***Topic****: The following is an excerpt from a memo written by the head of a governmental department:*

*"Neither stronger ethics regulations nor stronger enforcement mechanisms are necessary to ensure ethical behavior by companies doing business with this department. We already have a code of ethics that companies doing business with this department are urged to abide by, and virtually all of these companies have agreed to follow it. We also know that the code is relevant to the current business environment because it was approved within the last year, and in direct response to specific violations committed by companies with which we were then working—not in abstract anticipation of potential violations, as so many such codes are."*

*Discuss how well reasoned ... etc.*

**In this argument, the author believes that** there is no need to set stronger ethics regulations or stronger mechanisms for companies. **To substantiate this conclusion, the author** trusts in companies abiding by the code of ethics and considers the code set last year to be still relevant. **While at first glance the author’s argument appears convincing, a careful examination would reveal how groundless it is.**

**First, the author** holds a strong trusts in companies. He hastily thinks that the companies will follow the code of ethics as they agree to do so. That trust can be a good thing in regard of building a closer cooperation between each other, it can also give a strong strike to the government once the trust is torn down due to a lack of strong enforcement mechanism. Companies have to agree to follow the code in order to be legally registered. This can be just a formality work for some of them. To make an analogy, humans all vow to agree to the law. Still, crimes are conduct by some people somewhere in the world, while strong punishment is exerted by the law. No one could imagine a world without the enforcement of law. **If no ethical regulations were forced on companies, it would be unrealistic to believe that they would follow the code strictly.**

**Second, the author believes that** the code is still relevant to the current business environment, provided that it was approved last year. T**here is no direct correlation** between the previous and this year’s situation, at least we cannot infer any given the information provided here. Far too often, as we all witnessed the fast developing pace of the society, new business models emerge every year, leading to a more dynamic and versatile business environments. It is more reasonable to revise the code in order to adapt to the new situation. **Without any further information on the trend of business environments, we could hardly be convinced that the previous code may still apply to this year.**

**In conclusion, the argument is not sound or persuasive as it stands. Accordingly, it is hasty for the government to jump to the conclusion** that neither stronger regulations nor enforcement mechanisms should put forward, only by unilaterally holding trust in companies**. If the issues illustrated above were to be discussed and analyzed further in details, the argument would have been more thorough and convincing.**