

Modern societies need specialists in certain fields, but not in others.

Some people, therefore, think that governments should pay university fees for students who study subjects that are needed by society. Those who choose to study less relevant subjects should not receive government funding.

Would the advantage of such an educational policy outweigh the disadvantages?

All subjects that ~~are practised-taught~~ in ~~the~~ education system fundamentally ~~had are been~~ required and ~~What I am saying is that~~ the reason for creating them ~~had-has been been~~ the existence of demand, so I certainly do not think that less relevant is the reverse of being needed. Society should provide its members with the state university in all fields, but ~~/albeit with-by~~ imposing reasonable entrance filters such as related exams or an average of high school scores.

The first and more important element is one's interest and talent. Eliminating funds for some majors not only is a serious constraint for those who have financial limitation ~~not-but~~ also it causes misleading by placing financial incentives on some fields and leads to wrong ~~chooses-choices~~ by students. It is a real fact that just working with pleasure that enables humankind to sacrifice and leads to significant success.

Another argument in its favour is that society just may not see the direct impact of a group of subject matters such as art. While we can consider ~~are-art as~~ a spiritual need that in ~~the~~ today's society is of great sensibility and here is no denying that many physical problems ~~are rooted~~ in emotional problems, in my opinion, it is ~~an~~ undeniable fact that all majors act as a chain and rely on each other.

On balance, I see all majors as a need; either spiritual~~ly~~ or physical~~ly~~. It is better to find another way or policy to attract students to more crucial majors than cutting funds. For example, allocating a higher salary in future can be an effective one.