***Would you work if you didn’t need the money?*** ***If not, what would you do?***

Well, I’m not sure about this. Maybe yes, and maybe no. But, most likely, no. I think that the man, who earned enough money to rest all the residuary life (*or the rest of life*) , can allow himself to do what he really wants to do. I dislike working very much. That’s because I don’t like doing everything related with necessity to me to do something I don’t agree with. The absolute majority of jobs cannot be imagined without such a necessity. So I’d like to earn much money, buy a good and modern house not far away from the city and leave the work. What would I do? Again, I’m not absolutely sure. Possibly I’d read classical and modern literature, visit interesting exhibitions, travel in this country and abroad, work in Internet and so on. There are a lot of intriguing activities which are possible for those who have much free time and much money to spend (waste).

***Imagine that you are allowed to have only 3 electrical things. What would you choose?***

If I could only have three things that worked by electricity, I’d choose a computer, an electrical cooker and a TV-set. Why would I choose exactly these things? Because modern life, the life in the beginning of the 3rd millennium, cannot be imagined without above-named electrical appliances. A computer, if it has an Internet access, of course, is the best way to communicate with people in this country and abroad. New methods of electronic connections allow us to get info about events worldwide, to write a letter to a friend, to buy any goods without standing up from your chair and many other intriguing activities. So a computer is really necessary device with a lot of possibilities. My second choice, an electrical cooker, is also obligatory just because each man should eat some food each day and restaurants or canteens are usually rather expensive. My last option is a TV-set which is one of the best and, without doubt, the cheapest way to rest and to get operative news and information.

***Describe any situation when quick-thinking was very important***

That was about 5 months ago, in the beginning of 1999. That time I had my first university session and it wasn’t very easy period for me. I wasn’t ready to the exams and only hoped for luck. The History of State and Law of Foreign Countries, which is one of the most difficult subjects, was our 3rd exam, but nevertheless I wasn’t able to prepare to it good enough. To get 4 or 5 it was necessary to know texts of Laws and Constitutions perfectly while I didn’t know them at all. My examination question concerned the Constitution of the 3rd Republic in France. Absolutely not knowing the text, I attempted to dispute about some aspects of the Constitution with our teacher Timur Petrovich. In the heat of the fight he took the chrestomathy, opened the text and said me to read it – just the thing I planned. After reading the text, I acknowledged my defeat, but, of course, there was no any problem to answer the rest of question excellently. As a result, I got 5.

***Statement of Claim***

Fortunately, I’ve never bought faulty things in shops. Therefore, I have nothing to tell you about. But I want to remind you about a well-known and specifically Russian problem. That is so called ‘law nihilism’. It is expressed in the distrust of the population to the basic principles of Law. That means, for example, that Russian people wouldn’t go to the court if they have some claims to the shop or manufacturer because they don’t believe that court could solve their problems, that it can help people in many different ways. Russians suppose often that Law has been created to protect the interests of the state or judicial persons, but not their own rights. In the situation when any American goes to the court or addresses to other officials practically all Russians wouldn’t do anything. Even an assumption of the possibility of court hearings causes negative emotional reaction in Russia. That’s one of the most significant obstacles in the process of developing modern market economy in this country as well as a major judicial problem.

***What is your choice: stability or risk? Would you join perspective, but risky company or leave at your old job?***

Establishing a new company is a considerable risk even in the developed countries like the United States or Great Britain. Founders can get great profits or get into even greater debts. I think that you should think if she really needs money or, may be, a quiet and stable life is more important for her. Analysing both variants you should take into account the situation with your family and children – if you are able to provide them with all necessary things and, which is often more important, with parent’s care and love. You shouldn’t forget also about your present job – maybe there’s the perspective of promotion and (or) the rise of wages. From other point of view, old Russian aphorism says: ‘The person who doesn’t risk, doesn’t drink champagne’ (i.e. no risk, no profits).

After all, any decision will be right if it is well thought-out and motivated.

***How much should children respect their parents’ religious beliefs?***

The religion has been and is an integral part of our life. Independently of our wishes, it’s one of the most significant institutions of the society and for many people it’s something sacred, something that is prohibited to intervene in, something that cannot be disturbed. On the other hand, present-day laws provide absolute religious freedom, including the possibility of being an atheist. So, there’s a contradiction between the basics of religion and the statements of laws.

A universal solution of this problem isn’t possible, I can only propose that anyone who faces it should analyze what is more important for him/her – the parents beliefs or his/her own life. In any case you shouldn’t forget that insulting human’s beliefs – religious or not – wouldn’t result in anything positive. Only calm and open-hearted discussion would help you to find a right decision.