



普通高等教育“十五”国家级规划教材

# CONTEMPORARY

Oral English

# COLLEGE ENGLISH

## 现代大学英语

● 总主编：杨立民

● **口语** **4**

● 主 编：林 岩

● 副主编：翟 峥 伊 蕊

● 编 者：申昌英 刘 枫

易 焱

外 语 教 学 与 研 究 出 版 社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS



普通高等教育“十五”国家级规划教材



北京市高等教育精品教材立项项目

Contemporary College English

# 现代大学英语

总主编：杨立民

Oral English

口语 4

江苏工业学院图书馆

副主编：翟 峥 伊 蕊

编者：申昌英 刘 枫

易 焱

外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

北京 BEIJING

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

现代大学英语口语. 4 = Contemporary College English Oral English / 林岩主编; 翟峥, 伊蕊  
副主编. — 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 2006. 2

(现代大学英语)

ISBN 7-5600-5403-X

I. 现… II. ①林… ②翟… ③伊… III. 英语—口语—高等学校—教材 IV. H319.9

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2006) 第 012794 号

出 版 人: 李朋义

选题策划: 雷 航

项目负责: 胡伟春

责任编辑: 胡伟春

封面设计: 高 瓦 韩晓梦

版式设计: 路丽佳

出版发行: 外语教学与研究出版社

社 址: 北京市西三环北路 19 号 (100089)

网 址: <http://www.fltrp.com>

印 刷: 北京密云红光印刷厂

开 本: 787×1092 1/16

印 张: 14.75

版 次: 2006 年 5 月第 1 版 2006 年 5 月第 1 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 7-5600-5403-X

定 价: 18.90 元

\* \* \*

如有印刷、装订质量问题出版社负责调换

制售盗版必究 举报查实奖励

版权保护办公室举报电话: (010)88817519

# 序 言

本套教材为“现代大学英语”系列中的口语教材，共四册，供大学英语专业本科一、二年级学生及水平相当的学习者使用。

众所周知，口语是用来进行语言交际的一项重要技能。多年来，“不敢说”、“不想说”、“没话说”、“不会说”一直是中国学生在英语学习中遇到的难以逾越的障碍。本套口语教材就是针对这些问题，吸取国内外同类教材的优点，继承我国口语教学的传统编写而成的。

本套教材的特点如下：

1. 作为系列教材中的一个有机部分，本套教材在语言、题材和训练重点等方面和其他教材，如听力、写作、精读等有密切的联系和配合。这样就可以大大增加学生语言材料的输入，解决“没话说”的问题。同时又可以使学生得到先听后说、先读后说、写了再说等不同方式的训练。
2. 教材内容比较丰富。每一课都提供了大量的语言材料。这一方面是为了便于让学生模仿，为他们提供必要的词语、表达方法以及有关的观点和思路，另一方面更重要的是激发学生的兴趣和他们说话的愿望。本套教材所选的对话和课文题材广泛，努力结合学生的生活实际，就是为了解决学生“不想说”的问题。
3. 本套教材的头两册采用题材和口语功能相结合的方法，旨在让学生通过口语课尽快掌握日常生活用语，这是精读课无法代替的。但是口语并不只是一些套语，它还有丰富的内容，三、四册就针对一些社会热点话题让学生进行讨论和辩论。整套教材按题材组织单元，将各种口语训练功能穿插其间。
4. 这套教材十分注重趣味性，但更重视人文内涵。我们努力在轻松中保持教材的格调，努力做到让学生不仅能说，而且言之有物，言之成理。
5. 全套教材体系完整，由浅入深，由近及远。主题从一、二册的日常生活逐渐过渡到三、四册的各种社会、文化、经济和政治热点问题。练习重点也从与日常生活相关的功能表达以及相对容易的问答、复述、归纳逐渐升级为对各种热点问题的论述。课堂讨论和接近实战的经过充分准备的专题辩论，既能体现训练的阶段性，同时又可通过滚动式的安排防止教材安排的机械单调和训练方式的前后脱节。
6. 这套教材努力做到既有中国味，又有外国味；既考虑到中国的国情和中国学生的生活实际，以及他们希望表达的内容，同时又兼顾西方文化和生活的介绍。
7. 这套教材所采用的语言力求地道，但尽量避免使用土语、俚语和俗语。教材中适当介绍了一些有用的相关词语，但数量有限。这是因为口语课的主要任务不是扩大词汇，而是活用已学的东西。
8. 这套教材的练习设计，吸取了国外教材的优点，尽量注意交际性、趣味性和多样性，尽量把学生放在主动的地位。

以上是我们力求在教材中体现的特点，但效果如何还有待于实践的证明；加上参与编写的人员水平有限，这套教材中的问题肯定会不少，恳请使用本书的同行和学生提出宝贵意见。

本书由新西兰专家 Helen Wylie 审阅，在此对她表示衷心的感谢。

编者

2004年6月

# 第四册使用说明

本册书的适用对象是大学英语专业本科二年级第二学期的学生或其他具有同等英语水平的学习者。这一阶段的学习者英语口语已达到中等或中等以上水平,接下来需要训练的是如何就复杂而深刻的社会问题表达自己的观点。我们注重在训练学生语言技巧的同时培养学生的思辨能力,引导他们对社会文化问题进行思考。正是基于这些考虑我们编写了这本以辩论为主要练习形式的教材。

## 1. 本书的训练重点

- i 以辩论的形式培养学生对社会文化热点问题的关注和兴趣,以及对问题进行深入分析,从多方面进行思考的能力和习惯。
- ii 锻炼学生查找信息、理清思路的能力;通过广泛阅读、酝酿和口笔头的准备,进一步提高学生的口语表达水平。
- iii 帮助学生掌握辩论技巧。通过8个题目的辩论,使学生熟悉准备辩论的全过程,帮助学生学会在辩论中做到沉着冷静,思维清晰,针锋相对,应对自如。
- iv 帮助学生掌握一些逻辑知识,培养锻炼学生的逻辑思维能力。

## 2. 本书的基本框架和使用方法

本书共8个单元,每个单元供两周共6课时使用。此外在书中我们还提供了一些额外的辩论题目和素材,供教师和学生选择使用。在每次上课前教师应要求学生预习,包括阅读课文提供的材料和对问题进行初步思考。本书介绍了两种辩论形式:课堂辩论和议会制辩论。由于辩论对学生的语言和思维要求较高,在学期开始,可采用要求学生发言时间较短的课堂辩论,然后随着学生对辩论形式和方法的熟悉,适当延长发言时间或练习使用议会制辩论。辩论队的人数也可时常变化,一个队可以有2人,也可以有3人或4人。

每个单元的组成部分如下:

### i 准备辩论

#### ● 热身练习

时间大约15分钟。主要通过讨论图片内容或相关问题激发学生兴趣,引导学生思考,打开学生思路。学生就主题展开初步讨论。

#### ● 背景知识

每课有一篇文章提供有关该话题的一些背景材料,这些材料需要学生课前阅读。课上,教师可用15-20分钟时间让学生结合这篇文章谈谈为什么这个话题会引起争论,以及就这个话题进行辩论的意义所在。

#### ● 案例

每课提供2-3个案例,进一步启发学生展开联想,加深他们对问题的认识。案例后面设计有一些练习,如角色扮演、小组问答等,目的是帮助学生巩固日常生活的口语表达能力,并通过多样的形式表达自己对问题的看法。

#### ● 阅读材料

每课提供2-5篇阅读材料不等。学生应在课前进行阅读。这些材料一方面可以引导

学生从多种角度对问题进行思考，另一方面也可作为讨论该问题的语言范本，为学生提供所需要的词汇和短语。阅读材料后面配有练习，其目的在于帮助学生理解材料，分析作者的观点和论据，供学生进行参考模仿。

在充分了解了题目内涵以后，学生确定辩论题目，并选择正方和反方。之后每个学生重点准备从某一个方面对观点进行阐述。下一次上课时，学生按正反方分组，每人先在小组内部阐述自己已准备好的观点，然后再集体讨论如何更好地阐述己方观点同时反驳对方观点，为辩论做准备。

#### ii 辩论技巧

学生应在课前阅读每单元提供的关于辩论技巧的介绍，然后课上由老师带领学生做练习，学习使用这些技巧。

#### iii 逻辑错误

关于逻辑错误的有关部分学生也应在课前认真阅读。课上主要是做练习，一方面避免自己犯逻辑错误，另一方面在辩论中巧妙利用有关知识批驳对方。

#### iv 辩论

在每单元的最后一节课，学生正式分组进行辩论。没有辩论任务的学生做评委。他们需要边听辩论边做记录，以便最后做点评。辩论结束后评委投票决定哪一方获胜，并给出理由。学生要对辩论进行反思，总结辩论中的成功与失败。

每一个单元我们还列出一些讨论该问题时常用的词汇、短语和句型，供学生参考。

# Acknowledgments

---

We are extremely grateful to the authors and publishing houses of all the articles we have chosen as the texts for this textbook. We apologize for the insufficient information in some cases due to lack of resources. We intend to show every respect for intellectual property rights, but we hope our pleading for the permission to use the related articles for teaching purposes will receive kind and generous consideration.

## Unit 1

“Robotic (Not Human) Missions Deliver Big Bang” in Section 1 Tasks is taken from Editorial Board in *U.S.A. Today*, July 6, 2005.

“To Explore Is Human” in Section 1 Tasks by Michael Griffin is taken from *U.S.A. Today*, July 6, 2005.

“Are High-Tuition Junior High Schools Against the Compulsory Education Law?” in Section 2 Tasks by Chen Jingjing is taken from *New Express*, May 16, 2005.

《杨立民教授评英语辩论赛》 in Section 5 was originally published in *English Language Learning*, April, 2005.

## Unit 2

Background Information is based on an article carried in *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (6th edition) and articles carried in *Wikipedia*, the leading user-contributed encyclopedia.

Case 1 is based on a story originally published in *China Daily*, August 3, 2004.

“Fairy Tale Master’s Modernized Private Home School” in Case 2 is based on a story written by Zhang Shen in *Nanfang Weekend*, June 30, 2005.

“Challenge from Private Home Schools” in Case 2 is based on an article written by Zhang Enchao. Reading Materials <1> is written by Ronald D. Moore.

Reading Materials <2> by Caroline Alphonso is from *The Globe and Mail*, March 12, 2004.

## Unit 3

Background Information <2> is written by John Henry, Tu-Trang Phan, and Jeffrey Rohlmeier.

Case Study is based on an article in *Morning News*, August 19, 2003.

Reading Materials <1> is adapted from an article in *The Economist*, March 10, 2005.

Reading Materials <2> is written by John Kosakowski.

Reading Materials <3> is from *The Economist* (print edition), October 24, 2002.

Reading Materials <4> is from the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.



Reading Materials <5> is written by Antoine Blua.

Reading Materials <6> is from *The Economist*, April 29, 1999.

## Unit 4

Case 2 is based on an article written by Jim Yardley, carried in *The New York Times*, December 21, 2004.

Case 3 is from *Shenzhen Daily*, November 15, 2004.

Case 4 is from <http://www.phoenixtv.com>.

Reading Materials <1> is from *Yale Global Online* at <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu>.

Reading Materials <2> written by Paul Wiseman is from *U.S.A. Today*, April 12, 2005.

Reading Materials <3> written by Leslie T. Chang is from *The Wall Street Journal*, June 8, 2005.

Reading Materials <4> is from *People's Daily Online* at <http://english.people.com.cn>.

## Unit 5

The cartoon in Warm-up is taken from *New Weekend*.

Background Information is based on “Cars in China: Dream Machines” carried in *Economics*, June 2, 2005.

Case 1 is taken from *Beijing Youth Daily*.

“Should Chinese Households Have Cars?” in Case 2 by Mu Zi was in *Beijing Review*, March 1, 2001.

“Beijing Should Not Follow Los Angeles” in Case 2 is taken from *Beijing Youth Daily*, October 19, 2003.

“Mass Transit in New York” in Case 2 is based on online materials.

Reading Materials <1> is adapted from Praful Bidwai’s article posted on <http://www.flonnet.com/fl2120/stories/20041008001508200.htm>.

Reading Materials <2> is based on the response of the Association of British Drivers to the government’s Integrated Transport, January, 1998.

## Unit 6

Case Study is taken from an online article posted on <http://www.earth-policy.org>.

Reading Materials <1> is written by David Pimentel, O. Bailey, P. Kim, E. Mullaney, J. Calabrese, L. Walman, F. Nelson, and X. Yao from College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University, 1999.

Reading Materials <2> is written by Jonathan Fowler.

Reading Materials <3> is written by William J. Baumol and Sue Anne Batey Blackman, carried in *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics*.

Reading Materials <4> was in *The Economist*, August 2, 2001.



## Unit 7

Background Information <1>, <2>, <3> are based on information from <http://www.euthanasia.com>.  
Background Information <4> and <5> are taken from the website of International Task Force on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide.

Case 1 is taken from <http://www.compassionandchoices.org>.

Case 2 is taken from *China Daily*, June 9, 2003.

## Unit 8

Background Information is based on “WWF Tourism Background Paper”.

Case 1 is based on “Tourism in Bali” carried in *TED Case Studies*.

Case 2 is based on “The Impact of Tourism on Florida’s Economy: Telling the Full Story” in *Special Report* by Florida Taxwatch Center for Tourism.

Reading Materials <1> is adapted and translated from an article written by Zhang Kejia.

Reading Materials <2> is based on online UNEP (United Nations Environment Program) materials.

## Supplementary Materials

### Unit 1

Background Information is based on an article from *Wikipedia*.

Reading Materials <1> is written by Tom Hamilton.

Reading Materials <2> is written by Sophia Sunseri, carried in *New Moon Network*, December 31, 2000.

Reading Materials <3> is an article carried in *China Daily*, November 20, 2003.

### Unit 2

Background Information is based on an article contributed by Katrin Schultheiss.

Reading Materials <1> is taken from *The Economist* (print edition), December 20, 2001.

Reading Materials <2> is taken from *The Economist* (print edition), April 1, 1999.

Reading Materials <3> is written by Arthur Witherall in 1996.

Reading Materials <4> is written by Katrin Schultheiss.

Reading Materials <5> is taken from *The Economist* (print edition), October 23, 2003.

### Unit 3

Background Information <1> is taken from *Wikipedia*.

Background Information <2> is taken from *Debatebase*.

Reading Materials <1> is written by Jagadeesh Gokhale, published on September 9, 2004.

Reading Materials <2> is an article retrieved at [http://www.management-issues.com/display\\_page.asp?section=research&id=1660](http://www.management-issues.com/display_page.asp?section=research&id=1660).

#### **Unit 4**

Background Information <1> is from *Raise the Issues: An Integrated Approach to Critical Thinking* (2nd edition), by Carol Numrich in cooperation with National Public Radio, Pearson Education, Inc.

Reading Materials <1> is written by Binu S. Thomas, taken from Education World.

#### **Unit 5**

Reading Materials <1> is excerpted from a debate on GM rice for China in *Beijing Review*.

Reading Materials <2> is based on “GM Foods OK in U.S.” taken from the website of Social Issues Research Center.

Reading Materials <3> is excerpted from Nathan Batalion’s “50 Harmful Effects of Genetically Modified Foods”.

Reading Materials <4> is excerpted from Boru Douthwaite’s “The Role of Science in Sustainable Agriculture”.

#### **Unit 6**

Reading Materials <1> is taken from *New Straits Times*, November 17, 2002.

Reading Materials <2> is taken from *The Economist*, December 29, 2004.

# Contents

Unit 1 Approaching Debate .....	1
Unit 2 Home Schooling Versus Formal Education .....	23
Unit 3 Information Technology: Advantages and Disadvantages .....	42
Unit 4 Migration of Rural Labor to the City in China .....	68
Unit 5 City Versus Cars .....	93
Unit 6 Are We Using Up the Earth's Resources? .....	117
Unit 7 Euthanasia .....	141
Unit 8 Tourism: Benefits Versus Costs .....	159

## Supplementary Materials

Unit 1 Is Beauty Contest Harmful? .....	181
Unit 2 Has Feminism Gone Too Far? .....	188
Unit 3 Should There Be a Mandatory Retirement Age? .....	197
Unit 4 To Know More About Less or Less About More? .....	202
Unit 5 Genetically Modified Foods .....	208
Unit 6 Should We Preserve Endangered Languages? .....	215
Suggested Keys .....	223

## Unit

# 1

## Approaching Debate



## Section 1 Getting to Know the Basics

Debate is a verbal communication event primarily conducted between two matched sides: the affirmative side to support the topic and the negative side to oppose it.

The speakers (debaters) from the two sides/teams take a stand for or against an idea, or give pros and cons of the question under debate. They then take turns to give their arguments to support their position. In most formats, they will ask each other questions after the speeches (called “cross-examination”). In this way, they are not only communicating with each other but also with a third party, as the debate is usually conducted in front of an audience, which both the affirmative and the negative teams are trying to win over. In a debate contest, the judges will give a decision as to who has won the debate and give comments and advice so that debaters can improve their techniques.

Through debating, student debaters learn to use a library, and to find the exact information they need in the shortest possible time. They learn to be thorough and accurate. They learn to analyze; to distinguish between the vital and the unimportant. They learn the need to prove their statements; to support every statement with valid evidence and sound reasoning—and they learn to demand the

same sort of proof for the statements of others. They learn to present ideas in a clear and effective manner, and in a way which wins others to their way of thinking. They learn to think under pressure, to “use their heads” in a time of need, to make decisions quickly and accurately.

## Tasks



### Examine the dialogs

People exchange opinions with others around them on many different topics almost every day. In these communications, they not only have to give their opinions, but also have to express agreement or disagreement with other people's opinions. Examine the four dialogs below. What is the topic of each one? Do the speakers agree or disagree with each other?

#### Dialog 1

**Man:** Would you like something to eat? I'll go get you a sandwich.

**Woman:** Oh, thank you. Can you get me one on whole wheat brown bread?

**Man:** Why? Don't you like white bread?

**Woman:** Yeah, white bread is OK, but I think that brown bread tastes better.

**Man:** Really? I've never liked brown bread very much.

#### Dialog 2

**Man:** Would you mind not smoking?

**Woman:** Excuse me?

**Man:** I said, "Would you mind not smoking?"

**Woman:** Are you serious? This is a party. People always smoke at parties and I think that I have the right to smoke in here.

**Man:** I'm sorry, but cigarette smoke makes me sick.

**Woman:** Well, why don't you go outside on the balcony?

**Man:** I think I have the right to be in here. Smokers should smoke outside on the balcony.

#### Dialog 3

**Man 1:** I was watching sports on TV the other day and they had this show about Michael Jordan. Man! I believe that he is the greatest athlete of all time.

**Man 2:** I know what you mean. I think so too. But you know more and more people now think Yao Ming is the greatest athlete of all time.

**Man 1:** Yeah, I've heard that. But I still think Jordan was a better athlete than Yao.

**Man 2:** Yeah, me too. Remember that last shot in game 6 of the 1998 finals against Utah when he stole the ball and...

#### Dialog 4

**Woman 1:** Do you wanna go to a concert this weekend? There's a big outdoor concert in the park.

**Woman 2:** Nah, not really. I think it's going to rain this weekend.

**Woman 1:** No it's not... I saw the weather forecast in the paper. It's gonna be beautiful weather.

**Woman 2:** I doubt it. It always rains when I go to an outdoor concert.

1) Topic: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Agree

☐ Disagree

2) Topic: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Agree

☐ Disagree

3) Topic: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Agree

☐ Disagree

4) Topic: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Agree

☐ Disagree



#### Examine the articles

Debate is an important part of people's life. In addition to the examples above, what other debate occasions can you think of? Debate also comes in the form of writing, such as articles on the opinion/op-ed pages of newspapers. Examine the following two articles and summarize the major arguments of each side. Which side sounds more convincing to you?



Deep Impact (“深度撞击”彗星探测器) is a NASA space probe designed to study the composition of the interior of the comet Tempel 1. At 5:52 GMT on July 4, 2005, one section of the Deep Impact probe successfully impacted the comet's nucleus, excavating debris from the interior of the nucleus. The Deep Impact mission is the first to examine a cometary interior, and thus, scientists hope, reveal new secrets about these small frozen bodies.



<b>Robotic (Not Human) Missions Deliver Big Bang</b> Editorial Board ( <i>U.S.A Today</i> 7/6/2005)	<b>To Explore Is Human</b> By Michael Griffin ( <i>U.S.A Today</i> 7/6/2005)
<p>NASA's Deep Impact probe, which smashed into a comet Monday, was a big hit. In fact, it was a billion hits. That's how many computer "hits" NASA's website recorded in just 24 hours around the event.</p>	<p>Within the lifetime of a baby born this Fourth of July—the day NASA's Deep Impact spacecraft collided with the comet Tempel 1, and also the 1,705th consecutive day of human occupancy onboard the International Space Station—human pioneers will build</p>
<p>Robotic probes, once the domain of academics, have become NASA's new stars. The probes have always generated more science. Now they generate more enthusiasm and romance. They are cheaper, faster and more exciting. They go farther and stay longer. They explore the frontiers of the cosmos.</p>	<p>outposts on the moon and Mars, extract minerals from large asteroids and construct huge space telescopes to map the details of continents on distant planets.</p>
<p>What's more, they make better use of the preeminent technology of our times, the Internet. Thanks to signals sent back by the Mars rovers Spirit and Opportunity, the Red Planet has been "visited" a little more than 670 million times since January of last year.</p>	<p>This is the space program NASA will pursue, based on the premise that a robust program of human and robotic space exploration will help fuel American creativity, innovation, technology development and leadership.</p>
<p>When and if astronauts arrive there, the product they provide the Internet consumer will</p>	<p>If history demonstrates anything, it is that those nations that make a commitment to exploration invariably benefit. I believe that America, through its mastery of human space flight, can shape the cultures and societies of the future, in space and here on earth, as the great nations of the past have</p>



be, in many respects, inferior. No sooner would they arrive than attention would shift to getting them home safely. Rovers, on the other hand, plow on, month after month, sending data, living off nothing but sunshine.

The current human space program is only a cure for insomnia. The International Space Station orbits in near oblivion. The space shuttle doesn't really go anywhere. Sadly, it makes headlines only when its flights end in tragedy.

NASA is embarking on a costly shuttle replacement program, when far cheaper options exist. Even now, in the early stages, almost two thirds of NASA's budget, a little less than \$10 billion annually, goes into human space programs—the shuttle fleet and the Space Station.

The shuttle replacement might get built by 2014, or even 2010, as some people hope. Or it might end up like the X-33 and the National Launch System, two programs abandoned when their costs became clear.

What does appear certain is that lawmakers will pump vast amounts of money into a directionless human space program just as the public's attention has shifted away.

That's too bad. After watching Deep Impact and other recent robotic missions, it's clear that NASA's science division has become a real hit machine. It would be fascinating to see what it could do if set loose.

shaped the cultures of today. This future is being purchased for the 15 cents per day that the average taxpayer currently provides for space exploration.

Space flight is a continuation of the ancient human imperative to explore, discover and understand; to settle new territory and to develop new ways to live and work. We need both robotic pathfinders and people in our space journeys. As capable as our robots are, a human explorer can move over new territory far more quickly than a robot, assess and interpret the local environment, and make unexpected discoveries. In all other human activities, we complement, but do not replace, ourselves with our machines. Why should it be any different in space?

As with all pioneering journeys into the unknown, space flight is risky. Next week, if all goes well, we will launch seven courageous astronauts on the Space Shuttle Discovery. A successful mission would give us greater confidence that we can fly the shuttle safely through its planned 2010 retirement, then move on into a new era of exploration.

I cannot imagine that this nation will ever abandon space exploration, either human or robotic. The proper debate in a world of limited resources is over which goals we should pursue. I have little doubt that the huge majority of Americans would prefer to invest their 15 cents per day in the exciting, outward-focused, destination-oriented program we are pursuing.

*Michael Griffin is NASA administrator.*



## Presentation

What are some of the issues you'd like to voice strong opinions on? Break into groups of six and take turns to present your opinion on the issue that you are most concerned with. Each student may talk for a maximum of 2 minutes. The following areas and topics are for your reference.

- Values
  - 1) Money is the root of all evil.
  - 2) Tradition is an obstacle to life.
- Education
  - 1) Schools should abolish exams.
  - 2) College education should be free to all in China.
- Politics and economy
  - 1) Nationalism is a virtue.
  - 2) Free trade serves a universal good.
- Social issues
  - 1) Beggars should not be allowed to hang around in busy districts of the city.
  - 2) College students should not be allowed to marry before graduation.
- Environment
  - 1) The government should put the economy before the environment.
  - 2) Man should revere nature.



## Section 2 Conducting a Debate

### Overview of a debate

A debate usually consists of constructive speeches and rebuttal speeches. All the major points of the teams must be presented in the **constructive speeches**. **Refutation** is an attack on the opponent's arguments. It is found in all the speeches except the first affirmative constructive speech. Usually, the affirmative team presents their idea or plan and gives their major reasons. The negative team attacks the affirmative team's constructive speeches and presents their idea or counterplan. In **cross-examination**, the examiner only asks questions and is not allowed to make a new argument. The examinee, on the other hand, must answer all reasonable questions and is not allowed to ask questions except for clarification. The examiner may stop the examinee if the answer is irrelevant or unnecessarily long. In cross-examination, the examiner and the examinee directly face each other, whereas in constructive and rebuttal speeches, the speaker addresses himself/herself to the audience. **Rebuttal** is a defense of the team's original arguments in light of the opponent's attack. Rebuttal speeches may present the extension of the team's constructive arguments, but not new ones (major arguments). In