

Mc
Graw
Hill
Education



(美) KURT FINSTERBUSCH 编

TAKING SIDES 立场

辩证思维训练

社会篇

CLASHING VIEWS ON
SOCIAL ISSUES

17th
edition

Mc
Graw
Hill

TAKING SIDES 立场

辩证思维训练

社会篇

17TH 第17版
EDITION

CLASHING VIEWS ON
SOCIAL ISSUES

(美) KURT FINSTERBUSCH 编

外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

北京 BEIJING

京权图字: 01-2014-1991

Finsterbuch, Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Social Issues, 17e
ISBN: 0-07-805033-2
Copyright © 2013 by McGraw-Hill Education.

All Rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including without limitation photocopying, recording, taping, or any database, information or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

This authorized English Abridgement is jointly published by McGraw-Hill Education (Asia) and Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. This edition is authorized for sale in the People's Republic of China only, excluding Hong Kong SAR, Macao SAR and Taiwan.

Copyright © 2014 by McGraw-Hill Education (Asia), a division of McGraw-Hill Education (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. and Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

版权所有。未经出版人事先书面许可，对本出版物的任何部分不得以任何方式或途径复制或传播，包括但不限于复印、录制、录音，或通过任何数据库、信息或可检索的系统。

本授权英文影印删减版由麦格劳-希尔（亚洲）教育出版公司和外语教学与研究出版社合作出版。此版本经授权仅限在中华人民共和国境内（不包括香港特别行政区、澳门特别行政区和台湾）销售。

版权 ©2014 由麦格劳-希尔（亚洲）教育出版公司与外语教学与研究出版社所有。

本书封面贴有 McGraw-Hill Education 公司防伪标签，无标签者不得销售。

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

立场：辩证思维训练·社会篇：第17版：英文 / (美) 芬斯特布施 (Finsterbuch, K.) 编. — 北京：外语教学与研究出版社，2014.5
ISBN 978-7-5135-4438-2

I. ①立… II. ①芬… III. ①英语—语言读物 IV. ①H319.4

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2014) 第 091147 号

出版人 蔡剑峰
责任编辑 刘佳 蒲瑶
封面设计 覃一彪
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 三河市北燕印装有限公司
开本 650×980 1/16
印张 17
版次 2014 年 5 月第 1 版 2014 年 5 月第 1 次印刷
书号 ISBN 978-7-5135-4438-2
定价 42.00 元

购书咨询：(010) 88819929 电子邮箱：club@fltrp.com
外研书店：<http://www.fltrpstore.com>
凡印刷、装订质量问题，请联系我社印制部
联系电话：(010) 61207896 电子邮箱：zhijian@fltrp.com
凡侵权、盗版书籍线索，请联系我社法律事务部
举报电话：(010) 88817519 电子邮箱：banquan@fltrp.com
法律顾问：立方律师事务所 刘旭东律师
中咨律师事务所 殷斌律师
物料号：244380001



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 on SOCIAL ISSUES

Seventeenth Edition

EDITOR

Kurt Finsterbusch

University of Maryland

ACADEMIC ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Pamela Altman

Georgia Southern University

Janet Armitage

St. Mary's University

David N. Baker

University of Toledo

Carole Campbell

*California State
University—Long Beach*

Rod Carveth

*Three Rivers Community
College*

Tamara Cheshire

Sacramento City College

Elizabeth F. Cohen

Syracuse University

**Christopher Lee
Coleman**

St. Joseph's College

Andrea L. Fallenstein

Gonzaga University

Even Gorelick

Strayer University

Michele Hax

*Community College of
Baltimore County, Dundalk*

Neil Johnson

Aspen University

Elizabeth Jones

*California University of
Pennsylvania*

Rosalind Kopfstein

*Western Connecticut State
University*

Leslie C. Lamb

*Farmingdale State
College*

Celia Lo

University of Alabama

Barbara Lucas

University of Indianapolis

Wendy Parker

*Albany College of
Pharmacy*

Peter Phipps

*Dutchess Community
College*

Rebecca Riehm

*Jefferson Community
College*

Jesse Rogers

*Texas State University—
San Marcos*

Paulina Ruf

Lenoir-Rhyne University

**Fortunata Songora
Makene**

Worcester State College

Russ Ward

*Maysville Community &
Technical College*



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寺宫滔滔激辩的场景,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“国土”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，自己在这领域的知识结构已搭建得初具规模。摆在面前的课题往往庞大空疏，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，无论篇幅长短，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，到写毕业论文时暴露无疑：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级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。如果有至少两种具有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”。由常人变，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。



Topic Guide

This topic guide suggests how the selections in this book relate to the subjects covered in your course. You may want to use the topics listed on these pages to search the Web more easily. On the following pages a number of websites have been gathered specifically for this book. They are arranged to reflect the units of this *Taking Sides* reader. You can link to these sites by going to www.mhhe.com/cis/. All the articles that relate to each topic are listed below the bold-faced term.

Biology

5. Should Biotechnology Be Used to Alter and Enhance Humans?

Business

6. Is Street Crime More Harmful Than White-Collar Crime?

Crime

6. Is Street Crime More Harmful Than White-Collar Crime?

Drugs

7. Should Laws Against Drug Use Remain Restrictive?

Economics

3. Is the Gender Wage Gap Justified?
10. Is Economic Globalization Good for Both Rich and Poor?

Environment

9. Is Humankind Dangerously Harming the Environment?

Gender

2. Should Same-Sex Marriages Be Legally Recognized?
3. Is the Gender Wage Gap Justified?

Government/Politics

1. Does the Media Have a Liberal Bias?

Legal Issues

2. Should Same-Sex Marriages Be Legally Recognized?
7. Should Laws Against Drug Use Remain Restrictive?

Media

1. Does the Media Have a Liberal Bias?

Poverty

4. Was the Welfare Reform the Right Approach to Poverty?

Science

5. Should Biotechnology Be Used to Alter and Enhance Humans?

Technology

5. Should Biotechnology Be Used to Alter and Enhance Humans?

Welfare

4. Was the Welfare Reform the Right Approach to Poverty?

Torture

8. Is Torture Ever Justified?



Introduction

Debating Social Issues

Kurt Finsterbusch

What Is Sociology?

"I have become a problem to myself," St. Augustine said. Put into a social and secular framework, St. Augustine's concern marks the starting point of sociology. We have become a problem to ourselves, and it is sociology that seeks to understand the problem and, perhaps, to find some solutions. The subject matter of sociology, then, is ourselves—people interacting with one another in groups and organizations.

Although the subject matter of sociology is very familiar, it is often useful to look at it in an unfamiliar light, one that involves a variety of theories and perceptual frameworks. In fact, to properly understand social phenomena, it *should* be looked at from several different points of view. In practice, however, this may lead to more friction than light, especially when each view proponent says, "I am right and you are wrong," rather than, "My view adds considerably to what your view has shown."

Sociology, as a science of society, was developed in the nineteenth century. Auguste Comte (1798–1857), the French mathematician and philosopher who is considered to be the father of sociology, had a vision of a well-run society based on social science knowledge. Sociologists (Comte coined the term) would discover the laws of social life and then determine how society should be structured and run. Society would not become perfect, because some problems are intractable, but he believed that a society guided by scientists and other experts was the best possible society.

Unfortunately, Comte's vision was extremely naive. For most matters of state there is no one best way of structuring or doing things that sociologists can discover and recommend. Instead, sociologists debate more social issues than they resolve.

The purpose of sociology is to throw light on social issues and their relationship to the complex, confusing, and dynamic social world around us. It seeks to describe how society is organized and how individuals fit into it. But neither the organization of society nor the fit of individuals is perfect. Social disorganization is a fact of life—at least in modern, complex societies

such as the one we live in. Here, perfect harmony continues to elude us, and “social problems” are endemic. The very institutions, laws, and policies that produce benefits also produce what sociologists call “unintended effects”—unintended and undesirable. The changes that please one sector of the society may displease another, or the changes that seem so indisputably healthy at first turn out to have a dark underside to them. The examples are endless. Modern urban life gives people privacy and freedom from snooping neighbors that the small town never afforded; yet that very privacy seems to breed an uneasy sense of anonymity and loneliness. Take another example: Hierarchy is necessary for organizations to function efficiently, but hierarchy leads to the creation of a ruling elite. Flatten out the hierarchy and you may achieve social equality—but at the price of confusion, incompetence, and low productivity.

This is not to say that all efforts to effect social change are ultimately futile and that the only sound view is the tragic one that concludes “nothing works.” We can be realistic without falling into despair. In many respects, the human condition has improved over the centuries and has improved as a result of conscious social policies. But improvements are purchased at a price—not only a monetary price but one involving human discomfort and discontent. The job of policymakers is to balance the anticipated benefits against the probable costs.

It can never hurt policymakers to know more about the society in which they work or the social issues they confront. That, broadly speaking, is the purpose of sociology. It is what this book is about. This volume examines issues that are central to the study of sociology.

Culture and Values

A common value system is the major mechanism for integrating a society, but modern societies contain so many different groups with differing ideas and values that integration must be built as much on tolerance of differences as on common values. Furthermore, technology and social conditions change, so values must adjust to new situations, often weakening old values. Some people (often called *conservatives*) will defend the old values. Others (often called *liberals*) will make concessions to allow for change. For example, the protection of human life is a sacred value to most people, but some would compromise that value when the life involved is a 90-year-old comatose man on life-support machines, who had signed a document indicating that he did not want to be kept alive under those conditions. The conservative would counter that once we make the value of human life relative, we become dangerously open to greater evils—that perhaps society will come to think it acceptable to terminate all sick, elderly people

undergoing expensive treatments. This is only one example of how values are hotly debated today.

A debate on values is presented in Issue 1. It examines a major institution that can be seen as responsible for instilling values and culture in people—the media. This issue focuses in particular on whether the news reporters and anchorpersons report and comment on the news with professional objectivity and relatively bias free. Fred Barnes argues that the major news outlets are liberal and hire liberal journalists. The selection and reporting of news, therefore, has a liberal bias. In contrast, Robert F. Kennedy Jr. counters that most people get their news from conservative sources and believe many conservative myths as a result.

Sex Roles, Gender, and the Family

An area that has experienced tremendous value change in the last several decades is sex roles and the family. Women in large numbers have rejected major aspects of their traditional gender roles and family roles while remaining strongly committed to much of the mother role and to many feminine characteristics. Men have changed much less, but their situation has changed considerably. . . . Issue 2 debates whether same-sex marriages should be legal. The Human Rights Campaign presents all the arguments in its favor and Peter Sprigg presents all the arguments against it.

Stratification and Inequality

Issue 3 deals with the gender wage gap. Why do full-time women workers make only 72 percent of men measured by median income? J. R. Shackleton argues that the wage gap is justified because it is the outcome of women's free choices. To have time and energy to be good mothers and housewives, many of them seek less demanding jobs. Hilary M. Lips rejects the supposition that women's choices cause the gap but blames it largely on discrimination, prejudice, and stereotypes.

Political Economy and Institutions

The United States is a capitalist welfare state, and the role of the state in capitalism (more precisely, the market) and in welfare is examined in the next issue. Issue 4 debates the wisdom of the Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, which ended Aid to Families with Dependent Children (which was what most people equated with welfare). David Coates presents the argument that the welfare reform was a great success because it greatly reduced welfare rolls and dramatically increased the employment of welfare

mothers. Stephanie Mencimer tells a different story. She documents the horrible way welfare is administered in many states. Many welfare workers deny many benefits to many people who qualify for welfare. Thus, many welfare benefits do not reach the poor.

The fifth issue deals with a set of concerns about the use of present and soon-to-emerge biotechnologies. The value of biotechnologies for healing people is accepted by all. Issue 5, however, debates their use to alter and enhance humans. The President's Council on Bioethics describes how biotechnologies could improve the genes of babies and enhance everyone. The arguments against such practices are presented by Michael Sandel.

Crime and Social Control

Crime is interesting to sociologists because crimes are those activities that society makes illegal and will use force to stop. Why are some acts made illegal and others (even those that may be more harmful) not made illegal? Surveys indicate that concern about crime is extremely high in America. Is the fear of crime, however, rightly placed? Americans fear mainly street crime, but Jeffrey Reiman argues in Issue 6 that corporate crime—also known as “white-collar crime”—causes far more death, harm, and financial loss to Americans than does street crime. In contrast, David A. Anderson calculates the full costs of crime, both direct and indirect, and concludes that the costs of murder and theft far exceed the cost of white-collar crime. These contradictory findings result from differing definitions of white-collar crime. A prominent aspect of the crime picture is the illegal drug trade. It has such bad consequences that some people are seriously talking about legalizing drugs in order to kill the illegal drug business. In Issue 7, Herbert Kleber and Joseph Califano disagree. They think that drug laws should remain restrictive because legalization would result in increased use, especially by children. They contend that drug legalization would not eliminate drug-related violence but would increase the harm caused by drugs. Peter Gorman thinks that the drug laws are harmful and should be repealed. Restrictive drug laws have been ineffective. He notes that drug use and drug addiction have increased since drug laws became more stringent. Despite the crackdown on drug use, the availability of drugs has increased while the cost of drugs has decreased. In addition, restrictive drug laws, says Gorman, are racist and endanger civil liberties.

Issue 8 takes up the current debate about torture. When national interest is threatened, is torture justified? The Bush administration thought so but argued that the torture that they used was not torture. According to Bagaric and Clarke, the Bush administration is not unique. Most nations use

torture when needed. Their justification is that torture is needed to prevent great harm. Philip E. Devine argues that torture is wrong and the end does not justify evil means.

The Future: Population/Environment/Society

Many social commentators speculate on “the fate of the earth.” Issue 9 on the state of the planet addresses this concern. Some environmentalists view the future in apocalyptic terms. They see the possibility that the human race could degrade the environment to the point that population growth and increasing economic production could overshoot the carrying capacity of the globe. The resulting collapse could lead to the extinction of much of the human race and the end of free societies. Other analysts believe that these fears are groundless. In Issue 9, Lester R. Brown shows how human actions are degrading the environment in ways that adversely affect humans. In contrast, Bjørn Lomborg argues that the environment is improving in many ways and that environmental problems are manageable or will have only mildly adverse effects.

Issue 10 assesses the benefits and costs of globalization. Staff members of the International Monetary Fund examine the effects of globalization and conclude that economic globalization contributes greatly to world prosperity. Ravinder Rena disagrees. Globalization does produce many benefits but also produces many negative impacts. The poor and poorer countries are the most harmed by globalization, so it should be restrained.

The Social Construction of Reality

An important idea in sociology is that people construct social reality in the course of interaction by attaching social meanings to the reality they are experiencing and then responding to those meanings. Two people can walk down a city street and derive very different meanings from what they see around them. Both, for example, may see homeless people—but they may see them in different contexts. One fits them into a picture of once-vibrant cities dragged into decay and ruin because of permissive policies that have encouraged pathological types to harass citizens; the other observer fits them into a picture of an America that can no longer hide the wretchedness of its poor. Both feel that they are seeing something deplorable, but their views of what makes it deplorable are radically opposed. Their differing views of what they have seen will lead to very different prescriptions for what should be done about the problem.

The social construction of reality is an important idea for this book because each author is socially constructing reality and working hard to

persuade you to see his or her point of view, that is, to see the definition of the situation and the set of meanings he or she has assigned to the situation. In doing this, each author presents a carefully selected set of facts, arguments, and values. The arguments contain assumptions or theories, some of which are spelled out and some of which are unspoken. The critical reader has to judge the evidence for the facts, the logic and soundness of the arguments, the importance of the values, and whether or not omitted facts, theories, and values invalidate the thesis. This book facilitates this critical thinking process by placing authors in opposition. This puts the reader in the position of critically evaluating two constructions of reality for each issue instead of one.

Conclusion

Writing in the 1950s, a period that was in some ways like our own, the sociologist C. Wright Mills said that Americans know a lot about their “troubles” but they cannot make the connections between seemingly personal concerns and the concerns of others in the world. If they could only learn to make those connections, they could turn their concerns into *issues*. An issue transcends the realm of the personal. According to Mills, “An issue is a public matter: some value cherished by publics is felt to be threatened. Often there is a debate about what the value really is and what it is that really threatens it.” It is not primarily personal troubles but social issues that I have tried to present in this book. The variety of topics in it can be taken as an invitation to discover what Mills called “the sociological imagination.” This imagination, said Mills, “is the capacity to shift from one perspective to another—from the political to the psychological; from examination of a single family to comparative assessment of the national budgets of the world. . . . It is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self—and to see the relations between the two.” This book, with a range of issues well suited to the sociological imagination, is intended to enlarge that capacity.





Contents

导读 英语思辨, 攻错他山 朱绩崧 v

Topic Guide xiii

Introduction xiv

Issue 1. Does the Media Have a Liberal Bias? 1

YES: Fred Barnes, from "Is the Mainstream Media Fair and Balanced?" *Imprimis* (August 2006)

NO: Robert F. Kennedy Jr., from "The Disinformation Society," *Crimes Against Nature* (Harper Perennial, 2005)

Fred Barnes, journalist, executive editor of *The Weekly Standard* and TV commentator, argues that the mainstream media has a pronounced liberal bias. They do not hire conservatives, and an analysis of specific news stories shows their bias. Robert F. Kennedy Jr., environmentalist and political activist, agrees with Barnes that the media is biased but believes that it has a conservative bias. Surveys show that most Americans have many false beliefs that are fed to them by conservative talk radio shows and other conservative media outlets. Many media owners are very conservative and stifle investigative reporting.

Issue 2. Should Same-Sex Marriages Be Legally Recognized? 24

YES: Human Rights Campaign, from "Answers to Questions about Marriage Equality," *Human Rights Campaign Report* (Human Rights Campaign, 2009)

NO: Peter Sprigg, from "Questions and Answers: What's Wrong with Letting Same-Sex Couples 'Marry'?" *Family Research Council* (2004)

America's largest lesbian and gay organization, the Human Rights Campaign, presents many arguments for why same-sex couples should be able to marry. The main argument is fairness. Marriage confers many benefits that same-sex couples are deprived of. Researcher Peter Sprigg presents many arguments for why same-sex couples should not be able to marry. The main argument is that the state has the right and duty to specify who a person, whether straight or gay, can marry, so no rights are violated.

Issue 3. Is the Gender Wage Gap Justified? 45

YES: J. R. Shackleton, from "Explaining the Overall Pay Gap" in *Should We Mind the Gap? Gender Pay Differentials and Public Policy* (Institute of Economic Affairs, 2008)

NO: Hilary M. Lips, from "The Gender Wage Gap: Debunking the Rationalizations" and "Blaming Women's Choices for the Gender Pay Gap," *Expert Advice for Working Women*, www.womensmedia.com (2009)

J. R. Shackleton, a professor of economics and dean of the Royal Docks Business School at the University of East London, argues that the gender wage gap is not largely due to discrimination. It is largely due to the differential value of male and female workers in the employment market. Employers want profits, so they pay differently for different skills, commitment, and performance, and women choose less profitable training and limit their commitment. Hilary M. Lips, professor and chair of psychology and director of the Center for Gender Studies at Radford University, documents the continuing gender gap in wages and blames it largely on discrimination based on stereotypes and prejudice.

Issue 4. Was the Welfare Reform the Right Approach to Poverty? 65

YES: David Coates, from "Cutting 'Welfare' to Help the Poor," *A Liberal Toolkit: Progressive Responses to Conservative Arguments* (Praeger, 2007)

NO: Stephanie Mencimer, from "Brave New Welfare," *Mother Jones* (January/February 2009)

David Coates presents the argument for welfare reform, which is that most poverty is self-induced; the previous welfare program created poverty and many other problems; and the reform reduces poverty, improves the lives of the people who left welfare, and solves other problems. Stephanie Mencimer, staff reporter for *Mother Jones*, does not denigrate the current welfare law but documents the horrible way welfare is administered in many states. Many welfare workers deny many benefits to many people who qualify for welfare. Thus, many welfare benefits do not reach the poor.

Issue 5. Should Biotechnology Be Used to Alter and Enhance Humans? 90

YES: President's Council on Bioethics, from *Beyond Therapy: Biotechnology and the Pursuit of Happiness* (October 2003)

NO: Michael J. Sandel, from "The Case Against Perfection: Ethics in the Age of Genetic Engineering," *The Atlantic Monthly* (April 2004)

The President's Council on Bioethics was commissioned by George Bush to report to him their findings about the ethical issues involved in the uses of biotechnology. Included in this selection are the expected positive benefits from the biotechnologies that are on the horizon. Political science professor Michael J. Sandel was on the President's Council on Bioethics but presents his private view in this selection, which is very cautionary on the use of biotechnology to alter and enhance humans. Many other uses of biotechnology he praises, but he condemns using biotechnology to alter and enhance humans. In these activities, humans play God and attempt inappropriate remaking of nature.