**Should Rich Countries Be Required to Help Poorer Nations?**

Inequality has long marked a signature on our world. While certain nations are swathed in gilt and marble, their neighbours often struggle with pangs of poverty, malnutrition, and lack of basic infrastructure. Should rich countries have an obligation to help poor ones? The answer is yes, undeniably. Developed nations have both a moral duty and a practical interest in supporting global stability.

Consider the mother in some drought-stricken village, helplessly watching her child starve, while millions of tons of food are being wasted in other, more prosperous countries. It is not an injustice but inhuman contrast between feast and famine. Poorer nations often cannot produce enough food because of historical exploitation, colonization, or economic disadvantages beyond their control. To refuse to assist is to stand upon the shore, with a lifebelt in hand, and watch another human being struggle in the water.

Beyond ethics, helping poorer nations benefits everyone. Foreign aid fosters global trade by developing new markets, allowing businesses in wealthier countries to expand. Studies show that countries receiving aid experience economic growth, which in turn increases demand for goods and services from donor nations. Furthermore, poverty breeds instability, leading to political unrest, migration crises, and even terrorism—issues that directly impact wealthy nations. By assisting struggling economies, rich nations are investing in a safer, more prosperous world.

Politically, aiding poorer nations builds diplomatic ties, fostering stability and reducing conflicts. Economically, it creates trade opportunities and boosts global markets. Socially, it promotes international cooperation and reduces resentment between nations. Technologically, it enables knowledge-sharing in crucial sectors like healthcare and agriculture. Legally, it aligns with human rights and international agreements, while environmentally, it allows for joint efforts in combating climate change, which disproportionately affects the poorest regions.

By assisting struggling economies, rich nations are investing in a safer, more prosperous world. Rich nations have the means to make a difference, and turning a blind eye to suffering is neither ethical nor practical. Global progress is only possible when no nation is left behind.

**Are Smartphones Making Us Dumber?**

The smartphone is lauded as an instrument of progress in the manner it connects us with vast sources of information at warp speed. The irony: it may actually do more damage than good to our cognitive capabilities. Overusing smartphones has been blamed for reducing attention spans, memory problems, and even decreased critical thinking.

Think of a family sitting around a table, each face staring at their screens, with almost no conversation occurring. Kids that used to be playing outside are now inside scrolling through social media, stuck in this vicious circle of digital distraction powered by dopamine. More and more are those who claim to feel anxious and restive without their phones, as if they lose control over their ability to focus on something. If smartphones really ease life, why do so many feel brain-drained after spending hours online?

Studies have been showing that excessive use of smartphones is linked to the shortening of attention spans. In 2017, researchers at the University of Texas discovered that even having a smartphone near decreases cognitive performance due to the part of one's brain that is distracted by its presence. Another study also showed that students who frequently use phones for entertainment score low on both memory and problem-solving tasks. In fact, the constant stream of fragmented information, texts, notifications, and social media updates short-circuits deep thinking. People become more reactive without much reflection.

From a political perspective, governments struggle to regulate screen addiction, as tech companies profit from user engagement. Economically, excessive phone use boosts the digital economy but reduces productivity in workplaces. Socially, smartphone dependency weakens face-to-face interactions, harming relationships. Technologically, while these devices offer knowledge, they also encourage shallow thinking. Legally, issues like digital privacy and misinformation present major challenges. Environmentally, e-waste from constant phone upgrades is a growing problem.

Smartphones are not inherently harmful, but their misuse is undeniably changing how we think, interact, and learn. To prevent cognitive decline, people must regain control over their screen habits and prioritize real-world intellectual engagement over digital distractions.

**Should School Start Later?**

Every day, teenagers around the world go to school at times when their brains are still not awake. And the research evidence, students' experiences, and educational performances all say the same thing: school should start later. It would align education with biological needs, improve academic performance, and maintain good mental health and overall well-being.

Imagine a student, eyes heavy with exhaustion, sitting in a classroom, struggling to stay awake during an early-morning lesson. Where the body seeks rest, the schedule of school would not allow it. Students all over the world are made to wake up as early as 5:00 AM every morning, where they get only about 5-6 hours of sleep. Severe sleep deprivation results in stress, mood swings, and de-motivation. How are we to expect good scores out of a student when his basic needs are being deprived?

Biological studies confirm that teenagers have a different rhythm of sleep compared with adults: their organism produces the sleep hormone, melatonin, later in night hours, which makes early wake-ups unnatural for them. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, teenagers need 8 to 10 hours of sleep, while they actually get only 6 to 7 hours because of school schedule issues. Schools that shifted to later start times reported a 30% increase in student focus, a 25% improvement in grades, and a 45% reduction in mental health issues. Clearly, early school start times contradict science.

Politically, changing school start times requires policy adjustments but has public support. Economically, better-rested students perform better, contributing to a stronger future workforce. Socially, reduced stress leads to healthier students with improved relationships. Technologically, digital devices contribute to sleep problems, making later school times even more necessary. Legally, child health rights could be used to advocate for schedule reforms. Environmentally, later start times reduce morning traffic congestion, lowering carbon emissions.

Education should be about maximizing learning, not forcing students into schedules that work against their biology. A later start time would not only benefit students academically but also enhance their mental and physical health. Schools should prioritize science over outdated traditions and ensure that students are given the rest they need to thrive.