

博雅
教育

全国英语专业博雅系列教材

总主编 丁建新

博雅阅读 精读 ④

洪 丹 主编

LIBERAL EDUCATION



中山大學出版社
SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

全国英语专业博雅系列教材/总主编 丁建新

博雅阅读·精读 4

主 编 洪 丹

副 主 编 周传进

参编人员 罗巾如 莫利娜 胡 琨
梁 凌 陈 珍 何湘君 罗 琴



中山大學出版社
SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

· 广州 ·

版权所有 翻印必究

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

博雅阅读·精读·4/洪丹主编;周传进副主编. —广州:中山大学出版社,
2016.1

(全国英语专业博雅系列教材/丁建新 总主编)

ISBN 978 - 7 - 306 - 05387 - 9

I. ①博… II. ①洪… ②周… III. ①英语—阅读教学—高等学校—教材
IV. ①H319.4

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2015) 第 180828 号

出版人: 徐 劲

策划编辑: 熊锡源

责任编辑: 熊锡源

封面设计: 曾 斌

责任校对: 刘学谦

责任技编: 黄少伟

出版发行: 中山大学出版社

电 话: 编辑部 020 - 84111996, 84113349, 84111997, 84110779

发行部 020 - 84111998, 84111981, 84111160

地 址: 广州市新港西路 135 号

邮 编: 510275 传 真: 020 - 84036565

网 址: <http://www.zsup.com.cn> E-mail: zdcbs@mail.sysu.edu.cn

印 刷 者: 广州中大印刷有限公司

规 格: 787mm × 1092mm 1/16 16.75 印张 410 千字

版次印次: 2016 年 1 月第 1 版 2016 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

印 数: 1 ~ 3000 册 定 价: 39.00 元

如发现本书因印装质量影响阅读, 请与出版社发行部联系调换

英语专业博雅系列教材编委会

总主编 丁建新 (中山大学)

编 委 会

李洪儒 (黑龙江大学)
司显柱 (北京交通大学)
赵彦春 (天津外国语大学)
田海龙 (天津外国语大学)
夏慧言 (天津科技大学)
李会民 (河南科技学院)
刘承宇 (西南大学)
施 旭 (浙江大学)
辛 斌 (南京师范大学)
杨信彰 (厦门大学)
徐畅贤 (湖南城市学院)
李玉英 (江西师范大学)
李发根 (江西师范大学)
肖坤学 (广州大学)
宫 齐 (暨南大学)
张广奎 (广东财经大学)
温宾利 (广东外语外贸大学)
杜金榜 (广东外语外贸大学)
阮 炜 (深圳大学)
张晓红 (深圳大学)

博雅之辩（代序）

大学精神陷入前所未有的危机，许多人在寻找出路。

我们的坚持是，提倡博雅教育（Liberal Education）。因为大凡提倡什么，关键在于审视问题的症结何在，对症下药。而当下之困局，根源在于功利，在于忘掉了教育之根本。

博雅教育之理念，可以追溯至古罗马人提倡的“七艺”：文法、修辞、辩证法、音乐、算术、几何、天文学。其目的在于培养人格完美的自由思考者。在中国教育史上，博雅的思想，古已有之。中国儒家教育的传统，强调以培养学生人格为核心。儒家“六艺”，礼、乐、射、御、书、数，体现的正是我们所讲的博雅理念。“学识广博，生活高雅”，在这一点上，中国与西方，现代与传统，并无二致。

在古罗马，博雅教育在于培育自由的人格与社会精英。在启蒙时代，博雅教育意指解放思想，破除成见。“什么都知道一点，有些事情知道得多一点”，这是19世纪英国的思想家约翰·斯图亚特·密尔（John Stuart Mill）对博雅的诠释。同一时期，另外一位思想家，曾任都柏林大学校长的约翰·亨利·纽曼（John Henry Newman）在《大学理念》一书中，也曾这样表述博雅的培养目标：“如果必须给大学课程一个实际目标，那么，我说它就是训练社会的良好成员。它的艺术是社会生活的艺术，它的目的是对世界的适应……大学训练旨在提高社会的精神格调，培养公众的智慧，纯洁一个民族的趣味”。

博雅教育包括科学与人文，目标在于培养人的自由和理性的精神，而不是迎合市场与风俗。教育的目标在于让学生学会尊重人类生活固有的内在价值：生命的价值、尊严的价值、求知的价值、爱的价值、相互尊重的价值、自我超越的价值、创新的价值。提倡博雅教育，就是要担当这些价值守护者的角色。博雅教育对于我们来说，是一种素质教育、人文教育。人文教育关心人类的终极目标，不是以“有用”为标准。它不是“万金油”，也无关乎“风花雪月”。

在美国，专注于博雅教育的大学称为“文理学院”，拒绝职业性的教育。在中国香港，以博雅教育为宗旨的就有岭南大学，提倡“全人教育”；在台湾大学，博雅教育是大学教育的基础，课程涉及文学与艺术、历史思维、世界文明、

道德与哲学、公民意识与社会分析、量化分析与数学素养、物质科学、生命科学等八大领域。在欧洲，博雅教育历史中的七大范畴被分为“三道”（初级）与“四道”（高级）。前者包括语法、修辞与辩证法，后者包括算术、几何、天文与音乐。在中国大陆的中山大学，许多有识之士也提倡博雅之理念，让最好的教授开设通识课程，涉及现代学科之环境、生物、地理等各门。同时设立“博雅学院”，学拉丁，读古典，开风气之先。

外语作为一门人文性很强的学科，尤其有必要落实博雅之理念。对于我们来说，最好的“应用型”教育在于博雅。早在20世纪20~40年代，在水木清华的外文系，吴宓先生提倡“语”“文”并重，“中”“西”兼修，教学上提倡自主学习与互动研究。在《西洋文学系学程总则》中，吴宓明确了“博雅之士”的培养目标：

本系课程编写的目的为使学生：（甲）成为博雅之士；（乙）了解西洋文明之精神；（丙）熟读西方文学之名著、谙悉西方思想之潮流，因而在国内教授英、德、法各国语言文字及文学，足以胜任愉快；（丁）创造今日之中国文学；（戊）汇通东西方之精神而互为介绍传布。

博雅之于我们，不仅仅是理念，更重要的是课程体系，是教材，是教法，是实践，是反应试教育，是将通识与专业熔于一炉。基于这样的理念，我们编写了这套丛书。希望通过这样的教育，让我们的学生知道人之为人是具有他内在的生活意义，告诉我们的学生去求知，去阅读，去思考，去创造，去理解世界，去适应社会，去爱，去相互尊重，去审美，去找回精神的家园。

无需辩驳，也不怕非议。这是我们的坚守。

中山大学外国语学院 教授、博士生导师

中山大学语言研究所 所长

丁建新

2013年春天

前 言

《博雅阅读·精读》是供英语专业本科学生或水平相当的英语学习者使用的一套教材。本教材共4册,每册12个单元,每单元由A、B两篇课文组成,每篇课文后附有文章注释,以帮助学习者更好地理解文章内涵。文章A(Text A)为主课文,包括“读前”活动(Pre-reading Questions)、正文(Text)及课后练习(Exercises)组成。文章B(Text B)为副课文,是主课文A在主题、语言技能等方面的延伸。

本教材的编写是在本“博雅教育”系列教材的总的指导思想下完成的。从材料的选取,到练习的设计,都力争做到以文载物,与时俱进。在推进学生的英语语言综合能力培养的过程中,融入东西方文化经典的内涵,使学生在过程中得到良好的人文、科学思想的全面熏陶和发展。围绕这一思想,选题尽可能地做到博观取约、务实去华,并最终确定了“母爱与成长、人生态度、情感故事、历史文化、旅游地理、家庭生活、时代科技、历史人物”等几方面主题。

课后习题的设计旨在提高学生的阅读能力及语言技能,并进一步培养学生独立分析问题、解决问题的能力。其中,“课文理解(Text Comprehension/Understanding the Text/Comprehension Questions)”以阅读为主线,引导学生通过对课后问题的思考,培养其阅读理解与分析语篇的能力及文化意识。“词汇和结构(Vocabulary and Structure)”“语法(Grammar)”“翻译(Translation)”通过词汇、语法及翻译等练习,引导学生逐步提高自身的语言基本功、语言敏感性等。一年级设计了“语法巩固(Grammar Consolidation)”部分,旨在较系统地巩固复习英语语法知识(多数在中学已学过),考虑到来自不同地域的学生的水平差异,基本上通过以练习代巩固的形式进行,侧重于一些语法难点项目的练习,为进一步开展大学阶段的英语教学夯实语法基础。二年级重点培养学生的释义(Paraphrase)、翻译以及写作能力,并且给出了一些topic让学生自由讨论,培养他们独立思考和辩证思考的能力。每个单元后还有与主题相关的“引语(Quotation)和“拓展阅读推荐书目(Further Readings)”,在于开阔学生视野,引发新的思考。

在编写上,我们尽量做到:

(1) 充分考虑学习者的英语基础,所选文章难易适中、文字规范、长度合

理。

(2) 结合本套教材的博雅主题,注重文章选取时博雅精神的体现,既考虑文章本身的知识性、可读性,也考虑文章文化精神的体现。

(3) 符合英语专业教学大纲及我国培养创新型英语专业人才的要求。

(4) 在编排模式上,结合语言习得及外语教学的相关理论,注意体现学生在课堂上的主体地位。

(5) 理论联系实际,注重学习效果的实用性。

(6) 注重教材编排的系统性及科学性。

编写过程中,外籍专家 Jeffery 和 Norma 给予了审阅和帮助,在此我们致以衷心的感谢。受编者经验与水平限制,本教材难免有疏漏之处。望广大师生读者批评指教,以利今后修订完善。

编 者

2013 年

Contents

Unit 1	1
Text A Live and Learn, Why We Have College	2
Text B The Complete Collection of Lies That High School Told Me	15
Unit 2	21
Text A The Trying Twenties	22
Text B Cure Yourself of Unhappiness	34
Unit 3	40
Text A The Joy Luck Club (Excerpt)	41
Text B A Defining Gap: Seniors for Romney, Millennials for Obama	53
Unit 4	59
Text A News in the Television Schedule	60
Text B How to Establish Your Professional Network Through Social Media	72
Unit 5	75
Text A The World Turns Gray	76
Text B Oil's New World Order	88
Unit 6	93
Text A Is Technology a Threat to Liberal Society?	94
Text B Modern Science and Technology and the Challenges of Third World Countries	105

Unit 7	111
Text A Digital Photography Does Not Exist?	112
Text B THE iPHONE: Three Revolutionary Products in One	124
Unit 8	129
Text A ChildFund International	130
Text B Stop Telling Rich Folks to Give More to Charity	144
Unit 9	151
Text A The Story Behind the Amazing Success of Black Athletes	152
Text B Why the Story of Muhammad Ali's Rebellion Matters Today	172
Unit 10	183
Text A Body Politics	184
Text B The Moral Causes of Europe's Predicament	199
Unit 11	205
Text A Beauty	206
Text B Give Her a Pattern	218
Unit 12	223
Text A Plato	224
Text B Who Was Socrates?	237
Phrase List	243
Vocabulary List	248

Unit 1



More and more Americans are going to college, but how many of them are actually learning anything?

Pre-reading Questions:

1. Is your college life like what you had imagined before your entrance? If not, what are the differences?
2. Have you ever thought why we need to go to college, to help us become more competitive in job-hunting or to learn things that will make us 'a whole person well-adjusted to the society'? Or do you hold any other opinions?
3. Should we have tests at college? Why or why not?

Text A

Live and Learn, Why We Have College

Louis Menand

1 My first job as a professor was at an Ivy League university. The students were happy to be taught, and we, their teachers, were happy to be teaching them. Whatever portion of their time and energy was being eaten up by social commitments — which may have been huge, but about which I was ignorant — they seemed earnestly and unproblematically engaged with the academic experience. If I was naïve about this, they were gracious enough not to disabuse me. None of us ever questioned the importance of what we were doing.

2 At a certain appointed hour, the university decided to make its way in the world without me, and we parted company. I was assured that there were no hard feelings. I was fortunate to get a position in a public university system, at a college with an overworked faculty, an army of part-time instructors, and sixteen thousand students. Many of these students were the first in their families to attend college, and any distractions they had were not social. Many of them worked, and some had complicated family responsibilities.

3 I didn't regard this as my business any more than I had the social lives of my Ivy League students. I assigned my new students the same readings I had assigned the old ones. I understood that the new students would not be as well prepared, but, out of faith or ego, I thought that I could tell them what they needed to know, and open up the texts for them. Soon after I started teaching there, someone raised his hand and asked, about a text I had assigned, "Why did we have to buy this book?"

4 I got the question in that form only once, but I heard it a number of times in the unmonetized form of "Why did we have to read this book?" I could see that this was not only a perfectly legitimate question; it was a very interesting question. The students were asking me to justify the return on investment in a college education. I just had never been called upon to think about this before. It wasn't part of my training. We took the value of the business we were in for granted.

5 I could have said, "You are reading these books because you're in college, and these are the kinds of books that people in college read." If you hold a certain theory of education, that answer is not as circular as it sounds. The theory goes like this: In any group of people, it's easy to determine who is the fastest or the strongest or even the best-looking. But picking out the most intelligent person is difficult, because intelligence involves many attributes that can't be captured in a one-time assessment,

like an I. Q. test. There is no intellectual equivalent of the hundred-yard dash. An intelligent person is open-minded, an outside-the-box thinker, an effective communicator, is prudent, self-critical, consistent, and so on. These are not qualities readily subject to measurement.

6 Society needs a mechanism for sorting out its more intelligent members from its less intelligent ones, just as a track team needs a mechanism (such as a stopwatch) for sorting out the faster athletes from the slower ones. Society wants to identify intelligent people early on so that it can funnel them into careers that maximize their talents. It wants to get the most out of its human resources. College is a process that is sufficiently multifaceted and fine-grained to do this.

7 College is, essentially, a four-year intelligence test. Students have to demonstrate intellectual ability over time and across a range of subjects. If they're sloppy or inflexible or obnoxious — no matter how smart they might be in the I. Q. Sense — those negatives will get picked up in their grades. As an added service, college also sorts people according to aptitude. It separates the math types from the poetry types. At the end of the process, graduates get a score, the G. P. A., that professional schools and employers can trust as a measure of intellectual capacity and productive potential. It's important, therefore, that everyone is taking more or less the same test.

8 I could have answered the question in a different way. I could have said, "You're reading these books because they teach you things about the world and yourself that, if you do not learn them in college, you are unlikely to learn anywhere else." This reflects a different theory of college, a theory that runs like this: In a society that encourages its members to pursue the career paths that promise the greatest personal or financial rewards, people will, given a choice, learn only what they need to know for success. They will have no incentive to acquire the knowledge and skills important for life as an informed citizen, or as a reflective and culturally literate human being. College exposes future citizens to material that enlightens and empowers them, whatever careers they end up choosing.

9 In performing this function, college also socializes. It takes people with disparate backgrounds and beliefs and brings them into line with mainstream norms of reason and taste. Independence of mind is tolerated in college, and even honored, but students have to master the accepted ways of doing things before they are permitted to deviate. Ideally, we want everyone to go to college, because college gets everyone on the same page. It's a way of producing a society of like-minded grownups.

10 If you like the first theory, then it doesn't matter which courses students take, or even what is taught in them, as long as they're rigorous enough for the sorting mechanism to do its work. All that matters is the grades. If you prefer the second theory, then you might consider grades a useful instrument of positive or negative reinforcement, but the only thing that matters is what students actually learn. There is

stuff that every adult ought to know, and college is the best delivery system for getting that stuff into people's heads.

11 A lot of confusion is caused by the fact that since 1945 American higher education has been committed to both theories. The system is designed to be both meritocratic (Theory 1) and democratic (Theory 2). Professional schools and employers depend on colleges to sort out each cohort as it passes into the workforce, and elected officials talk about the importance of college for everyone. We want higher education to be available to all Americans, but we also want people to deserve the grades they receive.

12 It wasn't always like this. Before 1945, elite private colleges like Harvard and Yale were largely in the business of reproducing a privileged social class. Between 1906 and 1932, four hundred and five boys from Groton applied to Harvard. Four hundred and two were accepted. In 1932, Yale received thirteen hundred and thirty applications, and it admitted nine hundred and fifty-nine — an acceptance rate of seventy-two per cent. Almost a third of those who enrolled were sons of Yale graduates.

13 In 1948, through the exertions of people like James Bryant Conant, the president of Harvard, the Educational Testing Service went into business, and standardized testing (the S. A. T. and the A. C. T.) soon became the virtually universal method for picking out the most intelligent students in the high-school population, regardless of their family background, and getting them into the higher-education system. Conant regarded higher education as a limited social resource, and he wanted to make more strait the gate. Testing insured that only people who deserved to go to college did. The fact that Daddy went no longer sufficed. In 1940, the acceptance rate at Harvard was eighty-five per cent. By 1970, it was twenty per cent. Last year, thirty-five thousand students applied to Harvard, and the acceptance rate was six per cent.

14 Almost all the elite colleges saw a jump in applications this year, partly because they now recruit much more aggressively internationally, and acceptance rates were correspondingly lower. Columbia, Yale, and Stanford admitted less than eight per cent of their applicants. This degree of selectivity is radical. To put it in some perspective; the acceptance rate at Cambridge is twenty-one per cent, and at Oxford eighteen per cent.

15 But, as private colleges became more selective, public colleges became more accommodating. Proportionally, the growth in higher education since 1945 has been overwhelmingly in the public sector. In 1950, there were about 1.14 million students in public colleges and universities and about the same number in private ones. Today, public colleges enroll almost fifteen million students, private colleges fewer than six million.

16 There is now a seat for virtually anyone with a high-school diploma who wants to attend college. The City University of New York (my old employer) has two hundred

and twenty-eight thousand undergraduates — more than four times as many as the entire Ivy League. The big enchilada of public higher education, the State of California, has ten university campuses, twenty-three state-college campuses, a hundred and twelve community-college campuses, and more than 3.3 million students. Six per cent of the American population is currently enrolled in college or graduate school. In Great Britain and France, the figure is about three per cent.

17 If you are a Theory 1 person, you worry that, with so many Americans going to college, the bachelor's degree is losing its meaning, and soon it will no longer operate as a reliable marker of productive potential. Increasing public investment in higher education with the goal of college for everyone — in effect, taxpayer-subsidized social promotion — is thwarting the operation of the sorting mechanism. Education is about selection, not inclusion.

18 If you are friendly toward Theory 2, on the other hand, you worry that the competition for slots in top-tier colleges is warping educational priorities. You see academic tulip mania: students and their parents are overvaluing a commodity for which there are cheap and plentiful substitutes. The sticker price at Princeton or Stanford, including room and board, is upward of fifty thousand dollars a year. Public colleges are much less expensive — the average tuition is \$7,605 — and there are also many less selective private colleges where you can get a good education, and a lot more faculty face time, without having to spend every minute of high school sucking up to your teachers and reformatting your résumé. Education is about personal and intellectual growth, not about winning some race to the top.

19 It would be nice to conclude that, despite these anxieties, and given the somewhat contradictory goals that have been set for it, the American higher-education system is doing what Americans want it to do. College is broadly accessible: sixty-eight per cent of high-school graduates now go on to college (in 1980, only forty-nine per cent did), and employers continue to reward the credential, which means that there is still some selection going on. In 2008, the average income for someone with an advanced degree (master's, professional, or doctoral) was \$83,144; for someone with a bachelor's degree, it was \$58,613; for someone with only a high-school education, it was \$31,283.

Notes

1. About the author.

Louis Menand has been contributing to *The New Yorker* since 1991. Menand is the author and editor of several books. His book *The Metaphysical Club*, was awarded the 2002 Pulitzer Prize for History and the Francis Parkman Prize from the Society of American Historians. He was an associate editor at *The New Republic* from 1986 to

1987, and was a contributing editor at *The New York Review of Books* from 1994 to 2001.

Menand is the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of English and American Literature and Language at Harvard University. He has also taught at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, Princeton, Columbia, and the University of Virginia School of Law.

2. My first job as a professor was at an **Ivy League** university. (Para. 1)

The Ivy League is an athletic conference composed of sports teams from eight private institutions of higher education in the Northeastern United States. The conference name is also commonly used to refer to those eight schools as a group. The eight institutions are Brown University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Princeton University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University. The term Ivy League also has connotations of academic excellence, selectivity in admissions, and social elitism.

3. An intelligent person is open-minded, an **outside-the-box thinker**, ... (Para. 5)

Thinking outside the box (also thinking out of the box or thinking beyond the box) is to think differently, unconventionally, or from a new perspective. This phrase often refers to novel or creative thinking. To think outside the box is to look further and to try not thinking of the obvious things, but to try thinking beyond them.

4. Ideally, we want everyone to go to college, because college gets everyone **on the same page**. (Para. 9)

In business meetings and college classes people often make copies of a single report and hand a copy to each person at the meeting. While they discuss the different points in the report, each person needs to be reading from the same page ("on the same page"). Everyone is "on the same page" when they are all following along and understanding the basic idea that the group is sharing. "On the same page" has a further meaning of people being in basic understanding and agreement on something. Example: "Before we make any decisions today, I'd like to make sure that everyone is on the same page."

5. ...the **Educational Testing Service** went into business, ... (Para. 13)

Educational Testing Service (ETS), founded in 1947, is the world's largest private nonprofit educational testing and assessment organization. It is presently headquartered near Princeton, New Jersey. ETS develops various standardized tests primarily in the United States for K—12 and higher education, and it also administers international tests including the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication), GRE (Graduate Record Examinations) General and Subject Tests, and The Praxis test Series — in more than 180 countries, and at over 9,000 locations worldwide.

6. ...and standardized testing (the **S. A. T.** and the **A. C. T.**) soon became the virtually universal method... (Para. 13)

The SAT is a standardized test for college admissions in the United States. The SAT is owned, published, and developed by the College Board, a nonprofit organization in the United States. The test is intended to assess a student's readiness for college. It was first introduced in 1926, and its name and scoring have changed several times. It was first called the Scholastic Aptitude Test, then the Scholastic Assessment Test.

The ACT (originally an abbreviation of American College Testing) is a standardized test for high school achievement and college admissions in the United States. It was first administered in November 1959 by Everett Franklin Lindquist as a competitor to the College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Test, now the SAT Reasoning Test. The ACT has historically consisted of four tests: English, Mathematics, Reading, and Science Reasoning.

7. To **put it in some perspective**, the acceptance rate at Cambridge is twenty-one per cent, and at Oxford eighteen per cent. (Para. 14)

If you put something into perspective you show that you realize or make others realize the importance/significance of the thing you are referring to. Alternatively, it means you put the thing into its correct place (or make it clear for you and others). e. g.

1) You know that we have done a good research. We ask you to do a favor for us and put it into perspective when you talk to the stakeholders. (to show the significance of our work)

2) Let's put it into perspective: 100 years ago the frequency of skin cancer was way lower than what it is now. (to give a clear idea of what has happened)

8. You see academic **tulip mania**: students and their parents are overvaluing a commodity for which there are cheap and plentiful substitutes. (Para. 18)

Tulip mania or tulipomania was a period in the Dutch Golden Age during which contract prices for bulbs of the recently introduced tulip reached extraordinarily high levels and then suddenly collapsed. The term "tulip mania" is now often used metaphorically to refer to any large economic bubble (when asset prices deviate from intrinsic values).

Glossary

accommodating [ə'kɒmədeɪtɪŋ]	<i>a.</i>	helpful and obliging
aptitude [ˈæptɪtjuːd]	<i>n.</i>	an inherent ability, as for learning
attribute [ə'trɪbjʊt]	<i>n.</i>	a quality or characteristic inherent in or ascribed to someone or something
cohort [ˈkəʊhɔ:t]	<i>n.</i>	a group or band of people
commitment [kə'mɪtmənt]	<i>n.</i>	the state of being bound emotionally or