

于杉老师考研英语零基础速成考前拯救班系列课程

2019 考研英语押题班（千百次锦上添花，不如一次雪中送炭!!!）

（英语一与英语二阅读） 上课时间【英语一 12.19 下午 2 点】



考研英语于杉老师微博



上课地址

前言：

考研英语于杉老师，启航考研高端集训主讲老师，模考命题人兼阅卷组长，拥有 10 年考研英语辅导经验，授课风格亲切生动、朴实流畅，讲授技巧直击痛点、简洁实用，研究命题一针见血、直达规律，极具亲和力，深受万千学子喜爱。

考研届唯一擅长词汇、语法长难句、阅读、写作、完型、新题型、翻译等所有模块全讲的老师，是新生代中青派中少有的精通英语一和英语二的老师之一。其中于杉老师独创五三八语法结构深受历届学子所于追捧，擅长精讲真题阅读，词汇句法融会贯通，阅读技巧一点通，新题型方法保六分争八分，真题作文出题规律精通把握，连续五年押中考研英语大小作文。

2018 □

Among the annoying challenges facing the middle class is one that will probably go unmentioned in the next presidential campaign: What happens when the robots come for their jobs?

Don't dismiss that possibility entirely. About half of U.S. jobs are at high risk of being automated, according to a University of Oxford study, with the middle class disproportionately squeezed. Lower-income jobs like gardening or day care don't appeal to robots. But many middle-class occupations—trucking, financial advice, software engineering — have aroused their interest, or soon will. The rich own the robots, so they will be fine.

This isn't to be alarmist. Optimists point out that technological upheaval has benefited workers in the past. The Industrial Revolution didn't go so well for Luddites whose jobs were displaced by mechanized looms, but it eventually raised living standards and created more jobs than it destroyed. Likewise, automation should eventually boost productivity, stimulate demand by driving down prices, and free workers from hard, boring work. But in the medium term, middle-class workers may need a lot of help adjusting.

The first step, as Erik Brynjolfsson and Andrew McAfee argue in *The Second Machine Age*, should be rethinking education and job training. Curriculums —from grammar school to college—should evolve to focus less on memorizing facts and more on creativity and complex communication. Vocational schools should do a better job of fostering problem-solving skills and helping students work alongside robots. Online education can supplement the traditional kind. It could make extra training and instruction affordable. Professionals trying to acquire new skills will be able to do so without going into debt.

The challenge of coping with automation underlines the need for the U.S. to revive its fading business dynamism: Starting new companies must be made easier. In previous eras of drastic technological change, entrepreneurs smoothed the transition by dreaming up ways to combine labor and machines. The best uses of 3D printers and virtual reality haven't been invented yet. The U.S. needs the new companies that will invent them.

Finally, because automation threatens to widen the gap between capital income and labor income, taxes and the safety net will have to be rethought. Taxes on low-wage labor need to be cut, and wage subsidies such as the earned income tax credit should be expanded: This would boost incomes, encourage work, reward companies for job creation, and reduce inequality.

Technology will improve society in ways big and small over the next few years, yet this will be little comfort to those who find their lives and careers upended by automation. Destroying the machines that are coming for our jobs would be nuts. But policies to help workers adapt will be indispensable.

Text 2

A new survey by Harvard University finds more than two-thirds of young Americans disapprove of President Trump's use of Twitter. The implication is that Millennials prefer news from the White House to be filtered through other source, Not a president's social media platform.

Most Americans rely on social media to check daily headlines. Yet as distrust has risen toward all media, people may be starting to beef up their media literacy skills. Such a trend is badly needed. During the 2016 presidential campaign, nearly a quarter of web content shared by

Twitter users in the politically critical state of Michigan was fake news, according to the University of Oxford. And a survey conducted for Buzz Feed News found 44 percent of Facebook users rarely or never trust news from the media giant.

Young people who are digital natives are indeed becoming more skillful at separating fact from fiction in cyberspace. A Knight Foundation focus-group survey of young people between ages 14 and 24 found they use “distributed trust” to verify stories. They cross-check sources and prefer news from different perspectives—especially those that are open about any bias. “Many young people assume a great deal of personal responsibility for educating themselves and actively seeking out opposing viewpoints,” the survey concluded.

Such active research can have another effect. A 2014 survey conducted in Australia, Britain, and the United States by the University of Wisconsin-Madison found that young people's reliance on social media led to greater political engagement.

Social media allows users to experience news events more intimately and immediately while also permitting them to re-share news as a projection of their values and interests. This forces users to be more conscious of their role in passing along information. A survey by Barna research group found the top reason given by Americans for the fake news phenomenon is “reader error,” more so than made-up stories or factual mistakes in reporting. About a third say the problem of fake news lies in “misinterpretation or exaggeration of actual news” via social media. In other words, the choice to share news on social media may be the heart of the issue. “This indicates there is a real personal responsibility in counteracting this problem,” says Roxanne Stone, editor in chief at Barna Group.

So when young people are critical of an over-tweeting president, they reveal a mental discipline in thinking skills – and in their choices on when to share on social media.

Text 3

Any fair-minded assessment of the dangers of the deal between Britain's National Health Service (NHS) and DeepMind must start by acknowledging that both sides mean well. DeepMind is one of the leading artificial intelligence (AI) companies in the world. The potential of this work applied to healthcare is very great, but it could also lead to further concentration of power in the tech giants. It is against that background that the information commissioner, Elizabeth Denham, has issued her damning verdict against the Royal Free hospital trust under the NHS, which handed over to DeepMind the records of 1.6 million patients in 2015 on the basis of a vague agreement which took far too little account of the patients' rights and their expectations of privacy.

DeepMind has almost apologized. The NHS trust has mended its ways. Further arrangements – and there may be many – between the NHS and DeepMind will be carefully scrutinised to ensure that all necessary permissions have been asked of patients and all unnecessary data has been cleaned. There are lessons about informed patient consent to learn. But privacy is not the only angle in this case and not even the most important. Ms. Denham chose to concentrate the blame on the NHS trust, since under existing law it “controlled” the data and DeepMind merely “processed” it. But this distinction misses the point that it is processing and aggregation, not the mere possession of bits, that gives the data value.

The great question is who should benefit from the analysis of all the data that our lives now generate. Privacy law builds on the concept of damage to an individual from identifiable knowledge about them. That misses the way the surveillance economy works. The data of an

individual there gains its value only when it is compared with the data of countless millions more.

The use of privacy law to curb the tech giants in this instance feels slightly maladapted. This practice does not address the real worry. It is not enough to say that the algorithms DeepMind develops will benefit patients and save lives. What matters is that they will belong to a private monopoly which developed them using public resources. If software promises to save lives on the scale that drugs now can, big data may be expected to behave as a big pharma has done. We are still at the beginning of this revolution and small choices now may turn out to have gigantic consequences later. A long struggle will be needed to avoid a future of digital feudalism. Ms. Denham's report is a welcome start.

英语二 2018 □

Text 3

The power and ambition of the giants of the digital economy is astonishing – Amazon has just announced the purchase of the upmarket grocery chain Whole Foods for \$13.5bn, but two years ago Facebook paid even more than that to acquire the WhatsApp messaging service, which doesn't have any physical product at all. What WhatsApp offered Facebook was an intricate and finely detailed web of its users' friendships and social lives.

Facebook promised the European commission then that it would not link phone numbers to Facebook identities, but it broke the promise almost as soon as the deal went through. Even without knowing what was in the messages, the knowledge of who sent them and to whom was enormously revealing and still could be. What political journalist, what party whip, would not want to know the makeup of the WhatsApp groups in which Theresa May's enemies are currently plotting? It may be that the value to Amazon is not so much the 460 shops it owns, but the records of which customers have purchased what.

Competition law appears to be the only way to address these imbalances of power. But it is clumsy. For one thing, it is very slow compared to the pace of change within the digital economy. By the time a problem has been addressed and remedied it may have vanished in the marketplace, to be replaced by new abuses of power. But there is a deeper conceptual problem, too. Competition law as presently interpreted deals with financial disadvantage to consumers and this is not obvious when the users of these services don't pay for them. The users of their services are not their customers. That would be the people who buy advertising from them – and Facebook and Google, the two virtual giants, dominate digital advertising to the disadvantage of all other media and entertainment companies.

The product they're selling is data, and we, the users, convert our lives to data for the benefit of the digital giants. Just as some ants farm the bugs called aphids for the honeydew they produce when they feed, so Google farms us for the data that our digital lives yield. Ants keep predatory insects away from where their aphids feed; Gmail keeps the spammers out of our inboxes. It doesn't feel like a human or democratic relationship, even if both sides benefit.

2017 □

Text 1

First two hours, now three hours—this is how far in advance authorities are recommending people show up to catch a domestic flight, at least at some major U.S. airports with increasingly

massive security lines.

Americans are willing to tolerate time-consuming security protocols in return for increased safety. The crash of Egypt Air Flight 804, which terrorists may have downed over the Mediterranean Sea, provides another tragic reminder of why. But demanding too much of air travelers or providing too little security in return undermines public support for the process. And it should: Wasted time is a drag on Americans' economic and private lives, not to mention infuriating.

Last year, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) found in a secret check that undercover investigators were able to sneak weapons—both fake and real—past airport security nearly every time they tried. Enhanced security measures since then, combined with a rise in airline travel due to the improving economy and low oil prices, have resulted in long waits at major airports such as Chicago's O'Hare International. It is not yet clear how much more effective airline security has become—but the lines are obvious.

Part of the issue is that the government did not anticipate the steep increase in airline travel, so the TSA is now rushing to get new screeners on the line. Part of the issue is that airports have only so much room for screening lanes. Another factor may be that more people are trying to overpack their carry-on bags to avoid checked-baggage fees, though the airlines strongly dispute this.

There is one step the TSA could take that would not require remodeling airports or rushing to hire: Enroll more people in the PreCheck program. PreCheck is supposed to be a win-win for travelers and the TSA. Passengers who pass a background check are eligible to use expedited screening lanes. This allows the TSA to focus on travelers who are higher risk, saving time for everyone involved. TSA wants to enroll 25 million people in PreCheck.

It has not gotten anywhere close to that, and one big reason is sticker shock: Passengers must pay \$85 every five years to process their background checks. Since the beginning, this price tag has been PreCheck's fatal flaw. Upcoming reforms might bring the price to a more reasonable level. But Congress should look into doing so directly, by helping to finance PreCheck enrollment or to cut costs in other ways.

The TSA cannot continue diverting resources into underused PreCheck lanes while most of the traveling public suffers in unnecessary lines. It is long past time to make the program work.

Text 4

In a rare unanimous ruling, the US Supreme Court has overturned the corruption conviction of a former Virginia governor, Robert McDonnell. But it did so while holding its nose at the ethics of his conduct, which included accepting gifts such as a Rolex watch and a Ferrari Automobile from a company seeking access to government.

The high court's decision said the judge in Mr. McDonnell's trial failed to tell a jury that it must look only at his "official acts," or the former governor's decisions on "specific" and "unsettled" issues related to his duties.

Merely helping a gift-giver gain access to other officials, unless done with clear intent to pressure those officials, is not corruption, the justices found.

The court did suggest that accepting favors in return for opening doors is "distasteful" and "nasty." But under anti-bribery laws, proof must be made of concrete benefits, such as approval of a contract or regulation. Simply arranging a meeting, making a phone call, or hosting an event is not an "official act."

The court's ruling is legally sound in defining a kind of favoritism that is not criminal. Elected leaders must be allowed to help supporters deal with bureaucratic problems without fear of prosecution of bribery. "The basic compact underlying representative government," wrote Chief Justice John Roberts for the court, "assumes that public officials will hear from their constituents and act on their concerns."

But the ruling reinforces the need for citizens and their elected representatives, not the courts, to ensure equality of access to government. Officials must not be allowed to play favorites in providing information or in arranging meetings simply because an individual or group provides a campaign donation or a personal gift. This type of integrity requires will-enforced laws in government transparency, such as records of official meetings, rules on lobbying, and information about each elected leader's source of wealth.

Favoritism in official access can fan public perceptions of corruption. But it is not always corruption. Rather officials must avoid double standards, or different types of access for average people and the wealthy. If connections can be bought, a basic premise of democratic society—that all are equal in treatment by government—is undermined. Good government rests on an understanding of the inherent worth of each individual.

The court's ruling is a step forward in the struggle against both corruption and official favoritism.

2017 年英语二

Text 4

Though often viewed as a problem for western states, the growing frequency of wildfires is a national concern because of its impact on federal tax dollars, says Professor Max Moritz, a specialist in fire ecology and management.

In 2015, the US Forest Service for the first time spent more than half of its \$5.5 billion annual budget fighting fires—nearly double the percentage it spent on such efforts 20 years ago. In effect, fewer federal funds today are going towards the agency's other work—such as forest conservation, watershed and cultural resources management, and infrastructure upkeep—that affect the lives of all Americans.

Another nationwide concern is whether public funds from other agencies are going into construction in fire-prone districts. As Moritz puts it, how often are federal dollars building homes that are likely to be lost to a wildfire?

"It's already a huge problem from a public expenditure perspective for the whole country," he says. "We need to take a magnifying glass to that. Like, 'Wait a minute, is this OK?' " "Do we want instead to redirect those funds to concentrate on lower-hazard parts of the landscape?"

Such a view would require a corresponding shift in the way US society today views fire, researchers say.

For one thing, conversations about wildfires need to be more inclusive. Over the past decade, the focus has been on climate change—how the warming of the Earth from greenhouse gases is leading to conditions that worsen fires.

While climate is a key element, Moritz says, it shouldn't come at the expense of the rest of the equation.

"The human systems and the landscapes we live on are linked, and the interactions go both ways," he says. Failing to recognize that, he notes, leads to "an overly simplified view of what the

solutions might be. Our perception of the problem and of what the solution is becomes very limited.”

At the same time, people continue to treat fire as an event that needs to be wholly controlled and unleashed only out of necessity, says Professor Balch at the University of Colorado. But acknowledging fire’s inevitable presence in human life is an attitude crucial to developing the laws, policies, and practices that make it as safe as possible, she says.

“We’ve disconnected ourselves from living with fire,” Balch says. “It is really important to understand and try and tease out what is the human connection with fire today.”

2016 □ □ □ □

France, which prides itself as the global innovator of fashion, has decided(that) its fashion industry has lost an absolute right to define physical beauty for woman. Its lawmakers gave preliminary approval (批准)last week to a law that would make it a crime to employ ultra-thin models on runways. The parliament also agreed to ban websites that “incite excessive thinness” by promoting extreme dieting.

Such measures have a couple of uplifting motives. They suggest beauty should not be defined by looks <that end up with >impinging on health. That’s a start. And the ban on ultra-thin models seems to go beyond protecting models from starving themselves to death –as some have done. It tells the fashion industry that it must take responsibility for the signal it sends women, especially teenage girls, about the social tape(标准) –measure they must use to determine their individual worth.

The bans, if fully enforced ,would suggest to women (and many men)that they should not let others be arbiters of their beauty .And perhaps faintly, they hint that people should look to intangible(无形的) qualities like character and intellect rather than dieting their way to sine zero or wasp-waist□ 蜂腰□ physiques .

The French measures, however, rely too much on severe punishment to change a culture <that still regards beauty as skin-deep-and bone-showing>. Under the law, using a fashion model that does not meet a government-defined index of body mass could result in a \$85,000 fine(罚款) and six months in prison.

The fashion industry knows it has an inherent problem in focusing on material adornment and idealized body types. In Denmark, the United States, and a few other countries, it is trying to set voluntary standard for models and fashion images there rely more on peer pressure for enforcement.

In contrast to France’s actions, Denmark’s fashion industry agreed last month on rules and sanctions regarding age, health, and other characteristics of models .The newly revised Danish Fashion Ethical charter clearly states, we are aware of and take responsibility for the impact< the fashion industry has on body ideals>, especially on young people. The charter’s main tool of enforcement is to deny access for designers and modeling agencies to Copenhagen Fashion week(CFW), which is run by the Danish Fashion Institute .But in general it relies on a name-and-shame method of compliance.

Relying on ethical persuasion rather than law to address□ 解决□ the misuse of body ideals may be the best step. Even better would be to help elevate notions of beauty beyond the material standards of a particular industry.

2015 年

Text 1

King Juan Carlos of Spain once insisted “kings don’t abdicate, they dare in their sleep.” But embarrassing scandals and the popularity of the republican left in the recent Euro-elections have forced him to eat his words and stand down. So, does the Spanish crisis suggest that monarchy is seeing its last days? Does that mean the writing is on the wall for all European royals, with their magnificent uniforms and majestic lifestyle?

The Spanish case provides arguments both for and against monarchy. When public opinion is particularly polarised, as it was following the end of the Franco regime, monarchs can rise above “mere” politics and “embody” a spirit of national unity.

It is this apparent transcendence of politics that explains monarchs’ continuing popularity polarized. And also, the Middle East excepted, Europe is the most monarch-infested region in the world, with 10 kingdoms (not counting Vatican City and Andorra). But unlike their absolutist counterparts in the Gulf and Asia, most royal families have survived because they allow voters to avoid the difficult search for a non-controversial but respected public figure.

Even so, kings and queens undoubtedly have a downside. Symbolic of national unity as they claim to be, their very history—and sometimes the way they behave today – embodies outdated and indefensible privileges and inequalities. At a time when Thomas Piketty and other economists are warning of rising inequality and the increasing power of inherited wealth, it is bizarre that wealthy aristocratic families should still be the symbolic heart of modern democratic states.

The most successful monarchies strive to abandon or hide their old aristocratic ways. Princes and princesses have day-jobs and ride bicycles, not horses (or helicopters). Even so, these are wealthy families who party with the international 1%, and media intrusiveness makes it increasingly difficult to maintain the right image.

While Europe’s monarchies will no doubt be smart enough to survive for some time to come, it is the British royals who have most to fear from the Spanish example.

It is only the Queen who has preserved the monarchy’s reputation with her rather ordinary (if well-heeled) granny style. The danger will come with Charles, who has both an expensive taste of lifestyle and a pretty hierarchical view of the world. He has failed to understand that monarchies have largely survived because they provide a service – as non-controversial and non-political heads of state. Charles ought to know that as English history shows, it is kings, not republicans, who are the monarchy’s worst enemies.

Text 3

The journal Science is adding an extra round of statistical checks to its peer-review process, editor-in-chief Marcia McNutt announced today. The policy follows similar efforts from other journals, after widespread concern that basic mistakes in data analysis are contributing to the irreproducibility of many published research findings.

“Readers must have confidence in the conclusions published in our journal,” writes McNutt in an editorial. Working with the American Statistical Association, the journal has appointed seven experts to a statistics board of reviewing editors(SBoRE). Manuscript will be flagged up for additional scrutiny by the journal’s internal editors, or by its existing Board of Reviewing Editors or by outside peer reviewers. The SBoRE panel will then find external statisticians to review these manuscripts.

Asked whether any particular papers had impelled the change, McNutt said: “The creation of the ‘statistics board’ was motivated by concerns broadly with the application of statistics and data analysis in scientific research and is part of Science’s overall drive to increase reproducibility in the research we publish.”

Giovanni Parmigiani, a biostatistician at the Harvard School of Public Health, a member of the SBoRE group. He says he expects the board to “play primarily an advisory role.” He agreed to join because he “found the foresight behind the establishment of the SBoRE to be novel, unique and likely to have a lasting impact. This impact will not only be through the publications in Science itself, but hopefully through a larger group of publishing places that may want to model their approach after Science.”

John Ioannidis, a physician who studies research methodology, says that the policy is “a most welcome step forward” and “long overdue.” “Most journals are weak in statistical review, and this damages the quality of what they publish. I think that, for the majority of scientific papers nowadays, statistical review is more essential than expert review,” he says. But he noted that biomedical journals such as Annals of Internal Medicine, the Journal of the American Medical Association and The Lancet pay strong attention to statistical review.

Professional scientists are expected to know how to analyze data, but statistical errors are alarmingly common in published research, according to David Vaux, a cell biologist. Researchers should improve their standards, he wrote in 2012, but journals should also take a tougher line, “engaging reviewers who are statistically literate and editors who can verify the process”. Vaux says that Science’s idea to pass some papers to statisticians “has some merit, but a weakness is that it relies on the board of reviewing editors to identify ‘the papers that need scrutiny’ in the first place”.

Text 4

Two years ago, Rupert Murdoch’s daughter ,Elisabeth ,spoke of the “unsettling dearth of integrity across so many of our institutions” Integrity had collapsed, she argued, because of a collective acceptance that the only “sorting mechanism ”in society should be profit and the market .But “it’s us ,human beings ,we the people who create the society we want ,not profit ”.

Driving her point home, she continued: “It’s increasingly apparent that the absence of purpose, of a moral language within government, media or business could become one of the most dangerous foals for capitalism and freedom.” This same absence of moral purpose was wounding companies such as News International ,shield thought ,making it more likely that it would lose its way as it had with widespread illegal telephone hacking .

As the hacking trial concludes – finding guilty ones-editor of the News of the World, Andy Coulson, for conspiring to hack phones ,and finding his predecessor, Rebekah Brooks, innocent of the same charge –the winder issue of dearth of integrity still standstill, Journalists are known to have hacked the phones of up to 5,500 people .This is hacking on an industrial scale ,as was acknowledged by Glenn Mulcaire, the man hired by the News of the World in 2001 to be the point person for phone hacking. Others await trial. This long story still unfolds.

In many respects, the dearth of moral purpose frames not only the fact of such widespread phone hacking but the terms on which the trial took place .One of the astonishing revelations was how little Rebekah Brooks knew of what went on in her newsroom, wow little she thought to ask and the fact that she never inquired wow the stories arrived. The core of her successful defence

was that she knew nothing.

In today's world, it has become normal that well-paid executives should not be accountable for what happens in the organizations that they run perhaps we should not be so surprised. For a generation, the collective doctrine has been that the sorting mechanism of society should be profit. The words that have mattered are efficiency, flexibility, shareholder value, business-friendly, wealth generation, sales, impact and, in newspapers, circulation. Words degraded to the margin have been justice fairness, tolerance, proportionality and accountability.

The purpose of editing the News of the World was not to promote reader understanding to be fair in what was written or to betray any common humanity. It was to ruin lives in the quest for circulation and impact. Ms Brooks may or may not have had suspicions about how her journalists got their stories, but she asked no questions, gave no instructions—nor received traceable, recorded answers.

2014 年英语二

When the government talks about infrastructure contributing to the economy the focus is usually on roads, railways, broadband and energy. Housing is seldom mentioned.

Why is that? To some extent the housing sector must shoulder the blame. We have not been good at communicating the real value that housing can contribute to economic growth. Then there is the scale of the typical housing project. It is hard to shove for attention among multibillionpound infrastructure project, so it is inevitable that the attention is focused elsewhere. But perhaps the most significant reason is that the issue has always been so politically charged.

Nevertheless, the affordable housing situation is desperate. Waiting lists increase all the time and we are simply not building enough new homes.

The comprehensive spending review offers an opportunity for the government to help rectify this. It needs to put historical prejudices to one side and take some steps to address our urgent housing need.

There are some indications that it is preparing to do just that. The communities minister, Don Foster, has hinted that George Osborne, Chancellor of the Exchequer, may introduce more flexibility to the current cap on the amount that local authorities can borrow against their housing stock debt. Evidence shows that 60, 000 extra new homes could be built over the next five years if the cap were lifted, increasing GDP by 0.6%.

Ministers should also look at creating greater certainty in the rental environment, which would have a significant impact on the ability of registered providers to fund new developments from revenues.

But it is not just down to the government. While these measures would be welcome in the short term, we must face up to the fact that the existing £ 4.5bn programme of grants to fund new affordable housing, set to expire in 2015, is unlikely to be extended beyond then. The Labour party has recently announced that it will retain a large part of the coalition's spending plans if returns to power. The housing sector needs to accept that we are very unlikely to ever return to era of largescale public grants. We need to adjust to this changing climate.

While the government's commitment to long-term funding may have changed, the very pressing need for more affordable housing is real and is not going away.

Of all the changes that have taken place in English-language newspapers during the past quarter-century, perhaps the most far-reaching has been the inexorable decline in the scope and seriousness of their arts coverage.

It is difficult to the point of impossibility for the average reader under the age of forty to imagine a time when high-quality arts criticism could be found in most big-city newspapers. Yet a considerable number of the most significant collections of criticism published in the 20th century consisted in large part of newspaper reviews. To read such books today is to marvel at the fact that their learned contents were once deemed suitable for publication in general-circulation dailies.

We are even farther removed from the unfocused newspaper reviews published in England between the turn of the 20th century and the eve of World War II, at a time when newsprint was dirt-cheap and stylish arts criticism was considered an ornament to the publications in which it appeared. In those far-off days, it was taken for granted that the critics of major papers would write in detail and at length about the events they covered. Theirs was a serious business, and even those reviewers who wore their learning lightly, like George Bernard Shaw and Ernest Newman, could be trusted to know what they were about. These men believed in journalism as a calling, and were proud to be published in the daily press. "So few authors have brains enough or literary gift enough to keep their own end up in journalism," Newman wrote, "that I am tempted to define 'journalism' as 'a term of contempt applied by writers who are not read to writers who are.'"

Unfortunately, these critics are virtually forgotten. Neville Cardus, who wrote for the *Manchester Guardian* from 1917 until shortly before his death in 1975, is now known solely as a writer of essays on the game of cricket. During his lifetime, though, he was also one of England's foremost classical-music critics, a stylist so widely admired that his *Autobiography* (1947) became a best-seller. He was knighted in 1967, the first music critic to be so honored. Yet only one of his books is now in print, and his vast body of writings on music is unknown save to specialists.

Is there any chance that Cardus's criticism will enjoy a revival? The prospect seems remote. Journalistic tastes had changed long before his death, and postmodern readers have little use for the richly upholstered Vicwardian prose in which he specialized. Moreover, the amateur tradition in music criticism has been in headlong retreat.