

最完整的新题总结GMAT作文考试新题大公开（二）GMAT  
考试 PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

[https://www.100test.com/kao\\_ti2020/570/2021\\_2022\\_\\_E6\\_9C\\_80\\_E5\\_AE\\_8C\\_E6\\_95\\_B4\\_E7\\_c89\\_570581.htm](https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/570/2021_2022__E6_9C_80_E5_AE_8C_E6_95_B4_E7_c89_570581.htm) 自2006年ACT接

手GMAT出题以来，一直都很低调，延续ETS出题风格，沿用原来的可用题库和出题方式，直到自己有实力去全面控制局面。2年过去了，其他部分目前毫无动静，唯独作文部分，出现了小小的尝试。2007年初ACT在北美花钱请人测试作文题目，暗下决心要啃下这块骨头，本人也参与了那次测试。之后在2007年末，ACT悄悄地在所有考生中随机加入这几道题目（以目前情况来看，100个考生中大约只有5-8个人会遇到新题）以磨练自己的评分人员和评分程序。既然如此

，GMAT作文有题库而且必须按照题库出题的思路（ETS时代任何新题都必须先公布一段时间才能真正进入考试）已经被ACT赤裸裸地打破，所以所有考生都应该对考(试大这些新题有很好的了解。在这里，我们对其中一道令大家颇为头痛的Issue题给出一篇非常适合模仿的北美范文。 NT2. "People have a duty to disobey laws that they consider unjust." Discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the opinion stated above. Support your views with reasons and/or examples from your own experience, observations, or reading. 人们有义务不遵守那些他们认为不公正的法律。由于此题考的话题是法律，恰恰是中国同学（即使是法律系的学生）都不太能应对的抽象话题，所以在考场上颇为费力，以下给出一篇分析深刻（把事物本身和人们对事物的perception分开），思路严谨（论证有论据有解释有例外有保留），内容充实（两个主层次，之下才是论

证) , 语言自然 ( 善用长句和正式词汇 , 但稍有一点晦涩味道 ) 的考(试大范文。 范文 : According to this statement, each person has a duty to not only obey just laws but also disobey unjust ones. In my view this statement is too extreme, in two respects. First, it wrongly categorizes any law as either just or unjust. and secondly, it recommends an ineffective and potentially harmful means of legal reform. First, whether a law is just or unjust is rarely a straightforward issue. The fairness of any law depends on ones personal value system. This is especially true when it comes to personal freedoms. Consider, for example, the controversial issue of abortion. Individuals with particular religious beliefs tend to view laws allowing mothers an abortion choice as unjust, while individuals with other value systems might view such laws as just. The fairness of a law also depends on ones personal interest, or stake, in the legal issue at hand. After all, in a democratic society the chief function of laws is to strike a balance among competing interests. Consider, for example, a law that regulates the toxic effluents a certain factory can emit into a nearby river. Such laws are designed chiefly to protect public health. But complying with the regulation might be costly for the company. the factory might be forced to lay off employees or shut down altogether, or increase the price of its products to compensate for the cost of compliance. At stake are the respective interests of the companys owners, employees, and customers, as well as the opposing interests of the regions residents whose health and safety are impacted. In short, the fairness of the law is subjective, depending largely on how ones personal interests are affected by it. The second fundamental

problem with the statement is that disobeying unjust laws often has the opposite affect of what was intended or hoped for. Most anyone would argue, for instance, that our federal system of income taxation is unfair in one respect or another. Yet the end result of widespread disobedience, in this case tax evasion, is to perpetuate the system. Free-riders only compel the government to maintain tax rates at high levels in order to ensure adequate revenue for the various programs in its budget. Yet another fundamental problem with the statement is that by justifying a violation of one sort of law we find ourselves on a slippery slope toward sanctioning all types of illegal behavior, including egregious criminal conduct. Returning to the abortion example mentioned above, a person strongly opposed to the freedom-of-choice position might maintain that the illegal blocking of access to an abortion clinic amounts to justifiable disobedience. However, it is a precariously short leap from this sort of civil disobedience to physical confrontations with clinic workers, then to the infliction of property damage, then to the bombing of the clinic and potential murder. In sum, because the inherent function of our laws is to balance competing interests, reasonable people with different priorities will always disagree about the fairness of specific laws. Accordingly, radical action such as resistance or disobedience is rarely justified merely by ones subjective viewpoint or personal interests. And in any event, disobedience is never justifiable when the legal rights or safety of innocent people are jeopardized as a result.

(536 words) 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)