



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

● **精读** **6**

● 主 编：梅仁毅  
编 者：王立礼  
梁 泓

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

精 读 6

江苏工业学院图书馆  
藏书章

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 精读 6/杨立民总主编;梅仁毅主编. —北京:外语教学与研究出版社,2003

ISBN 7-5600-3776-3

I. 现… II. ①杨… ②梅… III. 英语—高等学校—教材 IV. H31

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2003)第 100045 号

出 版 人: 李朋义

责任编辑: 胡伟春

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: 北京市鑫霸印务有限公司

开 本: 787×1092 1/16

印 张: 16.25

版 次: 2003 年 12 月第 1 版 2005 年 9 月第 4 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 7-5600-3776-3

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

# 编者说明

本书为《现代大学英语》精读教材,全套六册,供大学本科一至三年级学生及水平相当的学习者使用。

精读课的地位和作用,历来为英语教学工作所公认。随着我国进一步的改革开放和对外语人才的要求的不断提高,它的重要性只会更加突出。但当前的确也存在商品经济所造成的浮躁、虚夸、急功近利,甚至投机取巧的社会心理对这门课的冲击,以及有关教材跟不上形势的情况。编写本书的目的就是希望能对解决这个问题做出我们微薄的贡献。

## 一、编写原则

在编写这套教材的过程中,编者努力遵循以下几条原则:

1. 尽量使这套教材具有内在的联系,做到由浅入深,循序渐进,前后呼应,一气呵成,避免突然的跳跃,重大的遗漏和无谓的颠倒重复。
2. 努力体现新大纲的精神,狠抓基本功的训练。
3. 立足于国内,努力吸取我国英语教学的经验,使教材充分反映中国学生学习英语的特殊规律和要求,同时引进国外的新思想、新方法、新技术。
4. 在涉及教学法的问题上,采取兼容并蓄的方针,承认真理的多元性和相对性。根据不同情况和不同目的,使用一切行之有效的方法。谨慎处理英语教学中的各种关系,吸取历史教训,克服片面性。尽量兼顾语言和文化,听说和读、写、译等各个方面,避免走极端。
5. 教材工作事关国家人才培养,必须有强烈的质量意识,必须从总体设计上以及编写的各个具体环节中,都脚踏实地,一丝不苟,力争出精品。

## 二、具体安排

在以上原则指导下,我们作了以下具体安排:

1. 确定教材的起点为已学过基本语法、词汇量达到 2100 左右的普通中学成绩较好的毕业生。虽然根据有的统计目前中学教材出现的词汇量远远超过此数,但我们考虑到词汇统计方法不同,应试教学影响短期内很难克服,以及专业外语对语言训练应有更高要求等方面,决定留下充分余地,把起点定在比较稳妥的位置上。

2. 确定了精读课三年的总体设想。

第一年(即第一、二册)的任务:大力盘活中学所学内容,具体包括:

- 1) 尽快帮助学生熟悉大学学习环境和自主学习方法;使学生养成良好的学习习惯;培养学生的独立学习能力;引导学生对学习内容的正确理解和分析鉴别;帮助学生使用英语释义词典及其他基本工具书。
- 2) 大力盘活中学所学,整顿提高学生的语音、语调和朗读技巧;通过大量练习,消化并提升中学所学的词汇和语法知识,使之成为语言交际的实际技能。针对应试教学的弊病,要



特别突出听、说、读、写的全面培养。

3) 扩大基本词汇 2000 词左右(其中 1500 词左右来自精读)。

4) 积极介绍各种新的语言现象,为完成下一年任务打下基础。

词汇方面,要开始介绍构词法,要通过练习介绍搭配、习惯用语、短语动词、动词用法模式、同义词、一词多义等等概念,并进行初步操练。

语法方面也要未雨绸缪,介绍一些新的语法项目,填补中学的空白。

第二年(即第三、四册)的任务:全面完成基础阶段的训练,具体包括:

1) 全面开展各项技能的训练。在继续抓紧听说的前提下,努力加强对写作和翻译能力的训练。指导学生进行广泛阅读。口语应由第一年的问答应对及简单复述过渡到较长的叙述、描写、以及初步的分析和辩论能力的培养上。

2) 借助构词法,大力扩充词汇。使总词汇量再增加 2000 左右,达到大纲要求的 6000 词左右的指标。加上各类派生词,为大量阅读开辟道路。

通过练习使学生掌握基础阶段重点词、结构词;常用的短语动词;基本的动词用法模式;常用的同义词、反义词;常用的可以含有多种用法的词;以及常用的词组、搭配、习惯用语。

3) 语法要做到三点:一是继续补上重要的缺项,对第一、二册虽已介绍但未曾操练的项目进行操练;二是继续狠狠抓住中国学生的弱项(如从句、分词、动名词、不定式和介词短语的句法作用;人、数、格、性等的一致;句子的连接;各种动词形态的恰当选择等等),要更加突出句法方面;三是要更加重视语法在交际中的实用功能,要按概念(如怎样表达因果关系、如何进行比较、如何起承转合等等)从另一种角度提升学生对语法的掌握和运用能力。

4) 全面提高学生独立工作能力,养成使用基本工具书(首先是英英词典)以及对教材内容进行分析、批判、评论的能力。

第三年(即第五、六册)的任务:在更高层次上提高阅读理解能力,接近实战要求,具体包括:

1) 通过教学,使学生懂得入门不等于已经成为合格的英语专门人才,要帮助学生看到基础阶段所学之不足,激发他们攀登英语高峰的雄心。

2) 要加强学生的阅读理解能力。首先要理解内容。由于这一阶段的教材题材更广,内容有相当的难度,这就要求学生认真领会、深入钻研、积极思维并学习进行有水平的分析评论。其次在语言背景方面也会有更大的挑战。因此需要帮助学生进一步学会解决难字、难句的困难。提高同义词辨义和英语释义的本领。

3) 大力增强学生的分析欣赏能力。分析欣赏能力本质上仍是一种理解能力。学生在这个阶段理解上的困难往往不在字面上的意思,而是在字里行间更深层的地方。因此要帮助他们理解幽默、讽刺、含蓄、夸张、比喻、象征等等各种修辞手段;熟悉各种写作技巧及方法。

4) 帮助学生学会使用各种高级工具书以及其他手段(包括上网)收集资料,解决难题。

5) 适当配合写作课和翻译课,指导学生的写作和翻译。



### 3. 精读课文

鉴于精读教材中课文的核心地位,我们在课文的选择上花了较大的工夫。为了筛选出六册书中 90 篇正课文和 60 篇副课文,我们仔细阅读了近 120 本美英课本、选集、读物,以及 120 期各类杂志和某些报纸,并对这些课文作了认真删节和改动,以符合我们对课文的严格要求。从语言角度说,我们要求每篇课文文字不仅规范,而且精彩;课文中必须有适当的词汇量(50 左右),以及有丰富的语言现象;它应该长度合理,难度适中(第一册 800—1200 词左右,第二册 1000—1400 词左右,第三册 1300—1600 词左右,第四册 1500—1800 词左右,第五、六册 1800—3000 词左右);它要适合朗读、模仿、复述、讨论等等训练的要求;此外还要尽量照顾作者国别的代表性,风格技巧的多样性,以及题材和体裁的一定比例(第一、二册故事和非故事体的比例大致三七开,以前者为主;第三、四册逐步由对半分倒三七;第五、六册大致保持第四册的比例);总体格调要尽量做到亦庄亦谐,严肃而不呆板,活泼而不轻浮。从内容方面说,我们的教材虽然不是史地、政治或社会文化读本,但我们十分重视它们的文化内涵和人文价值,重视它们思想上的潜移默化作用。我们在选择这些课文时尽量做到总体上比较全面地介绍西方文化,尽量结合新世纪人类面临的各种挑战和当今社会的各种热点,力求通过这些教材不仅使学生学到语言知识和技能,同时激发他们的心智,开阔他们的视野,培养他们独立思考的精神、分析批判的能力、实事求是的态度和理性思维的习惯。

### 4. 精心设计练习

精读教材中围绕课文设计的各种练习是精读教材的另一个极重要的部分,其重要性不亚于课文。练习设计不好,就无法体现各种技能训练的要求,教材的科学性就要落空,一套教材就失去了“半壁江山”。因此:

1) 为了编好练习,我们根据不同阶段的不同任务和要求,确定了各个阶段的题型和数量,从而避免了练习设计的随意性。以第一册为例,练习分预习和复习两个部分。题型包括口头和笔头及词汇和语法两个方面。练习总量大致为 15 个,按每个练习平均 5 分钟计算,供 70 分钟使用。围绕课文内容的问答题由浅入深,先是帮助学生抓大意,进一步帮助学生解决难点,最后要求学生熟练问答、复述、讨论。词汇练习体现了对搭配、重点词、短语动词、动词使用模式、常见句型,以及一词多义、同义词、反义词、同义词辨义等等的系统训练;语法分三部分,有对新项目的初步观察介绍、对重点项目的反复训练以及对诸如冠词、介词、动词形式等老大难问题的细水长流的复习。

2) 练习方式不拘一格,句型法、翻译法、交际法都予以采用。一切根据需要。

3) 练习设计既有比较机械的练习,以熟练掌握英语形式的变化,也有充分发挥学生主动性,有利于提高学生交际能力的比较灵活的练习。

4) 词汇与语法练习有分工又有配合,不截然分开。以第一册为例,介词与动词组成固定搭配的用法,通过词汇练习解决,而介词单独的用法,则放在语法练习之中;动名词作宾语的问题在词汇练习中按动词用法模式加以处理,而动名词的其他用法则由语法练习解决。

5) 各类练习的例句尽量做到语言规范,内容丰富,不仅有用,而且可诵可背,让学生爱不释手。





## 5. 其他

1) 本套教材每册 15 课(第五、六册每册 12 课),大致每周一课,加上考试复习,供一学期使用。

2) 所需时间大致为第一、二册每周 7 至 8 课时,加上必需的课外预习、复习和练习的时间;第三、四册每周需 6 至 7 课时,第五、六册每周需 4 至 5 课时。

3) 基础阶段增设副课文。语言不作要求。所包括的生词和其他语言现象不计入统计数字。

4) 第一、二册每课所附警句,以及第三、四册所附小诗,都供欣赏用,不作特殊处理和要求。

以上说明中有不少还仅仅是编者的愿望和设想,由于时间仓促和编者水平有限,实际成书距此还有相当距离。编者诚恳希望使用本书的教师不吝赐教。

感谢参与本书的八位同志。梅仁毅同志是我系美社教研室负责人,博士生导师,他的加盟完全是“友情出演”,他和文学教研室的教授王立礼同志曾参加过张汉熙教授主编的《高级英语》的编写,本书第五、六册自然非他们莫属(最近他们还增加了一位年轻有为的讲师梁泓同志)。徐克容同志也是文学教研室的教授,刚主编完一套全国高教英语自考教材,现在马不停蹄,和编者共同编写二、三、四册。负责编写第一、二册的四位同志当中,陆培敏教授是《大学英语基础教程》的编者之一;吴一安教授(博导)和周燕副教授是北京外国语大学中国外语教育研究中心的核心成员;晏小萍副教授则是我系语言学教研室成员。以上这些同志当中,有五位和本人一样,都已有 40 年左右的教龄,而且基本上没有脱离过第一线的教学。他(她)们都是在承担极为繁重的教学和科研任务的情况下,克服重重困难,完成这项任务的。对他们,本人在此表示衷心的感谢。

在此我还要感谢北京外国语大学和英语系领导以及外语教学与研究出版社的支持。感谢我系同仁的鼓励。感谢新西兰专家 Helen Wylie 和美国朋友 Julie Drew 为我们担任审校。感谢所有为我们提供素材的作家和出版商。感谢校内外所有为我们积累了丰富教学经验的师长和同仁们。感谢曾经以不同方式直接或间接帮助我们完成这套教材的所有朋友。

北京外国语大学英语系  
杨立民

## 补充说明

《现代大学英语》五、六册是本套教材的提高阶段,其使用对象为大学英语专业三、四年级学生、非英语专业研究生以及其他具有同等学历有志于钻研英语的外语工作者和爱好者。

这两册书的中心任务是要尽可能明显地提高读者的理解能力、分析批判能力和欣赏能力。为此,我们所选的文章,无论从内容到语言,都有明显的深度和难度,希望读者对这些名家作品细细品味。

为帮助读者更好地掌握名篇课文,我们在每篇文章前面都附有“导读”,提供必要的背景知识,以及其他与理解文章的含义和写作特点有关的要点,供读者参考。此外,注释的内容也比前几册更为丰富,每课还辅以能帮助读者更好地理解 and 欣赏原文的两套问题。关于课文详细的解释将在教师参考书中提供。

这两册书中的课文,长短不一,可以灵活处理。以每周四课时计算,大致每周一课,但有些篇章也可延长至一周半,甚至两周。因此,每册正课文只选十二篇,外加四篇供选择使用。

作为提高阶段的教材,五、六册不再安排系统的语音、语法、词汇等方面的基本功训练,提供词汇表的目的是避免读者查阅过多的生词。读者应学会判断,不必拘泥于个别生僻词语。

本册编者特别要感谢美国专家 John Blair 教授和 Pamela Collett 女士对书稿的审校,感谢 Elizabeth Schultz 教授为我们提供资料。编者还要感谢马立媛女士和仵圣奇先生在技术上的支持。

诚恳欢迎批评指正。

编者





# Acknowledgment

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

## Text A (Authors/Sources)

- Lesson 1 "How to Get the Poor off Our Conscience" by John Kenneth Galbraith, from *Harper's*, Nov. 1985.
- Lesson 2 "The Woods Were Tossing with Jewels" by Marie St. John, 1981.
- Lesson 3 "At War with the Planet" by Barry Commoner, from *Reading the Environment*, ed. by Melissa Walker, W. W. Norton & Company, 1994.
- Lesson 4 "Nettles" by Alice Munro, from *Hateship, Friendship, Courtship, Loveship, Marriage*, 2001.
- Lesson 5 "The One Against the Many" by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr.
- Lesson 6 "Death of a Pig" by E. B. White, from *The Norton Sampler*, 3rd Edition, ed. by Thomas Cooley, New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1985.
- Lesson 7 "Inaugural Address" by John F. Kennedy, from *Presidential Papers of President Kennedy*, United States Government Printing Office, 1961.
- Lesson 8 "A Rose for Emily" by William Faulkner, from *Collected Stories of William Faulkner*, 1977.
- Lesson 9 "The Bluest Eye (Excerpts)" by Toni Morrison, from *The Bluest Eye*, 1970.
- Lesson 10 "Notes on the English Character" by E. M. Forster, from *Abinger Harvest*, 1986.
- Lesson 11 "Beauty" by Scott Russell Sanders, from *Hunting for Hope*, 1998.

• Lesson 12 “The Hot Gates” by William Golding, 1965.

Optional Reading

Lesson 1 “On Going Home” by Joan Didion, from *Slouching Towards Bethlehem*, 1968.

Lesson 2 “Stranger in the Village” by James Baldwin, from *Notes of a Native Son*, Boston: Beacon, 1955.

Lesson 3 “A Visit to Camelot” by Diana Trilling, from *The Best American Essays 1998*, eds. by Cynthia Ozick and Robert Atwan, Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

Lesson 4 “The Pharmageddon Riddle: Did Monsanto just want more profits, or did it want to save the world?” by Michael Specter, from *The New Yorker*, Apr. 10, 2000.



# CONTENTS

Lesson One	How to Get the Poor off Our Conscience .....	1
Lesson Two	The Woods Were Tossing with Jewels .....	15
Lesson Three	At War with the Planet .....	29
Lesson Four	Nettles .....	43
Lesson Five	The One Against the Many.....	61
Lesson Six	Death of a Pig.....	75
Lesson Seven	Inaugural Address .....	91
Lesson Eight	A Rose for Emily .....	101
Lesson Nine	The Bluest Eye .....	119
Lesson Ten	Notes on the English Character .....	133
Lesson Eleven	Beauty .....	151
Lesson Twelve	The Hot Gates .....	169
Optional Reading		
Lesson One	On Going Home .....	183
Lesson Two	Stranger in the Village .....	193
Lesson Three	A Visit to Camelot .....	211
Lesson Four	The Pharmageddon Riddle: Did Monsanto just want more profits, or did it want to save the world?.....	231







# Lesson One

# How to Get the Poor off Our Conscience

John Kenneth Galbraith

## Guide to Reading

John Kenneth Galbraith is the Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics, Emeritus, at Harvard University. He is internationally known for his development of Keynesian and post-Keynesian economics as well as for his writing and his active involvement in American politics.

In 1958 Galbraith published *The Affluent Society*, which challenged the myth of the U. S. economy's reliance on the gross national product for its social stability, positing instead that consumers' taste for luxury goods dictated the economy's focus at the expense of the common welfare.

The title of this essay seems to suggest that Professor Galbraith is joining other philosophers and economists in trying to find a theory to get the poor off our conscience. This impression will not change until we come to the end of the essay and unless we have a firm grasp of the ironic tone of the writing.

In the essay, the author brings up five historical solutions for getting the poor off our conscience. He then concentrates on five current designs for getting the poor off our conscience. In presenting the historical solutions, the author is implicit in his criticism. However, he comes out into the open when he deals with the current designs. Galbraith does not mince words in criticizing Reagan's economic policy, especially his rocketing defense budget. Galbraith warns at the end of the essay "Civil discontent and its consequences do not come from contented people." He points out that to make the poor contented is in the interest of the big business.

Today the gaps in wealth between the rich and the poor in the United States have grown wider. According to a Federal Reserve report of Jan. 22, 2003, the difference in median net wealth between the 10% of families with the highest incomes and the 20% of families with the lowest incomes jumped 70% from 1998 through 2001. The median income of 2001 for the lowest 20% of families was \$39,900 while the median income for the highest 10% of families was \$169,600. Yet the Bush Administration is pushing through Congress a tax cut plan which will mainly benefit the high income families. Some economists predict that the implementation of the Bush tax cut plan will exacerbate the polarization in American society.

With this in mind, we will find Galbraith's essay still highly relevant and his insight





admirable. His warning is still valid for the Bush Administration.

Galbraith's writing is noted for its lucidity and persuasiveness. This is clearly evident in the current essay. His skillful employment of irony, from humorous irony to bitter satire, provides excellent examples for careful study.

## Text

- 1 I would like to reflect on one of the oldest of human exercises, the process by which over the years, and indeed over the centuries, we have undertaken to get the poor off our conscience.
- 2 Rich and poor have lived together, always uncomfortably and sometimes perilously, since the beginning of time. Plutarch was led to say: "An imbalance between the rich and poor is the oldest and most fatal ailment of republics." And the problems that arise from the continuing coexistence of affluence and poverty—and particularly the process by which good fortune is justified in the presence of the ill fortune of others—have been an intellectual preoccupation for centuries. They continue to be so in our own time.
- 3 One begins with the solution proposed in the Bible: the poor suffer in this world but are wonderfully rewarded in the next. Their poverty is a temporary misfortune: If they are poor and also meek, they eventually will inherit the earth. This is, in some ways, an admirable solution. It allows the rich to enjoy their wealth while envying the poor their future fortune.
- 4 Much, much later, in the twenty or thirty years following the publication in 1776 of *The Wealth of Nations*—the late dawn of the Industrial Revolution in Britain—the problem and its solution began to take on their modern form. Jeremy Bentham, a near contemporary of Adam Smith, came up with the formula that for perhaps fifty years was extraordinarily influential in British and, to some degree, American thought. This was utilitarianism. "By the principle of utility," Bentham said in 1789, "is meant the principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question." Virtue is, indeed must be, self-centered. While there were people with great good fortune and many more with great ill fortune, the social problem was solved as long as, again in Bentham's words, there was "the greatest good for the greatest number". Society did its best for the largest possible number of people; one accepted that the result might be sadly unpleasant for the many whose happiness was not served.
- 5 In the 1830s a new formula, influential in no slight degree to this day, became available for getting the poor off the public conscience. This is associated with the

names of David Ricardo, a stockbroker, and Thomas Robert Malthus, a divine. The essentials are familiar: The poverty of the poor was the fault of the poor. And it was so because it was a product of their excessive fecundity: Their grievously uncontrolled lust caused them to breed up to the full limits of the available subsistence.

This was Malthusianism. Poverty being caused in the end meant that the rich were not responsible for either its creation or its amelioration. However, Malthus was himself not without a certain feeling of responsibility: He urged that the marriage ceremony contain a warning against undue and irresponsible sexual intercourse—a warning, it is fair to say, that has not been accepted as a fully effective method of birth control. In more recent times, Ronald Reagan has said that the best form of population control emerges from the market. (Couples in love should repair to R. H. Macy's, not their bedrooms.) Malthus, it must be said, was at least as relevant.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, a new form of denial achieved great influence, especially in the United States. The new doctrine, associated with the name of Herbert Spencer, was Social Darwinism. In economic life, as in biological development, the overriding rule was survival of the fittest. That phrase—"survival of the fittest"—came, in fact, not from Charles Darwin but from Spencer, and expressed his view of economic life. The elimination of the poor is nature's way of improving the race. The weak and unfortunate being extruded, the quality of the human family is thus strengthened.

One of the most notable American spokespersons of Social Darwinism was John D. Rockefeller—the first Rockefeller—who said in a famous speech: "The American Beauty Rose can be produced in the splendor and fragrance which bring cheer to its beholder only by sacrificing the early buds which grow up around it. And so is it in economic life. It is merely the working out of a law of nature and a law of God."

In the course of the present century, however, Social Darwinism came to be considered a bit too cruel. It declined in popularity, and references to it acquired a condemnatory tone. We passed on to the more amorphous denial of poverty associated with Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover. They held that public assistance to the poor interfered with the effective operation of the economic system—that such assistance was inconsistent with the economic design that had come to serve most people very well. The notion that there is something economically damaging about helping the poor remains with us to this day as one of the ways by which we get them off our conscience.

With the Roosevelt revolution, a specific responsibility was assumed by the government for the least fortunate people in the republic. Roosevelt and the presidents who followed him accepted a substantial measure of responsibility for the old through Social Security, for the unemployed through unemployment insurance, for the unemployable and the handicapped through direct relief, and for the sick through



Medicare and Medicaid. This was a truly great change, and for a time, the age-old tendency to avoid thinking about the poor gave way to the feeling that we did not need to try—that we were, indeed, doing something about them.

11 In recent years, however, it has become clear that the search for a way of getting the poor off our conscience was not at an end; it was only suspended. And so we are now again engaged in this search in a highly energetic way. It has again become a major philosophical, literary, and rhetorical preoccupation, and an economically not unrewarding enterprise.

30 Of the four, maybe five, current designs we have to get the poor off our conscience, the first proceeds from the inescapable fact that most of the things that must be done on behalf of the poor must be done in one way or another by the government. It is then argued that the government is inherently incompetent, except as regards weapons design and procurement and the overall management of the Pentagon. Being incompetent and ineffective, it must not be asked to succor the poor; it will only louse things up or make things worse.

10 The allegation of government incompetence is associated in our time with the general condemnation of the bureaucrat—again excluding those concerned with national defense. The only form of discrimination that is still permissible—that is, still officially encouraged in the United States today—is discrimination against people who work for the federal government, especially on social welfare activities. We have great corporate bureaucracies replete with corporate bureaucrats, but they are good; only public bureaucracy and government servants are bad. In fact, we have in the United States an extraordinarily good public service—one made up of talented and dedicated people who are overwhelmingly honest and only rarely given to overpaying for monkey wrenches, flashlights, coffee makers, and toilet seats. (When these aberrations have occurred, they have, oddly enough, all been in the Pentagon.) We have nearly abolished poverty among the old, greatly democratized health care, assured minorities of their civil rights, and vastly enhanced educational opportunity. All this would seem a considerable achievement for incompetent and otherwise ineffective people. We must recognize that the present condemnation of government and government administration is really part of the continuing design for avoiding responsibility for the poor.

10 The second design in this great centuries-old tradition is to argue that any form of public help to the poor only hurts the poor. It destroys morale. It seduces people away from gainful employment. It breaks up marriages, since women can seek welfare for themselves and their children once they are without their husbands.

10 There is no proof of this—none, certainly, that compares that damage with the damage that would be inflicted by the loss of public assistance. Still, the case is made—and believed—that there is something gravely damaging about aid to the unfortunate.



This is perhaps our most highly influential piece of fiction.

The third, and closely related, design for relieving ourselves of responsibility for the poor is the argument that public-assistance measures have an adverse effect on incentive. They transfer income from the diligent to the idle and feckless, thus reducing the effort of the diligent and encouraging the idleness of the idle. The modern manifestation of this is supply-side economics. Supply-side economics holds that the rich in the United States have not been working because they have too little income. So, by taking money from the poor and giving it to the rich, we increase effort and stimulate the economy. Can we really believe that any considerable number of the poor prefer welfare to a good job? Or that business people—corporate executives, the key figures in our time—are idling away their hours because of the insufficiency of their pay? This is a scandalous charge against the American businessperson, notably a hard worker. Belief can be the servant of truth—but even more of convenience.

The fourth design for getting the poor off our conscience is to point to the presumed adverse effect on freedom of taking responsibility for them. Freedom consists of the right to spend a maximum of one's money by one's own choice, and to see a minimum taken and spent by the government. (Again, expenditure on national defense is excepted.) In the enduring words of Professor Milton Friedman, people must be “free to choose”.

This is possibly the most transparent of all of the designs: No mention is ordinarily made of the relation of income to the freedom of the poor. (Professor Friedman is here an exception; through the negative income tax, he would assure everyone a basic income.) There is, we can surely agree, no form of oppression that is quite so great, no constriction on thought and effort quite so comprehensive, as that which comes from having no money at all. Though we hear much about the limitation on the freedom of the affluent when their income is reduced through taxes, we hear nothing of the extraordinary enhancement of the freedom of the poor from having some money of their own to spend. Yet the loss of freedom from taxation to the rich is a small thing as compared with the gain in freedom from providing some income to the impoverished. Freedom we rightly cherish. Cherishing it, we should not use it as a cover for denying freedom to those in need.

Finally, when all else fails, we resort to simple psychological denial. This is a psychic tendency that in various manifestations is common to us all. It causes us to avoid thinking about death. It causes a great many people to avoid thought of the arms race and the consequent rush toward a highly probable extinction. By the same process of psychological denial, we decline to think of the poor. Whether they be in Ethiopia, the South Bronx, or even in such an Elysium as Los Angeles, we resolve to keep them off our minds. Think, we are often advised, of something pleasant.

