TAKING SIDES 立场

CLASHING VIEWS IN

URBAN STUDIES

（美）**Myron A. Levine** 编

辩证思维训练 场 城市研究篇

外语教学与研究出版社
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

TAKING SIDES 立场

场

CLASHING VIEWS IN

URBAN
STUDIES

（美） Myron A. Levine 编

城市研究篇

Editors/Academic Advisory Board

Members of the Academic Advisory Board are instrumental in the final selection of articles for each edition of TAKING SIDES. Their review of articles for content, level, and appropriateness provides critical direction to the editors and staff. We think that you will find their careful consideration well reflected in this volume.

TAKING SIDES: Clashing Views in URBAN STUDIES

EDITOR

Myron A. Levine
Wright State University

Naphtali Hoffman
Elmira College

Joyce E. Howland
SUNY Empire State College

Demetrius Iatridis
Boston College

A. J. Jacobs
East Carolina University

Jack Kleinhenz
Case Western Reserve University

Marilyn Klotz
SUNY-Geneseo

Andrew Kozak
St. Mary's College of Maryland

Jeffrey Kraus
Wagner College

Bun Song Lee
Northwestern State University

Tom Lehman
Indiana Wesleyan University

Charles Leonard
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Lori Lynch
University of Maryland

Joseli Macedo
University of Florida

Joseph Marbach
La Salle University

Isaac Megbolugbe
Johns Hopkins University

David Mitchell
Missouri State University

Vince Montes
LaGuardia Community College

Ismaila Odogba
University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point

Van Pham
Salem State University

Gordana Rabrenovic
Northeastern University

Michael Ransom
Brigham Young University

Naomi Robertson
Macon State College

Deanna Schmidt
University of Houston, Clear Lake

Barbara A. Sherry
Northeastern Illinois University

Dick Simpson
University of Illinois at Chicago

Dorinda Smith
Lorain County Community College

J. Steven Smith
Martin University

Cynthia Stavrianos
Gonzaga University

Mary Stevenson
University of Massachusetts, Boston

Timothy Sullivan
Towson University

James Vanderleeuw
Lamar University

Hiroki Watanabe
Washington University, St. Louis

Linda F. Whitmer
Hope International University

Mohamed Yamba
California University of Pennsylvania

Melinda York
University of Southern Indiana

Ulf Zimmermann
Kennesaw State University

英语思辨，攻错他山

朱绩崧

学界奉为圭臬的《牛津英语大词典》（*The Oxford English Dictionary*）在side (n.)[1]条目的18.a.义项里，把18.b.所收词组 "to take a (or one's) side, take sides. Also to hold side (with one)" 里的side解释为[t]he position or interests of one person, party, etc., in contrast to that of an opposing one，个人立场相反、党派利益对立之意，了然无疑。

惜我愚钝，近年才明白，take sides不仅仅是英语词典里的一个词组，甚至可说是英国议会制度的根本；而议会制度，实在是英国对人类文明进步最大的贡献之一：通过take sides，把思辨，而非独断专行，尊奉为国事决策那不可撼动的核心机制。我们不会忘记，电影《铁娘子》（*The Iron Lady*）里梅里尔·斯特里普（Meryl Streep）新学一口英国腔就来西敏宫滔滔激辩的场景，那不是骂街，虽然嘘声迭起，那是两股思想在龙争虎斗，最终推进历史。

谈到西方好争论、善思辨的传统，古希腊已臻化境，垂范千古。但这并不意味着我国真如某些评论家所言，为定于一尊的儒学所戕害，使得读书人唯服从传承是务，从不挑战权威。

《古文观止》读到最后几卷，便会看到编注者吴楚材、吴调侯叔侄鼓励读者对古时定论大胆质疑的用心。如建文忠臣方孝孺的名篇《豫让论》，标新立异，一反古说，直指春秋时代为主雪仇的刺客豫让"不能扶危于未乱，而捐躯于既败者"，不配"国士"之誉。

甚至，在我们历史课本一向蔑之为"埋头故纸"、"皓首穷经"的乾嘉学派里，多数学者的考据也都具有很高的思辨性。从王念孙的《读书杂志》、刘宝楠的《论语正义》，到戴震"由字义以明经义"的治学方法和段玉裁《东原先生年谱》所载的戴氏札记——"仆生平著述最大者为《孟子字义疏证》一书，此正人心之要。今人无论正邪，尽以意见误名之曰理，而祸斯民，故《疏证》不得不作"——从文本到现实，立场鲜明，无不指向对真理的上下求索。

读书为求真。这句话，是儿时由老师灌输给我的，我不曾怀疑过。可也正是老师告诉我"乾嘉学派在历史上的作用是反动的"、"高考答题时，如遇到岳飞，不能勾选为民族英雄，他打的仗是人民内部矛盾"等等当年不容我怀疑辩驳的"事实"。

往事固不可追，令我大失所望的却是"寓教于乐"、"反对应试教育"了不知凡几年，中小学生竟在变本加厉地背记历史、语文的"标准答案"，到了

易只字则为错的地步。有人甚至把中小学生语文水平的普遍降低归咎于英语课太多，视母语、外语修习为零和博弈，全然不去审视、拷问、批判当下严重阻碍思辨与创造的文科教育体制本身。试问这样的教育，又如何能培养出活泼泼的人来？如何能引导他们求真？

求真，真真何其不易也。有时，权威发声，莫敢深究。有时，缺乏条件，无从寻觅。信息爆炸、思路开阔的今天，更多情况下是众说纷纭，莫衷一是，乃至有时在"是"与"非"这两者之间，都不知何从矣。

而相对综合型、重意合（parataxis）的汉语，英语是分析型语言，重形合（hypotaxis），语法规则更明确，对指代、性数格一致等形式要求更高，且有强烈的时态观。不能不说，这在很大程度上避免了汉语常见的因文害意：把一些站不住脚的歪理，用华丽辞藻一包装，就算是"美文佳构"了。（这方面，韩愈的个别名作，如为名教张目的《原道》，可算反面教材，远逊柳宗元的《驳复仇议》。后者的论理，简朴而流畅，本质上与今天英美法院经典判词如出一辙，堪称我国古代taking sides的典范。）加之英美学者好辩的传统在当代通过课堂教育、学术论文等形式得以强化，思辨的局面委实优于我国。

我素为古罗马倾倒，曾读国人编著的几种罗马史，又看了英国剑桥大学克里斯托弗·凯利（Christopher Kelly）教授写的《罗马帝国简史》（*The Roman Empire: A Very Short Introduction*），后者末章呈现的学者思辨生动别致，过目难忘，非我国传统重介绍"史实"的史书可比：20世纪初，英国历史学家、律师、自由党政治家詹姆斯·布赖斯（James Bryce）认为罗马帝国与大英帝国非常相似，都能维持高水平的内部和平与秩序，民人深谙工程技术，勇猛活跃，不畏困苦；牛津古代史教授弗朗西斯·哈弗菲尔德（Francis Haverfield）进一步说明，罗马帝国的成功，在于把行省居民同化为一个秩序井然、富有凝聚力的文明；曾奉职印度的英国古典学会会长埃弗林·巴林（Evelyn Baring）持不同看法，在"同化"问题上，大英帝国与罗马帝国有不可弥合的区别，单论印度语言、宗教、种族的多样性，就和罗马人征服的任何地区不同；哈弗菲尔德不同意巴林，认为英国之所以有印度问题，是因为征服印度时，印度已经发展成发达社会，文明形态稳固；牛津的古代史专家、考古学家D. G. 霍加斯（D. G. Hogarth）也反对巴林，认为罗马帝国有三个阶段，即"尚未同化"、"有意同化"、"积极同化"，大英帝国对印度犹处"尚未同化"的第一阶段。

把学者taking sides过程中的各种观点陈列出来，供读者思辨，是我国各阶段教材的短板。同时，也应注意，为提高我国学生的思辨水平以及英语能力，taking sides的内容不宜学科专业化程度过高（上述关于罗马帝国与

大英帝国的争辩即有此虞），还是具有一定社会影响力、为民众熟知的话题更宜为组织教材的出发点。

美国著名的*Taking Sides*丛书，其宗旨正在于满足成长中的思考者兼英语学习者的需要。这套书系，诞生于20世纪80年代，迄今出版52种专题分册，多数一版再版，其中传媒凡12版，经济、环境达15版，社会、教育更已有17版之多。畅销程度，不劳赘言。

从题材看，外研社首批择取的七册分别覆盖了社会、教育、经济、环境、科技、大众传媒与全球性问题，无一不是当下公众话题的焦点。但呈现的手法却很"单一"，即先提出问题，再摆出正反双方最典型、最具说服力的论证，最后引导读者作进一步的阅读与思考：

> 问：计算机对学生成长是否有副作用？
> 正：有。学校对电脑技术的迷信与滥用，导致学生心智发育与创
> 　　造力受损。
> 反：无。如对电脑善加利用，能促进教学革新，从而使学生获益。
> 后记："学校"或许正在由"地点"转变为"概念"，随着计算
> 　　机技术的进步，许多教育手段都不必在课堂实施，但随之
> 　　而来有许多新问题，需要探讨。多媒体能让学生与更多的
> 　　信息产生互动，但往往也减少了学生与学生、学生与所在
> 　　环境之间的互动。相关研究请见……（扩展阅读涉及三十
> 　　余处学术资源）
>
> 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　（《教育篇》第10话题）

目录并不冗长，但当读者学完全书，必会惊喜地发现，自己在这一领域的知识结构已搭建得初具规模。摆在面前的问题往往庞大空疏，报章常见，迄无公断。从这个角度思考，有这样的道理可知；从那个方面切入，有那样的结论可得。读者的任务，就是跟着两派的思路各走一遍，最终判定哪派有理。当然，结果也可能是两派皆不尽善，或者需要修正调和之后才能获得正解。但无论如何，这一过程本身，实在是智力上的一次奥德修斯式的旅行（an intellectual odyssey）。

之所以要用荷马史诗的隐喻，是因为读*Taking Sides*与看街边吵架或中学生议论文最根本的差别，就是需要调用的思想、学术资源极多。以《社会篇》第8话题为例，菲利普·迪瓦恩（Philip E. Devine）在得出"酷刑不可保留"的结论之前，将自由主义政治学、康德学说、功利主义、自然法等一一引出，要言不烦。对迪瓦恩这位哲学学者而言，这些理论或许早已熟烂于胸。

但对一般读者而言，为了确证作者没有断章取义，至少得就上述内容再读通几本导论、简介之类的书。顺便一提，酷刑当否的问题，我在近年畅销的一部法律通俗读物《法治》（*The Rule of Law*）论恐怖主义的一章中，也曾读到评论。作者、已故英国前首席大法官汤姆·宾厄姆（Tom Bingham）反对向恐怖主义犯罪嫌疑人施以酷刑的理由本质上与孔子的"己所不欲，勿施于人"无异，认为这是对法治原则的破坏。与迪瓦恩相较，其说直指人心，唯于学理微缺然。

事实上，*Taking Sides*书系所选文章，无论篇幅修短，莫不观点鲜明，针锋相对，而每一方都有强大的理据支撑，乍看难以撼动。由此，我们也不得不感叹，人类文明在今天呈现出的多样性，自有其道理，无论是同一文明内还是不同文明间发生的碰撞冲突，其背后都有复杂的理性动因，绝非皂白可以分明，需要我们全面观察、深度分析，最终选定立场。

我出身英文系，工作后常应媒体之邀，写些时事评论。落笔之前，现已养成习惯，会去新浪微博、知乎、Quora等网站，浏览各方的理性评论，在争议极大的问题上，熟悉*Taking Sides*封面上印的那两个词：Clashing Views（对立观点）。这是我在"后大学"时期补上的一堂课。

回想本科求学时，这方面所受教育几乎为零。教育的重点是背同义词、反义词与词形变化。文章，读通便好，却读不透，因为读通之后，总觉所言有理，不会想着去倾听"不同的声音"。这个弊端，到写毕业论文时曝露无遗：说明文还凑合，议论文就写不好了。名虽论文，连核心的论点都渺不可寻。这几年，本专业内，我还常常看到号称博士论文的研究综述，或者连文献回顾都没有的论文。

为了矫正这一通病，不少学校从编教材上下功夫，课文引入争议性话题，意在以此激发学生的critical thinking——"批判性思维"遂成高校英语教师培训班极为青睐的广告亮点。可惜，在我有限的学术视野内，能一变风气的作品，尚阙如焉。我看到过浅尝辄止者，其内一篇课文，取自美国某小报，讲一对夫妻人工受孕后离婚，胚胎留在医院冰箱里，不知如何处置，遂对簿公堂。最终，作者只是提出问题，没能向学生指出解决的途径。如果有至少两种具备一定思想深度与差异性的观点呈现在教材里，附上扩展研读的书目、提要，教育的效果定会面目一新，我们也会真正地开始在语言教育中培养思想者，而不只是机械的记忆者、复制者。这一任务，如前所示，*Taking Sides*完全胜任。

我乐于推荐该书系作精读教材的另一项理由在于语言质量。就量而言，目前的精读课（Intensive Reading），阅读量普遍过低，一两千词的文章，一读就是十天半月，课程设计者不明白唯有大数量与短时间的结合，方成就

intensive之效。与此相比，以本书系一卷之量，读一学期，日均1500词左右，恰到好处。以质而论，本书系符合我的外语习得理念：中高阶学生，应以非虚构作品（non-fiction）为"主食"。例如，本书系中有大量美国国会证言（congressional testimony），思维严谨，语言地道，学习西方法律、外交以及高等翻译等专业的学生如能熟读成诵，其英语学习的眼界势必更上层楼。从实用的角度看，有理、有力、有节的明快文风才是日常工作、生活所需，是语言的"常态"；文学作品中因作者意图而创造出的丰富表达，只是语言的"变态"。由常入变，初地坚固，发展空间亦大。反是，恐事倍功半。

至于"泛读"，也有一个基于Taking Sides的策略可行：各个话题牵涉到的著作，一学期可读上三五本。如读《环境篇》，可辅读雷切尔·卡森（Rachel Carson）的《寂静的春天》（Silent Spring）；读《科技与社会篇》，可辅读阿道司·赫胥黎（Aldous Huxley）的《美丽新世界》（Brave New World）。此时，不妨多些文学作品，加深对"精读"义理的体悟思辨，可全"文以载道"之功。

此外，Taking Sides对如今各高校流行的英语辩论也有直接的指导作用，无论其辩题还是论据，都可在模拟阶段直接取用。我更相信，认真研读过本书系的学生，其论文一定不会沦为简介、综述，不会抄袭维基、百度，因为他们掌握了论文写作的核心技术：如何灵巧运用事实与逻辑来作严肃的学术之论，而非执着于印象、习惯、偏见的意气之争。

总之，希望Taking Sides书系的引进，能综合我国英语学生的语言习得与思维训练，既提升交流的效率，更开启求真的法门，在乱云飞渡的当今时代，帮助读者迅速达成思想之质与辞藻之文的兼美共谐。

Preface

Urban affairs deals with important issues and policy questions. It is at the local level—at the regional, city, and even at the street level—that government decisions concerning law enforcement, schooling, housing, transportation, land use, and the environment, have the greatest impact on people's lives.

Major urban problems, however, are not easily solved. Some of the most serious urban problems—like poverty, crime, and students dropping out from school—are seen as "wicked" as they yield no easy, workable, and just answers. Simply put, we do not know how to solve these intricate social problems.

Attempts to solve urban problems also entail serious tradeoffs. Simply put, we can improve some aspects of urban society only by worsening problems elsewhere. The gentrification or renaissance of inner-city neighborhoods may help a city economically, but only by displacing poorer residents from their homes to accommodate the new development. Deporting illegal immigrants to their home countries may reduce the service costs that immigration imposes on cities and states; but the exclusion of immigrants will also deny cities the labor, talents, and entrepreneurial talents of the new arrivals. The expulsion of immigrants also means that newcomers will not be able to repopulate inner-city neighborhoods, breathing new life into areas suffering severe decline and abandonment. Increased "school choice" may enable some students to find a new school more responsive to their needs; but such a policy may also shrink the resources provided to a city's regular schools, diminishing the quality of education provided to students who are not reached by choice programs.

As the above examples underscore, urban policy questions often entail quite difficult tradeoffs. A policy that works well and helps to solve problems from one perspective may be a "loser" when judged from another perspective. No policy is perfect and can do all things well. This

is why urban policies are the subject of contentious debate. A policy that helps to achieve certain goals will be opposed by citizens committed to competing values.

Taking Sides: Clashing Views in Urban Studies does not give students *the* answer to any issue. It does not tell the student just what is the best policy solution. Instead, *Taking Sides* provides important background information on an issue and then presents the reader with conflicting points of view that are well-argued. Students are encouraged to "open their minds" to competing perspectives on an issue and to search for additional information (especially by referring to the list of sources and websites that accompany each issue in the book). The student will then evaluate the information gathered to formulate and defend his or her own position.

Taking Sides draws on a variety of sources: books, newspaper articles, academic journal articles, testimony before Congress and the state legislatures, reports issued by "think tanks," and advocacy pieces written by policy intellectuals and issue activists. As editor, I sought the inclusion of insightful articles that could engage students. I did not include more statically based analyses that would enmesh the reader in a sea of data, bogging down the student in the intricacies of methodological discussions and arcane debates of the proper operationalization of variables and the relative merits of alternative data collection instruments and measurement techniques. *Taking Sides* is meant to be a readable book, not a statistical tome. Data-based studies, the application of advanced statistical techniques, and the debate over proper methodology *are* indeed quite relevant to the discussion of urban policy, and such studies help to inform the advanced student in the field. But such a statistics-based discussion lies beyond the realm of the present volume.

Each chapter in *Taking Sides* is structured around a pair of articles that reveal a clash of perspectives on important urban problems. However, no single article or pair of articles can cover all important facets of a debate. Also, some of the articles were written for an audience that already has a fair familiarity with the topic that is being debated and may use terminology and refer to concepts that are not readily understood by

nonspecialist citizens. As a result, *Taking Sides* provides an *Issue Summary* that introduces each set of paired YES-NO articles. The reader will find these introductions quite useful, as they will help the reader understand the contending points of view that follow. Each *Issue Summary* also contains important points of view and information that are not revealed—or are reviewed way too quickly—in the featured articles. A list of *Learning Outcomes* further helps the reader to focus on just what he or she should "take away" from the issue debate.

In each chapter, an *Exploring the Issue* section follows the featured articles. Questions for *Critical Thinking and Reflection* seek to have the reader probe and evaluate the contending points of view and decide just which have more merit than others. Most importantly, just what does the informed reader believe is the "right" answer? The *Critical Thinking and Reflection* sections force the reader to take a position on an issue and to organize information to defend that position and rebut critics.

Is There Common Ground? is a section written specifically to encourage creative critical thinking. Too often, debate-style presentation of an issue encourages students to think in terms of polar extremes. Critical thinking, of course, entails more than that. A student may discover that there is always another position: something in the middle. *Is There Common Ground?* leads students to ask if there are possible middle-ground solutions that can meet the needs of many—if not quite all—of the parties in a debate. This section embraces a community-building approach to leadership that rejects the more simplistic conceptualization of politics only as combat, with each side fighting for its point of view while giving little concern to the perspectives voiced by opponents. In place of oppositional combat, the *Common Ground* sections seek to uncover the possibilities for collaborative action, for finding "win-win" and principled solutions even amid seeming dissensus. Can students discover creative solutions and compromises that give each side something useful, something with which each side can live?

Each chapter concludes with a list of *Additional Resources* that the student can use to find more in-depth information on an issue. A list of

some of the more important scholarly writings in the field accompanies each set of articles. A fairly long list of *Internet References* steers the engaged student and activist to some of the more important and useful websites. When used properly, the Web can be a valuable asset that allows students to quickly aggregate intelligent arguments and quality information from a variety of perspectives—although the critical user must be aware of the possible biases and incompleteness of any single article gathered from the Web. The Internet researcher must be especially aware of the biases contained in the information presented by the more "interested" or partisan advocacy websites.

My thanks go to Jack Dustin, the Chair of the Urban Affairs and Geography department at Wright State University for his continued support of this writing project and for his commitment to teaching and public service. I owe Larry Loeppke at McGraw-Hill Higher Education my gratitude for his belief in the promise of this book. Jill Meloy and Debra Henricks at MHHE were amazingly helpful in steering this volume to completion. I thank them for their gentle advice and patience.

Most of all, my thanks and love go to Nancy for her extensive support, wisdom, sacrifice, and love that have sustained me over the years in my teaching and writing.

Topic Guide

This topic guide suggests how the selections in this book relate to the subjects covered in your course.

All the issues that relate to each topic are listed below the bold-faced term.

Comparative Urban Policy

6. Should U.S. Cities Adopt a System of "Congestion Pricing" to "Tame" Traffic?
7. Should the United States Invest in High-Speed Intercity Rail?

Crime and Policing

4. Does Broken-Windows Policing Reduce Crime?

Economic Development

2. Should State Governments Impose Strong Limitations on the Ability of Cities to Use Eminent Domain Powers for Economic Development Purposes?
3. Should Cities Rely on Tax Increment Financing (TIF) as a Primary Tool in Their Efforts to Promote Local Economic Development?

Environment, "Green" Policy, and Sustainability

6. Should U.S. Cities Adopt a System of "Congestion Pricing" to "Tame" Traffic?
8. Is Urban Sprawl a Sufficiently Important Problem to Merit Government Corrective Action?
9. Do Portland-Style Smart Growth Policies Raise Housing Prices and Hurt Urban Livability?
10. Does New Urbanism Represent a Viable Strategy That Can Transform Suburban Communities?

Future of Cities and Suburbs

7. Should the United States Invest in High-Speed Intercity Rail?

Gentrification

1. Does Neighborhood Gentrification Benefit the Inner-City Poor?

History: Evolution of Cities and Suburbs

1. Does Neighborhood Gentrification Benefit the Inner-City Poor?

Housing

5. Did the Government's Regulation of Lending Institutions Under the Community Reinvestment Act Lead to the Mortgage Foreclosure Crisis?

National and State Urban Policy

2. Should State Governments Impose Strong Limitations on the Ability of Cities to Use Eminent Domain Powers for Economic Development Purposes?
5. Did the Government's Regulation of Lending Institutions Under the Community Reinvestment Act Lead to the Mortgage Foreclosure Crisis?
7. Should the United States Invest in High-Speed Intercity Rail?

Neighborhood and Community Development

4. Does Broken-Windows Policing Reduce Crime?

Introduction

The Persistence of Urban Problems

Is the urban crisis over? The last few decades have seen significant improvements in the urban condition. Big cities have enjoyed a downtown revival that was all but unimaginable in the 1970s. Numerous inner-city neighborhoods, once seemingly caught in a spiral of decline, too, have "come back" as the sites of new residential activity and investment. Cities have been able to maintain their vitality even during a period of national economic recession. Although the slow-growth national economy of the early 2000s meant new fiscal problems for cities, cities as a whole did not teeter on the edge of bankruptcy, as New York and Cleveland did in the 1970s.

Reason for optimism can also be found in the falling crime rates in inner-city neighborhoods, apparent over the last two decades. Community-based organizations have sustained poorer neighborhoods through a variety of bottom-up activities, including neighborhood watch programs, community cleanup days, and the operation of after-school tutoring programs. Community development corporations have entered into partnerships with banks, investment institutions, and government agencies, piecing together the financing necessary for the construction and rehabilitation of tens of thousands of units of quality affordable housing.

Racial discrimination also no longer poses the same barrier to residential mobility that it did in the past. Today, racial minorities make up approximately 35 percent of the suburban population, a figure that is roughly the same as their overall share of the national population (2010 census figures, as reported by the Brookings Institution). The all-white suburb, a common feature of the American landscape in the mid-twentieth century, has virtually disappeared. Racial progress is also apparent in the