

GMAT考试写作例文224篇连载(四一) PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

[https://www.100test.com/kao\\_ti2020/127/2021\\_2022\\_GMAT\\_E8\\_80\\_83\\_E8\\_AF\\_95\\_c89\\_127100.htm](https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/127/2021_2022_GMAT_E8_80_83_E8_AF_95_c89_127100.htm) 41. The following appeared as part of an article in a trade publication. “ Stronger laws are needed to protect new kinds of home-security systems from being copied and sold by imitators. With such protection, manufacturers will naturally invest in the development of new home-security products and production technologies. Without stronger laws, therefore, manufacturers will cut back on investment. From this will follow a corresponding decline not only in product quality and marketability, but also in production efficiency, and thus ultimately a loss of manufacturing jobs in the industry. ” Discuss how well reasoned... etc. The author of this article warns that stronger laws are needed to protect new kinds of home security systems from being copied and sold by imitators in order to prevent an eventual loss of manufacturing jobs within the industry. This conclusion is based on the following chain of reasoning: With the protection of stronger laws, manufacturers will naturally invest in the development of new home security products and production technologies, whereas without such protection, manufacturers will cut back on investment. If manufacturers cut back on investment, then a decline in product quality and marketability, as well as in production efficiency, will result. This, in turn, will cause the predicted loss of industry jobs. This line of reasoning is unconvincing for several reasons. To begin with, the author assumes that existing copyright, patent and trade

secret laws are inadequate to protect home security system design. But the author never explains why these laws don't offer sufficient protection, nor does he offer any evidence to show that this is the case. Secondly, the argument depends on the twin assumptions that stronger legal protection will encourage manufacturers to invest in home security-system production, while the absence of strong legal protection will have the opposite effect. The author fails to provide any evidence or reasons for accepting these assumptions about cause-and-effect connections between the law and what happens in the marketplace. Moreover, both of these assumptions can be challenged. It is possible that stronger protections would not greatly affect industry investment or jobs overall, but would instead help to determine which companies invested heavily and, therefore, provided the jobs. For instance, a less-restricted market might foster investment and competition among smaller companies, whereas stronger legal protections might encourage market domination by fewer, larger companies. In conclusion, I do not find this argument compelling. The author must provide evidence that home security system designs are not being adequately protected by current patent, copyright or trade secret laws. The author must also provide an argument for the assumptions that stronger laws will create more industry jobs overall, while the absence of stronger laws will result in fewer industry jobs.

100Test 下载频道开通，各类考试题目直接下载。详细请访问 [www.100test.com](http://www.100test.com)