

# 英 語 課 本

(大學英語專業四年制用)

第 七 冊

上海外國語學院編

# 英 語 課 本

(大學英語專業四年制用)

## 第 七 冊

上海外國語學院編

1960年

## 序 言

我院西語系英語专业，在一九五七年伟大的整风运动中建立以来，一九五八年又进行了轰轰烈烈的教育革命，贯彻了党的总路线和教育方针，纠正了外语教学脱离政治，脱离实际，“重文艺、轻政治”，“重语言技巧、轻思想内容”，“厚古薄今”，“重外轻中”等资产阶级教育思想，正确树立了教育为无产阶级政治服务，教育与生产劳动相结合的教育方针，坚持“思想内容与语言形式的辩证统一”，“语言材料密切结合当前阶级斗争及生产斗争”，“充分发挥语言作为阶级斗争武器的战斗性”等原则。因此两年来，在教学工作上取得了显著的成绩，教学质量有了很大的提高，并积累了不少的經驗。

随着教育革命的深入发展，为了进一步提高教学质量和满足目前英语专业教学的实际需要，我们在党的正确领导下，在两年来教育革命和教学改革实践的基础上，师生合作编出了一整套以毛泽东思想为指导，坚持党的总路线和教育方针，贯彻理论联系实际，语言现代化的大学一至四年级英语教材八册。这套教材具有鲜明的政治性、思想性和战斗性，也具有一定的科学性和系统性，充分体现了政治标准第一、语言标准第二、教学标准第三的原则。新编教材具有以下几个主要特点：

(一)全部教材内容包括馬列主义、毛泽东思想的经典著作，党的方针政策，对现代修正主义的批判，英美共产党领导者的著作，我国的三面红旗，及其他社会主义国家的工农业建设，资本主义国家工人运动的发展，无产阶级革命导师和人民领袖生平轶事，革命英雄故事，最新科学技术常识等。通过这些教材，对学生进行共产主义思想教育，充分发挥语言的交际功能和战斗作用。

(二)教材的语言要求准确、鲜明、生动，教材内容的高度思想性和语言形式的多样性结合起来。为了使學生接触多方面的语言知识和掌握各种不同語体的语言，所选教材的語体力求多样化，有政論、文艺、报导、科学小品、应用文等。注释

中的漢語說明以及翻譯練習中的漢語部分也力求規範化，使學生通過兩種語言特點的比較，更好地掌握漢語外語的熟巧，更好地起橋樑作用。

(三)本教材既貫徹循序漸進的原則，又體現了高速度的精神。因此課文的安排注意到由淺入深，由簡到繁，並照顧到各年級之間的銜接。同時由於充分估計了師生在教學上的積極性和創造性，所以課文內容較深，份量較重，進度較快。各年級教材編寫、練習種類、以及課文的注釋也根據各年級培養實踐能力的不同要求而各有特點。低年級着重傳授基礎知識和基本熟巧的訓練。高年級着重培養學生獨立工作能力和口筆語的連貫表達能力。

(四)語言材料的組織貫徹開口動手大量實踐的原則。以課文為中心，語音、語法、詞匯有機結合。通過課文掌握詞匯、語音、語法知識，並通過語音、語法、詞匯教學進一步培養實際運用語言的能力。教材中的語音、語法知識的講解，力求精簡實用，有利於實際掌握外語。練習的編寫力求多樣化，以全面培養學生聽、說、讀、寫、譯的實踐能力。在低年級比較着重聽、說能力的培養，同時也考慮到使用電化設備的方便。

(五)為了使學生獲得比較廣博的知識，選用的題材較廣泛，其中也有少量英美進步作家的批判現實主義的作品，在課外還有大量的泛讀材料。在教學中必須以馬列主義和毛澤東思想的文藝理論為指導，以提高學生的思想水平和語言能力。

(六)為了便於教學經驗的積累，這套教材中的選文基本上穩定，但在教學過程中，為了配合當前政治運動和國內外形勢的發展，還可以採用一些機動的教材。穩定性的教材占全學期教材的80%，機動性教材占20%。

這套教材是深入教學改革的成果，雖經多次反復修改，但限於政治水平和業務能力，缺點甚至錯誤在所難免，有待於今後教學實踐中不斷修改補充。我們懇切地希望使用這部教材的教師同志和同學們提出批評和建議，以便再版時加以修訂。

上海外國語學院

1960年8月

## 使用說明

一、本教材第七冊共有課文十六篇，供大學四年制英語專業四年級第一學期使用。課文長度最長 5500 字左右，最短 1600 字左右，一般在 2000 到 3000 字之間。每篇課文可以在 6 至 12 課時內授完。教師可按篇幅長短，內容繁簡，學生水平等具體情況來靈活掌握講授每篇課文的時間，並根據各校不同情況來選擇應用。同時可選與課文內容相結合的輔助性閱讀材料作為泛讀。課文如不能全部用完，其中一部分也可用作泛讀材料。例如第三課 Song of New China 就可作為第二課 Salute to the People's Republic of China 的部分泛讀材料。

二、本教材的課文排列一方面照顧語言的由淺入深、由簡入繁，另一方面也照顧題材分類的一定完整性。總的安排如下：

第一部分——列寧主義真理的闡述和社會主義制度優越性在中國的反映（第 I 至 V 課）。

第二部分——英美資本主義社會內的工人運動和對該社會內黑暗的暴露和譴責（第 VII 至 XIII 課）。

第三部分——哲學語言學等問題（第 XIV 至 XVI 課）。

此外穿插了一篇藝術家的自傳（第 VI 課）。

使用時不必硬性按照本教材所排次序，各院校可按自己實際情況來制訂具體教學日曆。

三、本教材課文題材體裁字數列表如后：

課 文	篇 名	題 材	體 裁	字 數
1. <i>Hongqi Editorial Department: Long Live Leninism, Part II</i>		反对现代修正主义, 保卫世界和平	論	3,800
2. <i>Gallacher: Salute to the People's Republic of China</i>		中国现代革命史	政 报	2,200
3. <i>Neruda: Song of New China</i>		中国革命的胜利	詩	1,600
4. <i>Liu: The Glow of Youth</i>		对中国青年人的歌颂	小品散文	2,800
5. <i>Du Bois: China and Africa</i>		中国革命对非洲人民解放事业的意	演 說	1,800
6. <i>Ulanova: My Childhood and Youth in Ballet</i>		义 烏爾蘭娃青少年时代的芭蕾舞舞台	傳 記	1,900
7. <i>Fagan: The Great London Dock Strike, 1889</i>		十九世紀的英国工人运动	报导体历史	2,600
8. <i>Le Sueur: I Was Marching</i>		美国知識分子参加工人运动的过程	短篇小說	3,400
9. <i>North: The Road Turns Left</i>		美国知識分子参加工人运动的过程	傳 記	3,300
10. <i>Bonosky: Johnny Cucu's Record</i>		美国資本家和資产阶級医学界視工	短篇小說	3,000
11. <i>Betty Gannett Speaks to the U.S. Court</i>		人生命为儿戏的故事 对美帝国主义无理迫害共产党人的	演 說	1,900
12. <i>Aaronovitch: Against British Monopoly Capitalism</i>		控訴	政 論	2,400
13. <i>Shaw: The Apple Cart, Act II (abridged)</i>		反对英国垄断資本主义	劇 本	2,000
14. <i>Engels: The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man</i>		美英帝国主义之間的矛盾	政 論	3,000
15. <i>Stalin: The Characteristic Features of Language</i>		劳动在从猿到人过程中的作用	政 論	2,600
16. <i>Mao: On Practice</i>		語言的特征	学术論文	5,500
		实践論	政 論	

四、本教材注釋原則是一方面要充分發揮教師的主導作用，另一方面要在學生自覺學習的基礎上盡量培養學生的獨立工作能力。這個原則的具體貫徹在下面幾段內加以說明：

1. 注解第一部分是作者和作品介紹。這部分要求學生自學，教師在堂上檢查。

2. 注解第二部分是詞、短語、句子、各種背景知識等等的注解。作注詞句對象是一般辭典上不常見的，或是包含一定背景知識的，或是不常用的專門詞匯等等。單詞和習用語不作注解的重點。一般常用的詞匯詞組要求學生自己查用工具書。注解基本上是英語的，但有些專門名詞，或術語，特殊結構等則用漢語注釋，以貫徹漢英對比的原則。

五、本教材練習的編寫以大量實踐，培養連貫表達能力為原則。練習種類按課文內容性質而各課有所不同，主要有下列各種：

1. 要求復用的詞匯詞組表——為了達到不斷反復鞏固的作用，在每一課文後列有常用詞匯詞組表一。因使用本教材時不必硬性按照已排次序，而且也可有所取舍，每課的詞匯詞組表不避免重復。詞匯表一方面供教師做詞匯工作參考用，同時也供學生自學用。此表所列詞匯詞組較多，教師應有選擇有重點地挑選一部分給學生做練習。

2. 句型——本教材所選句型要求學生熟悉並模仿造句。

3. 英語釋意——為了發展學生活用英語的熟巧，同時檢查學生理解課文的程度，大部分課文有英語釋意的練習。這項練習可以口筆語并用。所選段落僅作參考。

4. 翻譯練習——編寫翻譯練習的原則是政論課文多用漢譯英練習，文藝性課文多用英譯漢練習。翻譯材料大部分是取自課文或題材相同的書刊片段。翻譯不要求逐字逐句地模仿課文，而是要求學生能進行整段連貫性的翻譯，以提高翻譯熟巧。

5. 討論題——討論題擬題較廣，是啟發性的。在使用時教師應根據實際情況指導學生準備較細致的討論提綱。

6. 作文與各種寫作練習——每篇課文都附有不同的寫作要求，有作文、復述、對課文思想內容和語言的分析批評、改

写等等。这些题目不要求全都都用，教师可以有选择地灵活使用。

7. 口語練習——包括表情朗讀、背誦、演說、复述等等。可以按具体情况斟酌使用。



## CONTENTS

I.	Long Live Leninism, Part II .....	<i>Hongqi Editorial Department</i>	1
II.	Salute to the People's Republic of China .....	<i>W. Gallacher</i>	19
III.	Song of New China .....	<i>P. Neruda</i>	34
IV.	The Glow of Youth .....	<i>K'iu Pai-yu</i>	49
V.	China and Africa .....	<i>W. E. B. Du Bois</i>	63
VI.	My Childhood and Youth in Ballet .....	<i>G. Ulanova</i>	78
VII.	The Great London Dock Strike, 1889 .....	<i>H. Fagan</i>	89
VIII.	I was Marching .....	<i>M. Le Sueur</i>	109
IX.	The Road Turns Left .....	<i>J. North</i>	127
X.	Johnny Cucu's Record .....	<i>P. Bonosky</i>	145
XI.	Betty Gannett Speaks to the U. S. Court .....		164
XII.	Against British Monopoly Capitalism .....	<i>S. Aaronovitch</i>	177
XIII.	The Apple Cart, Act II (abridged) .....	<i>G. B. Shaw</i>	194
XIV.	The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man .....	<i>F. Engels</i>	209
XV.	The Characteristic Features of Language .....	<i>J. V. Stalin</i>	228
XVI.	On Practice .....	<i>Mao Tse-tung</i>	244

**I**  
**LONG LIVE LENINISM**  
**Part II**

*Hongqi Editorial Department*

In order to mislead the people of the world, the U.S. imperialists, open representatives of the bourgeoisie in many countries, the modern revisionists represented by the Tito clique<sup>1</sup>, and the right-wing social democrats do all they can to paint an utterly distorted picture of the contemporary world situation in an attempt to confirm their ravings on how "Marxism is outmoded," and "Leninism is outmoded too."

Tito's speech at the end of last year referred repeatedly to the so-called "new epoch" of the modern revisionists. He said, "Today the world has entered an epoch in which nations can relax and tranquilly devote themselves to their internal construction tasks." Then he added, "We have entered an epoch when new questions are on the agenda, not questions of war and peace but questions of co-operation, economic and otherwise, and in so far as economic co-operation is concerned, there is also the question of economic competition." (From Tito's speech in Zagreb<sup>2</sup>, December 12, 1959.) This renegade completely writes off<sup>3</sup> the question of class contradictions and class struggle in the world, in an attempt to negate the consistent interpretation of Marxist-Leninists that our epoch is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the epoch of the victory of socialism and communism.

But how do things really stand in the world?

Can the exploited and oppressed people in the imperialist countries “relax”? Can the peoples of all the colonies and semi-colonies still under imperialist oppression “relax”?

Has the armed intervention led by the U.S. imperialists in Asia, Africa and Latin America become “tranquil”? Is there “tranquillity” in our Taiwan Straits when the U.S. imperialists are still occupying our territory Taiwan? Is there “tranquillity” on the African continent when the people of Algeria and many other parts of Africa are subjected to armed repressions by the French, British and other imperialists? Is there any “tranquillity” in Latin America when the U.S. imperialists are trying to wreck the people’s revolution in Cuba by means of bombing, assassination and subversion?

What kind of “construction” is meant by saying “(they) can devote themselves to their internal construction tasks”? Everyone knows that there are different types of countries in the world today, and principally two types of countries with social systems fundamentally different in nature. One type belongs to the socialist world system, the other to the capitalist world system. Is Tito referring to the “internal construction tasks” of arms expansion which the imperialists are carrying out in order to oppress the peoples of their own countries and oppress the whole world? Or is it the “internal construction” carried out by socialism for the promotion of the people’s happiness and in the pursuit of lasting world peace?

Is the question of war and peace no longer an issue? Is it that imperialism no longer exists, the system of exploitation no longer exists, and therefore the question of war

no longer exists? Or is it that there can be no question of war even if imperialism and the system of exploitation are allowed to survive for ever? The fact is that since the Second World War there has been continuous and unbroken warfare. Do not the imperialist wars to suppress national liberation movements and the imperialist wars of armed intervention against revolutions in various countries count as wars? Even though these wars have not developed into world wars, still do not these local wars count as wars? Even though these wars were not fought with nuclear weapons, still do not wars using so-called conventional weapons count as wars? Does not the U.S. imperialists' allocation of nearly 60 per cent of the 1960 budget outlay to arms expansion and war preparations count as a bellicose policy on the part of U.S. imperialism? Will the revival of West German and Japanese militarisms not confront mankind with the danger of a new big war?

What kind of "co-operation" is meant? Is it "co-operation" of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie to protect capitalism? Is it "co-operation" of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples with the imperialists to protect colonialism? Is it "co-operation" of socialist countries with capitalist countries to protect the imperialist system in its oppression of the peoples in these countries and suppression of national liberation wars?

In a word, the assertions of the modern revisionists about their so-called "epoch" are so many challenges to Leninism on the foregoing issues. It is their aim to obliterate the contradiction between the masses of people and the monopoly capitalist class in the imperialist countries, the contradiction between the colonial and semi-colonial peoples

and the imperialist aggressors, the contradiction between the socialist system and the imperialist system, and the contradiction between the peace-loving people of the world and the warlike imperialist bloc.

There have been different ways of describing the distinctions between different "epochs." Generally speaking, there is one way which is merely drivel<sup>4</sup>, concocting and playing around with vague, ambiguous phrases to cover up the essence of the epoch. This is the old trick of the imperialists, the bourgeoisie and the revisionists in the workers' movement. Then there is another way, which is to make a concrete analysis of the concrete situation with regard to the overall class contradictions and class struggle, putting forward strictly scientific definitions, and thus bringing the essence of the epoch thoroughly to light. This is the work of every serious Marxist.

On the features that distinguish an epoch, Lenin said:

... We are speaking here of big historical epochs; in every epoch there are, and there will be, separate, partial movements sometimes forward, at other times backwards, there are, and there will be, various deviations from the average type and average tempo of the movements.

We cannot know how fast and how successfully certain historical movements of the given epoch will develop. But we can and do know *which class* occupies a central position in this or that epoch and determines its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in the given epoch, *etc.*

Only on this basis, *i.e.*, by taking into consideration first and foremost the fundamental distinctive features of different "epochs" (and not of individual episodes in the history of different countries) can we correctly work out our tactics . . . . ("Under a False Flag," *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. XXI, p. 125.)

An epoch, as referred to here by Lenin, presents the question of which class holds the central position in an epoch and determines its main content and main direction of development<sup>5</sup>.

Faithful to Marx's dialectics, Lenin never for a single moment departed from the standpoint of analysing class relations. He held that: "Marxism judges 'interests' by the class antagonisms and the class struggles which manifest themselves in millions of facts of everyday life." ("Collapse of the Second International," *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1943, Vol. V, p. 189.) He stated:

The method of Marx consists, first of all, in taking into consideration the *objective* content of the historical process at the given concrete moment, in the given concrete situation, in understanding first of all *which* class it is whose movement constitutes the mainspring of possible progress in this concrete situation . . . . ("Under a False Flag," *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. XXI, p. 123.)

Lenin always demanded that we examine the concrete process of historical development on the basis of class analysis, instead of talking vaguely about "society in general" or "progress in general." We Marxists must not base proletarian policy merely on certain passing events or minute political changes, but on the overall class contradictions and

class struggle of a whole historical epoch. This is a basic theoretical position of Marxists. It was by taking a firm stand on this position that Lenin, in the new period of class changes, in the new historical period, came to the conclusion that the hope of humanity lay entirely with the victory of the proletariat and that the proletariat must prepare itself to win victory in this great revolutionary battle and establish a proletarian dictatorship. After the October Revolution, at the Seventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in 1918, Lenin stated:

We must begin with the general basis of the development of commodity production, the transition to capitalism and the transformation of capitalism into imperialism. Thereby we shall be theoretically taking up and consolidating a position from which nobody who has not betrayed socialism can dislodge us. From this follows an equally inevitable conclusion: the era of socialist revolution is beginning. ("Report on Revising the Programme and Name of the Party," *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1943, Vol. VIII, p. 317.)

This is Lenin's conclusion, a conclusion which up to the present still requires deep consideration by all Marxists.

The formulation of revolutionary Marxists that ours is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the epoch of the victory of socialism and communism is irrefutable, because it grasps with complete correctness the basic features of our present great epoch. The formulation that Leninism is the continuation and development of revolutionary Marxism in this great epoch and that it is the theory and policy of proletarian revolution and

proletarian dictatorship is also irrefutable, because it is precisely Leninism that exposed the contradictions in our great epoch—the contradictions between the working class and monopoly capital, the contradictions among the imperialist countries, the contradictions between the colonial and semi-colonial peoples and imperialism, and the contradictions between the socialist countries, where the proletariat has triumphed, and the imperialist countries. Leninism has, therefore, become our banner of victory. Contrary, however, to this series of revolutionary Marxist formulation, in the so-called “new epoch” of the Titos<sup>6</sup>, there is actually no imperialism, no proletarian revolution and, needless to say, no theory and policy of the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. In short, with them, the fundamental focal points of the class contradictions and class struggles of our epoch are nowhere to be seen, the fundamental questions of Leninism are missing and there is no Leninism.

The modern revisionists assert that in their so-called “new epoch,” because of the progress of science and technology, the “old conceptions” of Marx and Lenin are no longer applicable. Tito made the following assertion: “We are not dogmatists, for Marx and Lenin did not predict the rocket on the moon, atomic bombs and the great technical progress.” (From Tito’s speech in Zagreb, December 12, 1959.) Not dogmatists, that’s fine. Who want them to be dogmatists? But one can oppose dogmatism to defend Marxism-Leninism or one can actually oppose Marxism-Leninism in the name of opposing dogmatism. The Titos belong to the latter category. On the question of what effect



scientific and technological progress has on social development, there are people who hold incorrect views because they are not able to approach the question from the materialist viewpoint of history. This is understandable. But the modern revisionists, on the other hand, are deliberately creating confusion on this question in a vain attempt to make use of the progress in science and technology to throw Marxism-Leninism to the winds<sup>7</sup>.

In the past few years, the achievements of the Soviet Union in science and technology have been foremost in the world. These Soviet achievements are products of the Great October Revolution. These outstanding achievements mark a new era in man's conquest of nature and at the same time play a very important role in defending world peace. But, in the new conditions brought about by the development of modern technology, has the ideological system of Marxism-Leninism been shaken, as Tito says, by the "rocket on the moon, atomic bombs and the great technical progress" which Marx and Lenin "did not predict"? Can it be said that the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, social-historical outlook, moral outlook and other basic concepts have therefore become what they call stale "dogmas" and that the law of class struggle henceforth no longer holds good?

Marx and Lenin did not live to the present day, and of course could not see certain specific details of technological progress in the present-day world. But what, after all, does the development of natural science and the advance of technology augur for the capitalist system? Marx and Lenin held that this could only augur a new social revolution, but could certainly not augur the fading away of social revolution.