

GRE写作讲义(四) - 习作评改3GRE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_ti2020/632/2021_2022_GRE_E5_86_99_E4_BD_9C_E8_c86_632966.htm 第二篇Attitudes Towards

Two Types of LawRules: Present your perspective on the issue below, using relevant reasons and/or examples to support your views.Topic:

"There are two types of laws: just and unjust. Every individual in a society has a responsibility to obey just laws and, even more

importantly, to disobey and resist unjust laws."两个题目究竟有什么

不同呢？上一篇文章题目是讨论非科学的精神追求对人类社会有没有帮助这一问题。因此，即使赞成应该用科学的方法来解决人类的问题，也不能完全否认非科学的精神追求对人类也是有一定帮助的。而这道题的复杂性有不同的表现方式。这道题目的复杂性在于这道题目的论述过于general，看似非常简单，但是如果不加以分析，加以qualification的话，这道题目就没法做论述了，因为这个观点是完全正确的。习作修改原稿（第一段）语言修改

In almost everyone's

opinions[1], there are two kinds of laws in our society: just and

unjust.[2] How should we take our attitudes to these two different

laws?[3] Some say that we should only obey just laws and disobey

and resist unjust laws. others say that all the individuals should obey

these two kinds of laws. In my point of view, I am in favor of the first

one attitude.In most people's opinion, there are only two types of

laws in our society: just and unjust. What kind of attitude should we

have towards these laws? Some people say that we should only obey

the just laws and ignore the rest, others say that all laws must be

obeyed. I personally agree with the first attitude.内容点评及修改这篇习作的第一段只做到了前文提到的关于首段写作三个内容方面的要求中的一个，它只是表达了自己的观点，没有做到对题目的分析；更没有给读者一些关于下文脉络的指示。这样写有点类似于结构不好的TOEFL文章的开篇，这样的文章很难在GRE写作中拿到高分。其实在写作第一段之前，应该认真分析题目，这道题目的重点在于是否要反抗那些非正义的法律。要遵守正义的法律是不需要证实的。所以应该从下面这些方面考虑并进行论述。抵抗不正义来保护那些受到委屈的人是一种道德责任。这种理想应该被延伸到抵抗非正义的法律上来。但是只有这种非正义达到一定危害程度，人们才能这样做。有一些公民能够站出来反抗不公正的法律却不颠覆社会，这也是在没有其他的办法解决问题的情况下，使社会受益的上佳选择。第一段应该开宗明义指出作者的这种观点，即反抗非正义的法律是一种道德责任。在历史上，有很多先例已经证实了这对社会是有好处的。而且这种反抗是在没有其他的选择的条件下进行的，又不颠覆整个社会。这样对原来的题目做了很多qualification和界定，读者也了解接下来作者会举哪些例子来说明这一观点。修改范例To stand against injustice and defend someone who has been wronged is generally recognized as a moral obligation. This ideal of fighting injustice should extend as far as resisting and even disobeying unjust laws, but only when the injustice is great enough to warrant it. A few brave citizens' willingness to stand against the unjust laws without upsetting the fabric of society has colored and improved many societies, and is usually recognized as beneficial when no other

options presented themselves.原稿（第二段）语言修改First, laws are the fundamentals[4] of our society, especially in the modern society, so everyone should obey the laws to maintain our society to operate properly. All the rights such as freedom, democracy, and independence and so on we now hold can only be protected by the laws. If someone does not obey the laws, he will do as much harm to himself as to our society. if everyone in our society does not obey laws, our society will be corrupted and all the people will be the hazards to others.Laws are the fundamental backbone of society, especially modern society, and everyone must obey the law to maintain social stability. The rights that we hold dear, such as freedom, democracy and independence, exist because they are protected by law. If a person breaks the law he harms both himself and society. If everyone breaks the law society will begin to break down.内容点评及修改这一段的论述完全是空洞的，全部是statements，空话，没有任何例证。而且所述内容也有明显的问题。首先，法律是社会的基础，特别是在现代社会，所以每个人都要去遵守法律，使得我们的社会能够正常运转。这里不由让人产生疑问为什么特别是在现代社会？古代社会法律就不重要吗？另外，各种各样的concepts不能包含在rights里面，有了freedom才有rights，democracy是一种政治形态，independence国家可以有独立的，个人也可以有独立的，上述这些都不在一个范畴层次，所以是不能并列的。如果有人违反法律，对自己，对他人都有害。如果社会上所有的人都不遵守法律，我们的社会就会corrupted，人人对对方都是有害的。这一部分对于个人与社会、人人与社会的关系的论述

还可以成立，但是最后所涉及的人人相互危害，有些令人不知所云。这已经是文章的第二段，这里没有必要过多地陈述论点，而是应该展开论述，举出鲜活的例证。我们不妨这样论述。人们应当对违背人类基本道德准则的法律进行和平的抵抗。有些法律对社会中某一群体的人是正义的，它们对一群人歧视、压制、剥夺权利，甚至夺走生命，这些法律是需要进行和平抵抗的。这些法律本身在道德上是不可容忍的。任何接受这样法律的人都必须违反自己的道德准则。例如在二战的时候，希特勒的极端主义要求德国人剥夺其它无罪的人的生命，很多人默默反抗，也牺牲了自己的生命。虽然这种反抗并不能改变当时的现状，但那些暗中救助犹太人的那些人在那个耻辱的时代被认为是光荣的。这样的例证不仅支持了第一段的观点，而且这样的论述也使文章内容更加丰满。 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