

## Essays from Live Class

**The first man to walk on the moon said space exploration was going to change mankind's life. Some people argue that it made only a little change to our lives. Discuss both views and give your opinion.**

Introduction

Body 1: Discuss Side 1

- a. Discuss Viewpoint 1
- b. Give Opinion on View Point 1
- c. Give example to support

Body 2: Discuss Side 2

- a. Discuss Viewpoint 2
- b. Give Opinion Viewpoint 2
- C. Give example to support

Conclusion

**Space exploration had fascinated humankind since the early 1900s when writers created novels and silent movies about exploring the moon. Finally, in the 1960s, mankind achieved that lofty goal, but since then, a schism formed: moon travel elevated human life, or lunar exploration offered little impact. With these viewpoints in mind, this essay will tackle each vantage point but ultimately side with the moon voyage improving humanity's way of life.**

**Traveling to the moon embodies extreme challenges, but the benefits paid off in equal measure. A litany of improvements to society's lifestyle ensued after the successful lunar journey: digital flight control, food safety protocols, shock absorbers, computer coding, memory foam, tracking, and achieving the once impossible dream. This last point, the inconceivable dream, explains this essay's strong position favoring moon travel as a boon to the average person. For example, moon-inspired scientists realized even more unthinkable immensely culture-changing aspirations since astronauts blasted off in rockets to Earth's closest planetary body, including smartphones, the internet, and**

**portable computers. Although the stronger viewpoint favors the lunar landing as a windfall bonanza of growth, the opposing view warrants discussion.**

**Arguments exist that setting foot on the moon only slightly amended daily life. These rationalizations typically fall under the resolving problems closer to home, such as poverty, racism, and starvation. If we examine the world today, one could contend that these banes to humanity still exist somewhat even in more robust measure than in 1960. For example, the George Floyd national racism protest raged across American in 2021. Be that as it may, this reasoning does not carry strong enough weight since moon-led inventions improved social warriors' ability to report, reveal, change, and comment on the problems closer to home.**

**Despite unresolved societal problems, the position of little change does not stand up against the onslaught of improvements derived from moon travel. In the future, humans should travel to the moon and resolve human grief in equal measure and cost.**

**The world should have only one government rather than a national government for each country. Do the advantages of this outweigh the disadvantages?**

I. Introduction (Favor Advantages)

II. Body 2: Discuss Disadvantages

- a. Discuss Disadvantages
- b. Why are NOT more important

III. Body 1: Discuss Advantages

- a. Discuss Advantage
- b. Why more important/strong
- c. Discuss Advantage
- d. Why more important/strong

Conclusion

**Unlike the UN, an elected one-world government exists beyond an advisory role and embodies final global authority in all matters. Some declare this cosmocracy inevitable, which begs whether if such an empowered international body exists, the benefits outweigh the drawbacks. This essay sets forth that far more upside exists if humanity amalgamates under one governmental roof.**

**A few potential downsides to world government exists, but not in a measure of importance more than the positives. One pitfall suggests that the wealthiest powerbrokers will control a one-world entity with an iron fist of corruption and selfishness. However, this possibility presents no difference to the current state of the world. Outside of wealth control, an additional argument rests with eliminating voting and founding global tyranny. Be that as it may, has**

**the right to vote led to improving the world's problems? No, it has not, and the reasons center on a lack of authority to act globally.**

**After dismissing the disadvantages, examining the advantages reveals overpowering favor. First, a singly authorized leadership could offer controlled disarmament of all the life-ending weapons currently held by unstable madmen. This consideration holds significant importance because human society has faced the brink of ultimate destruction from various voted-on tyrannical leaderships. Besides controlled disarmament, globalized decision-making accelerates various industries: outer space, global pandemics, environmental laws, and easing territorial disputes. The world screams across the current globally controlled social media network for these societal upgrades, and immediately sanctioning global administration pushes this agenda forward. The arguments mentioned above edge out any declaration of drawbacks, presenting a stronger position.**

**Many citizens fear a global government, but most fear change until they experience it. Remember the fears of switching from kingships to democracies, and now it's time to take the next step from scattered democracies to one-world government. The idealistic world of Star Trek is achievable if we embrace this new path.**

**Many teenagers now have their own Smartphones. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages and give your own opinion.**

**Introduction**

**Body 1: Discuss Advantages**

- a. Point out Advantages**
- b. Give Opinion on Advantages**

**Body 2: Discuss Disadvantages**

- a. Point out Disadvantages**
- b. Give Opinion Disadvantages**

**Conclusion**

Since its inception, the smartphone has revolutionized every facet of society, and none is more impactful than teenagers. However, as smartphones cheapen due to competition, most teens singularly possess one, which begs an exploration of the benefits and drawbacks of this phenomenon. Therefore, this essay will highlight teenage smartphone ownership advantages and disadvantages while supplying an opinion on each.

By and large, providing cell phones to young adults holds several gains worth discussing. At the outset, these phones greatly enhance teenage education by allowing online research, note-taking, textbooks, recorded lectures, and educational apps. Imagine that a student struggling with grammar homework could activate the Khan Academy application and receive insightful grammar lessons. Apart from education, smartphones relax parental safety concerns since these phones allow for tracking and emergency contact. Overall this paper opines that these benefits speak highly on the prospect of a minor owning a smartphone as any parent wants their child to hold every

**educational advantage. Having children of my own, the positive related to safety resonates since lack of contact would be annoying to experience.**

**On the flipside, smartphones certainly have their share of drawbacks to providing an adolescent a phone. Foremost, the average consumer believes 24-hour contact is a boon, but teenagers experience extreme stress related to maintaining a constant physical and mental appearance. As proof, recent news stories report how minors have committed suicide due to these smartphone stresses. Furthermore, notwithstanding the continual contact stress, smartphones result in teenage cyber-bullying, addiction, and limited attention span. Case in point, the average teenager spends more time on smartphone social media than any other aspect of life, which distracts from the aforementioned educational benefits. In essence, these cell phone detractions points out the need for extreme parental navigation of teenage cell phone possession. The negatives of teen ownership are downright scary when one considers potential suicide, stress, and life-threatening addiction.**

**It seems a foregone conclusion that the average teenage global citizen will count a smartphone as one of their singular possessions. However, parents and teens should consider the upsides and downsides before purchasing and monitor teenage usage for any drawbacks.**

**The government money should be invested in teaching science rather than other subjects so as to help the country make progress and develop.**

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

**Introduction (Favor Agreement)**

**Body 1: Discuss Strongly Agree**

- a. Parts of Question Agree With
- b. Explain why this why so strong
- c. Parts of Question Agree With
- d. Explain why this is so strong

**Body 2: Discuss Partial Disagree**

- a. Part of Question Disagree with
- b. Explain why this is not so strong

**Conclusion**

**Inevitably each year, governments must determine how to use their education budgets, and policymakers favor differently prioritized considerations. With an eye towards the nation's progress, one such dividing proposal would direct funds away from other school subjects and towards science. Accompanied by minor reservations related to one other course, this paper strongly supports pushing funds towards science as the best option to tackle societal development and progression.**

**The country will advance by leaps and bounds by primarily funneling money towards science over most other subject areas. Principally on a fundamental level, science deserves monetary priority since it directly enhances the basic needs of society: food, shelter, health, security, water, employment, and reproduction. As proof, agricultural food science increased crop yields to feed**

**a global society, which embodies a progression of humanity that learning language or history would fail to achieve. Notwithstanding basic needs, humanity mentally and spiritually needs entertainment, and science more than sociology or humanities accomplishes that goal. If decision-makers move to underwrite towards science, the future graduates will direct our internet, computers, music, movie, and sports industries towards heightened progress. Outside of one subject, officials should channel money away from other subjects to science.**

**Now, this essay slightly disagrees with funding science instead of philosophy since it proportionately contributes to civilizations' positive transformation. Notably, philosophy provides scientists with needed morality, ethics, conceptual clarity, and independence to safely impart their innovations to the public. The case of social media highlights this salient point since the absence of conceptual clarity towards mental health offers depraved ethical standards and decency. If governmental money falls away from less critical topics but supports philosophy equally to science, it would solve ethical and moral emptiness, which some perceive as a downfall to civilizations' forward movement. In short, science needs philosophy.**

**By and large, education officials should say goodbye to supporting subjects that marginally improve progress and development and redirect towards science. However, philosophy must hold firm as the only excepted course to this controversial decision. In the long run, the betterment of the country is at stake.**