harmful effect of international tourism is associated with social disorder as people who have never been abroad before may not expect culture shock so they may cause some kind of disorder in the visited countries. Some tourists may be rude to waiters in a restaurant or not leave a tip after finishing meals. This can be very frustrating and annoying to local people.

The above reasons do bring bad reputation to international tourism, but there are practical ways to fix the problems. Firstly, domestic tour companies and tourist sites should seize the opportunity to adjust their services so that they can offset the loss of local tourists. Secondly, relative regulations and guidance should be implemented and offered to foreign visitors helping them understand new culture quickly before they cause any trouble. With these two measures, I believe fewer and fewer people would hold a negative attitude towards international tourism.

To conclude, being a threat to local tourism industry and causing social disorder, international tourism leaves a negative impression on locals. However, with proper methods, these problems can be avoided.