

上, 政治活动一直是对措辞和形象的注重多于本质和实际。然而, 自从照相机问世, 总统们已经越来越关注自己的形象。例如, 特迪·罗斯福在穿着一身网球服的时候, 就非常小心从不被拍照, 因为他担心这样的照片会损坏他的骑士形象, 骑士形象为他赢得了惟一的一次总统任期。随着电视的出现, 在总统政治中形象变得更加重要。毕竟, 是电视在约翰·F·肯尼迪和尼克松之间选择了前者, 而且在电视机的时代里, 任期只有两届的总统在很大程度上都是人们根据形象选出的。现在, 如果同潇洒的领导人里根或文雅且政治上正确的克林顿竞争, 不知道林肯、塔夫脱, 甚至是富兰克林·罗斯福是否还会当选。毕竟, 林肯相貌平平, 塔夫脱身材肥胖, 而罗斯福是一个跛子。

然而长远来看, 形象的重要性要大幅地减弱。由于吸烟有害健康, 万宝路品牌的形象最终被吸烟有害健康的真理所代替。流行音乐创作如果不能有真正的音乐创新, 就会最终从乐坛消失。经常买家庭旧货的人都知道, 今天的畅销书往往会成为明天的纸浆。甚至在政治领域, 我认为历史有剔除形象、注重真实成绩的本领。例如, 我认为历史将会记住特迪·罗斯福, 主要是因为他建造了巴拿马运河、建立了我们的国家公园系统, 而不是因为他简陋的衣柜。

综上分析, 在依靠某种程度上的游说、营销、推销而获得成功的努力中, 似乎形象已经真正的成为了这些去游说的人关注的中心。由于我们的生活越来越忙碌, 我们集中注意力的时间更少了, 我们在产品和服务间的选择却更多了。无论是好是坏, 我都预料这种趋势将永不衰退。

论点 **平衡观点** 本文属于典型的“具体情况具体分析”的类型。一方面, 在短期贸易或政治活动中, 形象的作用有时候会甚于本质内容; 另一方面, 从长远的角度(历史)讲, 形象最终是要屈服于本质和实际的。

开头方式 **提出问题 + 让步语气 + 表明立场** 该开头方式是在最前面重点推荐过的, 好处就不赘述了。首先, 以提问的方式引出问题——在我们的社会中, 创造形象是否已经重于形象背后的实质? 其次, 作者做出让步, 同意题目中的观点——形象很重要; 最后, 作者提出自己的观点——(不仅形象很重要)本质内容也非常重要。

论证过程 **比较型** 题目中的“more...than...”已经明确告诉你, 这道题最好当成比较型题目来处理。论证的三个自然段分成两个层次: 一方面, 作者举了若干的特例(商业和政治)来赞同形象的重要性; 另一方面, 作者又从相同的领域举出了反例, 强调本质仍然非常重要。

◆ **Tip 推敲反例** 同学们在举例论证方面感到难度很大, 因为他们认为自己找不到那么多贴切的例子。解决这个问题在于两点: 第一, 掌握四种论证过程, 通过论证的逻辑过程推出例子(每一个明确分工的主题句都会引出若干例子), 而不是凭空想像例子; 第二, 所有的文章观点都可以有正反两方面, 你只要找到一方面的例子, 就可以去推敲反面的情况。本文中畅销书和美国总统的例子就用了正反两面。

论证模式

- ① The important role of image is particularly evident in the business world.
- ② The growing significance of image is also evident in the political realm...
- ③ In the long term, however, the significance of image wanes considerably.

Issue 112 Should schools teach students to explore their own emotions?

“Some educational systems emphasize the development of students’ capacity for reasoning and logical thinking, but students would benefit more from an education that also taught them to explore their

own emotions.”

一些教育体系强调学生逻辑推理思维能力的发展,但是那些教学生们探究自身情绪的教育对学生们才更有好处。

The speaker asserts that educational systems should place less emphasis on reason and logical thinking and more emphasis on the exploration of emotions. **While I concede that** in certain fields students are well served by nurturing their emotions and feelings, **in most academic disciplines it is by cultivating intellect rather than emotions that** students master their discipline and, in turn, gain a capacity to contribute to the well-being of society.

I agree with the speaker insofar as undue emphasis on reason and logical thinking can have a chilling effect on the arts. After all, artistic ideas and inspiration spring not from logic but from emotions and feelings such as joy, sadness, hope, and love. And, the true measure of artistic accomplishment lies not in technical proficiency but rather in a work's impact on the emotions and spirit. **Nevertheless,** even in the arts, students must learn theories and techniques, which they then apply to their craft. And, creative writing requires the cognitive ability to understand how language is used and how to communicate ideas. Besides, creative ability is itself partly a function of intellect; that is, creative expression is a marriage of one's cognitive abilities and the expression of one's feelings and emotions.

Aside from its utility in the arts, however, the exploration of emotions has little place in educational systems. The physical sciences and mathematics are purely products of reason and logic. Even in the so-called “soft” sciences, emotion should play no part. Consider, for example, the study of history, political science, or public policy, each of which is largely the study of how the concepts of fairness, equity, and justice work themselves out. It is tempting to think that students can best understand and learn to apply these concepts by tapping feelings such as compassion, empathy, sympathy, and indignation. Yet fairness, equity, and justice have little to do with feelings, and everything to do with reason. **After all,** emotions are subjective things. **On the other hand,** reason is objective and therefore facilitates communication, consensus, and peaceful compromise.

Indeed, on a systemic scale undue emphasis on the exploration of our emotions can have deleterious societal consequences. Emotions invite irrationality in thought and action, the dangers of which are all too evident in contemporary America. For example, when it comes to the war on drugs, free speech and religion, abortion issues, and sexual choices, public policy today seems to simply mirror the voters' fears and prejudices. **Yet common sense dictates that** social ills are best solved by identifying cause-and-effect relationships—in other words, through critical thinking. The proliferation of shouting-match talk shows fueled by irrationality and emotion gone amuck is further evidence that our culture lends too much credence to our emotions and not enough to our minds. A culture that sanctions irrationality and unfettered venting of emotion is vulnerable to decline. **Indeed,** exploiting emotions while suppressing reason is how demagogues gain and hold power, and how humanity's most horrific atrocities have come to pass. **In contrast,** reason and better judgment are effective deterrents to incivility, despotism, and war.

In sum, emotions can serve as important catalysts for academic accomplishment in the arts. **Otherwise, however,** students, and ultimately society, are better off by learning to temper their emotions while nurturing judgment, tolerance, fairness, and understanding—all of which are products of reason

and critical thinking.

学校应该教学生发掘他们自己的情感吗？

发言者认为教育系统应当把重点更多地放在对学生的情感发掘上，而较少强调逻辑和推理思维。我承认在一定的领域里，通过培养学生的情感和感觉而使他们大有裨益，但在多数的学术领域中，正是通过智力的提高而非感情的孕育而使他们成为学科能手，并反过来获得贡献社会的这样一种能力。

我同意该发言人对不当地强调推理和逻辑推理能力会给艺术带来可怕影响的观点。毕竟，艺术想法和灵感不是来自于逻辑而是迸发于诸如欢乐、悲伤、希望和爱情等情感和感觉。并且，艺术成就的真正分量在于该作品对情感 and 精神的冲击，而非技术的娴熟程度。但是，即使在艺术创作中，学生必须要学会应用他们作品中的理论和技艺。同时，创造性的写作需要一种运用语言和传达思想的认知能力。而且，创新能力本身也是智力功能的一部分，也就是说，创新的思想表达是该作者认知能力和情感表述的结合物。

然而，除了对艺术创作有益外，对情感的发掘在教育体系中无足轻重。物理学和数学纯是推理和逻辑的产物。即使在所谓的“软”科学中，情感也无立足之地。以历史学、政治学和公共政策学为例，每一门大都是对如何形成公正、平等和正义这些概念的学习和研究。我们很容易会认为学生通过挖掘自己的情感，像热情、同情、感知以及愤慨等，就会更好地理解 and 运用这些概念。但公正、平等和正义却与感情鲜有干系，而与推理却息息相关。毕竟，情感是主观的东西。另一方面，推理却是客观的，并因此使交流、共识和和平的让步更为容易。

系统地说来，对情感开发的过分强调的确会带来毁灭性的社会后果。情感容易导致思想和行动上的非理智，它带来的危险在当代美国是有目共睹的。例如，在禁毒、言论和宗教信仰自由、堕胎以及性选择上，今日的公共政策似乎仅折射出选民的恐惧与偏见。但根据常识，社会疾病只有通过认清因果关系才能得到最好的解决，换句话说，就是通过批判的思考。犹如大嗓门大赛的脱口秀的泛滥就是我们的文化过于信赖我们的情感而较少诉诸头脑的进一步证据，而这些脱口秀正是由失去理智和情感宣泄所支撑。一种认可非理智和情感无节制宣泄的文化很容易衰败。事实上，压制理性的同时利用情感就是蛊惑人心的政客获取和控制权力及世间最骇人听闻的暴行发生的方式。相反，理性和客观的判断可以有效地制止失礼、暴政和战争。

总之，在艺术创作中，情感是学术成就的重要的催化剂。然而，学生以及最终服务的社会只有通过学会限制他们的情感，同时培养判断、忍耐、公正和理解——所有这些都是理性和逻辑思维的产物——才能有更好地发展。

论点 有保留的反对 本文也属于典型的“具体情况具体分析”的类型。一方面，在艺术领域中，作者承认情感的重要性；另一方面，在其他大多数领域中，作者认为逻辑和客观才是至关重要的。虽然，本文观点也是从正反两个方面论述的，但是反对观点涉及的范围和篇幅都有明显的倾向，因此，它属于有保留的反对观点。

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场 问题解决型文章中经常使用的开头方式：问题——如何教育学生，题目观点——培养学生的情感和感觉，作者立场——（不仅把重点放在对学生的情感发掘上）还要提高智力。

论证过程 问题解决型 论证过程的三个自然段分成两个方面：一方面，作者承认题目的观点，在艺术领域中情感的确很重要，而且需要培养；另一方面，在论证过程的第二、三段，作者开始驳论，举了若干例子证明自然科学领域需要逻辑和推理而非感情，以及另外的例子说明过多的

感性会导致的恶果。

论证模式

- ① I agree with the speaker insofar as undue emphasis on reason and logical thinking can have a chilling effect on... Nevertheless,...
- ② Aside from its utility in the arts, however, the exploration of emotions has little place in educational systems.
- ③ Indeed, on a systemic scale undue emphasis on the exploration of our emotions can have deleterious societal consequences.

Issue 127 Are facts “**stubborn things**,” or can we alter them?

“Facts are stubborn things. They cannot be altered by our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passions.”

事实都是固执的。它不可能随着我们的愿望、喜好或者情绪的趋向而改变。

Can we alter facts according to our wishes or inclinations? If by “facts” the speaker means such phenomena as political, economic, social, or legal status quo, then I concede that we can alter facts. The reason for this is that such systems are abstract constructs of our inclinations, wishes, and passions to begin with. Otherwise, I strongly agree with the speaker that we cannot alter facts. When it comes to certain aspects of our personal lives, and to historical events and scientific truths, no measure of desire or even passion can change external reality.

On an individual level, we all engage in futile attempts to alter facts—by pretending that certain things are not the way they are because they are inconsistent with our wishes or personal interests. Psychologists refer to this psychological defensive mechanism, which seems to be part of human nature, as “denial.” Consider curious pastimes such as mind-reading, psychic healing, rituals that purportedly impart immortality, and other such endeavors, which seems to transcend all cultures and periods of human history. Understandably, we would all like to have the ability to alter the physical world, including ourselves, as we see fit, or even to live forever by means of the sheer force of our will. Yet, not one iota of scientific evidence lends support to the claim that any human being has ever had any such ability.

Nor can we alter facts by virtue of our inclinations or passions when it comes to history. Admittedly, no person can truly know any particular past that the person did not experience firsthand. In this sense history is a construct, created for us by reporters, archivists, and historians. Historical facts are therefore susceptible to interpretation, characterization, and of course errors in commission and omission. This is not to say, however, that historical facts can be altered by our inventing versions that suit our inclinations or wishes. In short, a historical event is not rendered any less factual by either our ignorance or characterization of it.

Similarly, when it comes to science our wishes and desires ultimately yield to the stubbornness of facts—by which I mean empirical scientific evidence and the laws and principles of the physical world. Admittedly, in many cases it is difficult to distinguish between scientific “fact” and mere “theory.” History is replete with examples of what were considered at one time to be facts, but later disproved as incorrect theories. Yet it is telling that many such obsolete theories were based on the sub-

jective inclinations, desires, and wishes of theorists and of the societies in which the theorists lived. For example, the notions of an Earth-centered universe and of linear time and space were both influenced by religious notions—that is, by human wishes and passions. As our factual knowledge increased such theories ultimately give way.

In sum, I agree that facts are indeed “stubborn things.” Understandably, all humans are guilty of ignoring, overlooking, and misunderstanding facts—at least to some extent. **After all**, human passion, desire, and individual bias and perspective are powerful influences when it comes to what we believe to be true and factual. **Moreover**, the statement carries deep epistemological implications regarding the nature of knowledge and truth, which I cannot begin to adequately address here. **Nevertheless**, on a less abstract level the speaker is correct that neither inclination, desire, nor passion, no matter how fervent, can alter that which is past or beyond our physical control.

事实是“顽固不化”吗？或我们能改变它们吗？

我们能够按自己的意愿或是喜好改变事实吗？如果该发言者口中的事实为诸如政治、经济、社会或法律现状这些现象的话，那么我承认我们能够改变事实。理由是这些体系首先就是我们喜好、意愿和热情的抽象组合。否则，我绝对赞同该发言人关于我们不能改变事实的观点。当涉及我们个人生活、历史事件和科学事实的某些方面时，再强烈的愿望甚至热情都不能改变外在的现实。

就个人来讲，我们试图改变事实的努力都是徒劳的——我们总是假装某些事情并非应是在这种状况，因为它们与我们的意愿或是个人兴趣不符。心理学家将这种似乎是人类本性中一个组成部分的心理防卫机能称为“否认”。以一些奇特的消遣为例，像看透他人心思、精神治疗和据说可以得到永生的仪式以及其他诸如此类的努力，似乎都超越了所有文化和人类历史。我们都想有能力依自己的意愿改变物质世界，包括我们自己，甚至是仅依靠我们的意愿而获得永生，这可以理解。但是，没有任何的科学证据证明人类曾经拥有过任何这样的能力。

在历史方面，我们同样不能依自己的喜好或是热情来改变事实。我们必须承认，任何人在没有亲自经历的情况下，不可能真正知道过去特定的时期内所发生的事情。这样，历史就是记者、档案保管员和历史学家为我们构建的结构。因此，历史事实就有赖于人们的释义、勾勒，当然会产生遗漏和错误。但是这并不是说历史事实可以被符合我们意愿或喜好的杜撰所修改。总而言之，一个历史事件不会由于我们的无知或对其的描述而使其真实性受到损害。

同样，在科学方面，我们的愿望或意愿最终都要让步于事实的“顽固性”——这里的事实指的是由实践得出的科学证据以及物质世界的法规和原则。诚然，在许多情况下，人们很难区分科学“事实”和纯“理论”。历史充斥着这样的事例，一度被认为是事实的，后来被斥之为错误的理论。这些过时的理论许多都基于理论家以及他们所生活的社会的主观喜好、意愿和希望。例如，有关地心说以及线性时间和空间的理论都受到了宗教信仰的影响——也就是说受到了人的愿望和热情的影响。随着我们科学知识的增加，这些理论也寿终正寝了。

总之，我认为事实是“顽固的”。至少在一定的程度上，人们都会有意无意地忽略和曲解事实，这可以理解。毕竟，人类的热情、意愿及个人观点和视角在我们对事实的认定上具有很强的影响力。而且，就知识和真理的本性（篇幅有限，此处不能给出充足的叙述）而言，这种观点有着深刻的认识论上的含义。但是，具体点讲，发言人的关于无论个人喜好、意愿、热情如何强烈都不能改变超出我们物理控制能力之外的事情的观点是正确的。

论点 有保留的赞成 其实本文总的来说还是以赞成为主，但是就像基本上所有的 Issue 文章一

样，作者也没有把话说死：在一边倒地赞成我们无法按自己的意愿或是喜好改变事实的同时，还是做出了让步，承认存在很多例外情况（如政治、经济、社会或法律现实）。

开头方式 **提出问题 + 表明立场** 常用的开头方式之一，用问句引出话题——人们是否能够通过意愿改变事实？作者观点则是“具体情况具体分析”。

论证过程 **因果型** 又要用到那句老话，“Everything has cause and effect”。本文的因果关系就是“事实不以人的意志而转移→事实都是固执的”，论证过程的三个自然段从三个角度（个人、历史和科学）分别进行纵向的正反论证（因果成立和因果不成立的情况）。

论证模式

- ① On an individual level, we all engage in futile attempts to alter facts...
- ② Nor can we alter facts by virtue of our inclinations or passions when it comes to history.
- ③ Similarly, when it comes to science...

Issue 184 Is it a mistake to theorize without data?

“It is a grave mistake to theorize before one has data.”

在掌握足够资料之前建立理论会导致严重的错误。

Is it a “grave mistake” to theorize without data, as the speaker contends? I agree insofar as to theorize before collecting sufficient data is to risk tainting the process of collecting and interpreting further data. However, in a sense the speaker begs the question, by overlooking the fact that every theory requires some data to begin with. Moreover, the claim unfairly ignores equally grave consequences of waiting to theorize until we obtain too much data.

In one important respect I agree with the speaker's contention. A theory conjured up without the benefit of data amounts to little more than the theorist's hopes and desires—what he or she wants to be true and not be true. Accordingly, this theorist will tend to seek out evidence that supports the theory, and overlook or avoid evidence that refutes it. One telling historical example involves theories about the center of the Universe. Understandably, we ego-driven humans would prefer that the universe revolve around us. Early theories presumed so for this reason, and subsequent observations that ran contrary to this ego-driven theory were ignored, while the observers were scorned and even vilified.

By theorizing before collecting data the theorist also runs that risk of interpreting that data in a manner which makes it appear to lend more credence to the theory than it actually does. Consider the theory that the Earth is flat. Any person with a clear view of the horizon must agree in all honesty that the evidence does not support the theory. Yet prior to Newtonian physics the notion of a spherical Earth was so unsettling to people that they interpreted the arc-shaped horizon as evidence of a convex, yet nevertheless “flattish,” Earth.

Despite the merits of the speaker's claim, I find it problematic in two crucial respects. First, common sense informs me that it is impossible to theorize in the first place without at least some data. How can theorizing without data be dangerous, as the speaker contends, if it is not even possible? While a theory based purely on fantasy might ultimately be born out by empirical observation, it is equally possible that it won't. Thus without prior data a theory is not worth our time or attention. Secondly, the speaker's claim overlooks the inverse problem: the danger of continuing to acquire data

without venturing a theory based on that data. To postpone theorizing until all the data is in might be to postpone it forever. The danger lies in the reasons we theorize and test our theories: to solve society's problems and to make the world a better place to live. Unless we act timely based on our data we render ourselves impotent. For example, governments tend to respond to urgent social problems by establishing agencies to collect data and think-tanks to theorize about causes and solutions. These agencies and think-tanks serve no purpose unless they admit that they will never have all the data and that no theory is foolproof, and unless timely action is taken based on the best theory currently available—before the problem overwhelms us.

To sum up, I agree with the speaker insofar as a theory based on no data is not a theory but mere whimsy and fancy, and insofar as by theorizing first we tend to distort the extent to which data collected thereafter supports our own theory. Nevertheless, we put ourselves in equal peril by mistaking data for knowledge and progress, which require us not only to theorize but also to act upon our theories with some useful end in mind.

未掌握数据就得出理论是一个错误吗？

演讲者所说的，未掌握数据就得出理论是一个“大错误”吗？我只能认同在收集到足够的数
据之前就得出理论会影响到收集和分析后来数据的程序。然而，从某种意义上讲，演讲者是在忽略每个理论都首先需要用一些数据来推断的前提下进行辩论的。而且，这种说法也不公平地忽视了
在获得足够的数
据之前等待得出理论
的后果同样严重。

从一个重要的方面出发，我同意该演讲者的论点。一个没有数据支持而得出的理论，差不多就是理论家的希望和期望——他或她想要成为真实的或不想成为真实的东西。因此，理论家就会去寻找支持这个理论的证据，而忽略或避开否认它的证据。一个有力的历史例子是有关宇宙中心理论的。可以理解的是，我们以自我为中心的人类希望宇宙能够围绕着我们转。出于这个原因，早期的理论就假定为
此，而随后的与这个自我中心理论相悖的观察结果就被忽视了，观察者也被蔑视，甚至被诋毁。

在收集数据前就做出结论，理论家还会冒这样一种风险：用一种使其看上去比事实上更可信的方式来解释数据。拿地球是平的这个理论来举例，任何一个能看清地平线的人都必须老老实实地承认这个证据不支持这个理论。然而，先于牛顿物理学说的地球球体论是如此的不得人心，以致于人们把球体论中的弧形地平线解释为一个凸面的证据，而地球还是“平的”。

尽管演讲者说的有一定道理，但我发现这个理论在两个关键方面有问题。首先，常理告诉我没有一点儿数据就得出理论是不可能的。正如演讲者所说，如果没有数据就得出理论连可能性都没有，那么又何谈危险性呢？一个完全以想像为依据的理论有可能最终通过实际观察得以产生，同样，也
同样有可能被否掉。因此，早先没有数据依据的理论是不值得我们花费时间和精力
的。其次，演讲者的观点忽略了一个反向问题：只是不断寻求数据而不依靠已有数据得出理论的做法是危险的。为了掌握所有数据而延迟得出理论有可能会
导致永远延迟。危险就存在于我们得出理论和检验理论的原因：是为了解决社会问题，使世界成为人类生活的美好家园。除非我们根据数据及时地采取行动，否则就会使自己变得碌碌无为。例如，为了回应紧急的社会问题，政府通过建立机构来收集数据和建立智囊团来从理论上找出原因和解决的办法。这些机构和智囊团的工作没有任何目的性，除非他们承认自己永远不能掌握足够的数
据，没有极简单明了的理论；除非他们能够在问题爆发之前根据目前所能获得的最好理论而及时地采取行动。

总之，我还是同意演讲者“没有数据验证的理论不能成为理论，只是异想天开和幻想”这种看法。我也同意演讲者的另一个观点，就是过早得出理论会歪曲我们收集多少数据来支持我们

自己的理论的程度。然而，弄错知识和进展的数据会使我们同样困于险境，知识和进展不仅需要我们去得出理论，还需要我们根据头脑中的某种有用的目的实践这些理论。

论点 平衡观点 作者一方面认同在收集到足够的数据之前就得出理论会影响到理论的准确性，另一方面，作者认为题目忽视了一些重要的逻辑关系。

开头方式 提出问题 + 回答 + 表明立场 本文开头作者观点这一部分非常接近 Argument 的风格，这也是由本题的论证类型所决定的。

论证过程 结论型 本题是以判断句为标志的典型的结论型题目，同时它也是一道抽象类题目。遵循结论型论证 (why + if... then...)。论证过程的三个自然段分成两个层次：前两段为第一层次，挖掘题目持此观点的原因——没有数据支持的理论没有真正意义 (宇宙中心理论)，以及会导致理论维护者带着偏见的自圆其说 (地球是平面的理论)；论证过程的第三段为第二层次，这一个超长段落 (if... then...)，驳斥题目的绝对观点，举例说明有些情况不能只顾数据的完整 (政府解决当务之急的问题)。

论证模式

- ① In one important respect I agree with the speaker's contention.
- ② By theorizing before collecting data the theorist also runs that risk of...
- ③ Despite the merits of the speaker's claim, I find it problematic in two crucial respects.

Issue 41 The role of non-mainstream areas of inquiry

"Such non-mainstream areas of inquiry as astrology, fortune-telling, and psychic and paranormal pursuits play a vital role in society by satisfying human needs that are not addressed by mainstream science."

研究界的一些非主流领域，比如星象学、占卜术和意念及超自然探索，在社会中起到了很重要的作用，因为它们满足了人们无法从主流科学获得的需求。

This statement actually consists of two claims: (1) that non-mainstream areas of inquiry are vital in satisfying human needs, and (2) that these areas are therefore vital to society. I concede that astrology, fortune-telling, and psychic and paranormal pursuits respond to certain basic human needs. However, in my view the potential harm they can inflict on their participants and on society far outweighs their psychological benefits.

Admittedly, these non-mainstream areas of inquiry address certain human needs, which mainstream science and other areas of intellectual inquiry inherently cannot. One such need involves our common experience as humans that we freely make our own choices and decisions in life and therefore carry some responsibility for their consequences. Faced with infinite choices, we experience uncertainty, insecurity, and confusion; and we feel remorse, regret, and guilt when in retrospect our choices turn out to be poor ones. Understandably, to prevent these bad feelings many people try to shift the burden of making difficult choices and decisions to some nebulous authority outside themselves—by relying on the stars or on a stack of tarot cards for guidance.

Two other such needs have to do with our awareness that we are mortal. This awareness brings a certain measure of pain that most people try to relieve by searching for evidence of an afterlife. Absent

empirical proof that life extends beyond the grave, many people attempt to contact or otherwise connect with the so-called “other side” through paranormal and psychic pursuits. Another natural response to the prospect of being separated from our loved ones by death is to search for a deeper connection with others here on Earth and elsewhere, in the present as well as the past. This response manifests itself in people’s enduring fascination with the paranormal search for extraterrestrial life, with so-called “past life” regression and “channeling,” and the like.

While the sorts of pursuits that the speaker lists might be “vital” insofar as they help some people feel better about themselves and about their choices and circumstances, **query whether these pursuits are otherwise useful to any individual or society. In the first place**, because these pursuits are not rooted in reason, they are favorite pastimes of charlatans and others who seek to prey on dupes driven by the aforementioned psychological needs. And the dupes have no recourse. **After all**, it is impossible to assess the credibility of a tarot card that tells us how to proceed in life—simply because we cannot know where the paths not taken would have led. **Similarly**, we cannot evaluate claims about the after-life because these claims inherently defy empirical proof—or disproof.

In the second place, without any sure way to evaluate the legitimacy of these avenues of inquiry, participants become vulnerable to self-deception, false hopes, fantastic ideas, and even delusions. In turn, so-called “insights” gained from these pursuits can too easily serve as convenient excuses for irrational and unreasonable actions that harm others. On a personal level, stubborn adherence to irrational beliefs in the face of reason and empirical evidence can lead to self-righteous arrogance, intolerance, anti-social behavior, and even hatred. **Moreover**, on a societal level these traits have led all too often to holy wars, and to such other atrocities as genocide and mass persecution.

In sum, I concede that the non-mainstream pursuits that the speaker lists are legitimate insofar as they afford many people psychological solace in life. **However**, when such pursuits serve as substitutes for reason and logic, and for honest intellectual inquiry, participants begin to distrust intellect as an impediment to enlightenment. In doing so, they risk making ill-conceived choices for themselves and unfair judgments about others—a risk that in my view outweighs the psychological rewards of those pursuits.

非主流探求的作用

该观点实际上包含两方面的意思：(1) 非主流的探询领域对满足人类的需要至关重要，(2) 因此，这些领域对社会也至关重要。我承认，占星术、占卜以及对超自然现象的研究迎合了人们一定的基本需要。但是，在我看来，它们对参与者以及社会的潜在危害远远超过了它们对人们心理需要的贡献。

诚然，这些人类探求中的非主流领域满足了人们一定的需要，而主流学科和智力探询的其他领域却生来无能为力。其中的一种需要牵涉到我们作为人类的共同经历，即在生活中我们自主做出选择和决定，并因此为它们的后果承担一定的责任。面对浩如烟海的选择，我们会遭遇不确定、不安全和迷惑；在回顾我们做出的差劲的选择时，我们会自责、懊悔和遗憾。可以理解，为了防止产生这样的不良感觉，许多人试图将做出困难选择和决定的负担转嫁给一些自身之外的不可名状的权威——通过星象或占卜纸牌来指点迷津。

另外的两个需要与我们意识到自己终究要入土有关。该意识带来了一定的痛苦，而多数人试图通过寻找来世的证据来减轻这种痛楚。由于没有实践证据证明生命可以在死后得以延续，许多人又尝试通过超自然的灵魂研究来接触或联络所谓的“来世”。死亡将会使自己与心爱的人

分离，人们对此的自然反应是在地球上或其他的地方寻找一种与所爱的人在现在或是过去更紧密的联系。人们乐此不疲、近乎痴迷地对地外生命的超自然寻求和所谓的“往世”的回归和“转世”等等，就是该自然反应最好的见证。

演讲人列举的这些种研究在帮助一些人对自己、对自己所做出的选择和所处的环境感觉好一些这个方面或许是至关重要的，但除此之外，这些研究对任何个人或社会是否会有用是值得怀疑的。首先，因为这些研究并非根植于理性，仅是江湖郎中和那些以欺骗有着前面提到的心理需求的易受骗人群之徒所青睐的消遣而已。而这些被欺骗的人们毫无追索权。毕竟，我们不可能去评测一副指引生活方向的占卜牌的可信度——就是因为我们无从得知我们没有选择的那条路到底会通向何方。相同的是，我们不能够评价关于来世的看法，因为这些看法本质上是无法用实践证明是对是错的。

其次，因为没有确定的方法来评价这些探询途径的正当性，参与者就容易自欺欺人，产生虚假的希望和奇妙的想法，甚至是幻觉。反之，从这些探求中获得的所谓的“洞察力”很容易成为伤害他人的不理智和不合乎常理的行为的托词。就个人而言，在面对理智和实践证据时，固执地坚持荒谬的信仰会导致刚愎自用、心胸狭窄和反社会的行为，甚至是仇恨。而且，就社会而论，这些特性经常会导致圣战，以及其他诸如种族灭绝和大屠杀之类的暴行。

总而言之，我承认以上列举的非主流探求在生活中可以给许多人提供心理上的慰藉这个层面上是正当的。但是，当这些探求成为理性和逻辑以及真实的知识探求的替代品时，参与者就开始将理智视为精神启蒙的绊脚石而不再信任理智。因此，他们冒险做出错误的选择和对他人的不公正的判断——在我看来，其危害超出了这些探求对人们心理上的回报。

论点 有保留的反对 开头的中心句用的是大家见过很多次的让步语气句型 “I concede that... However, ...”，这暗示了作者在论证段要进行正反两方面的论证，最后由 outweigh 敲定了大负小正的结论。

◆ **Tip** 非常值得注意的一点是，考生们经常把 GRE 阅读中极端转折的让步语气概念照搬到 Issue 中，这两者之间是有很大的区别的。如果你想判定这句话到底倾向前半部分还是后半部分，只看让步语气并不可靠，在很多情况下会把意思弄反，例如：It is true that... in most cases, however, ...这句话大多数情况下是以前半句为准。这种情况在英文中非常普遍，看和用的时候请务必留心。

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场 不特别推荐这种开头方式，看上去有些哗众取宠，如果对题目内涵分析不到位的话，很容易弄巧成拙。

论证过程 结论型 非常标准的 “why + if... then...” 结构，在讲课过程中，受 GRE 阅读和同学们反馈的启发，我把它简单地归纳成两个成语：欲擒故纵 + 釜底抽薪。驳论时不是只从正面去攻击它，而是先找理由支持它，再由该结论推出一些谬误，证明它最终是存在问题的，这样的思路最全面，最完整。

论证模式

- ① Admittedly, these non-mainstream areas of inquiry address certain human needs, ...
- ② Two other such needs have to do with our awareness that we are mortal.
- ③ While... query whether these pursuits are otherwise useful to any individual or society. In the first place...
- ④ In the second place... participants become vulnerable to self-deception, false hopes, fantastic ideas, and even delusions.

Issue 131 Do the arts reveal society's hidden ideas and impulses?

"The arts (painting, music, literature, etc.) reveal the otherwise hidden ideas and impulses of a society."

艺术(绘画、音乐、文学等等)揭示了一个社会在其他方面隐藏着的理念和动力。

The speaker asserts that the arts reveal society's hidden ideas and impulses. While this assertion has merit, **I think it unfairly generalizes about art. Consider two particular art forms:** architecture and painting. In more important architecture one consistently sees a reflection of society's ideas and urges. However, in more important paintings of the most recent century one sees instead the artists' personal and idiosyncratic visions of an aesthetic ideal.

Turning first to public architecture, one sees in ancient and Renaissance forms an impulse to transcend the human condition. Clearly, the most important architecture of these periods was built to honor deities and to propel humans into the afterlife. **Consider,** for example, the ancient pyramids and the great cathedrals of Europe, which rise upward toward the stars and heavens. **During** the Medieval period the most important architectural form was the castle, which reflected an overriding concern for military security and brute strength during a time of comparative anarchy. **During** the twentieth century it was first the steel-forged art deco forms and then the sky-scraping office building that dominated public architecture. These forms reflect modern, more mundane concerns for industrial and technological progress.

Turning next to important paintings and painters, it seems to me that the art of previous centuries reflected the attitudes and ideas of the prevailing culture to a far greater extent than today's art. The cynosures of the Medieval and Renaissance artists, for instance, were certain Christian themes—the Trinity, virgin birth of Christ, the Resurrection, and so forth—with which the society at large was also preoccupied. Later, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, an emerging genteel class saw itself reflected in the bourgeois themes of impressionists such as Renoir and Monet.

But in the most recent century the picture has been much different. Consider three of the twentieth century's most influential painters: Picasso, Dali, and Pollock. Picasso's style underwent a series of radical changes throughout his career. Was the reason for Picasso's diverse "periods" a quick series of radical changes in society's ideas and impulses, or perhaps a reflection of society's hidden impulse for constant change? Or did Picasso's varied styles merely reflect the complex psychological profile of one eccentric artist? Dali is known for his surrealistic images; but do these images reveal some kind of existential angst on a societal level, or just the odd aesthetic vision of one man? Pollock's penchant was for dripping paint on the floor in order to create abstract images that would have the sort of visceral impact he was after. In fact, Pollock turned to this technique only after he tried but failed as a conventional painter, using brush and easel. So are Pollock's striking abstract murals a reflection of some mid-twentieth-century societal impulse, or merely the result of one struggling artist stumbling onto something he was good at? In all three cases, it seems that the art reflected the artist but not the society.

In sum, in the art of painting one can observe a shift from styles and themes reflecting broad societal impulses to a more recent concern for expressing personal impulses and creative urges. **In contrast,** the more public art form of architecture has always mirrored society's ideas and impulses, and

probably always will—because architecture is so much more public than the art of painting.

艺术揭示了社会中隐藏的观念和冲动吗？

发言人断言，艺术揭示了社会中隐藏着的观念和冲动。尽管这种断言有其正确的一面，但我认为它对艺术的概括并不公平。试想两种特定的艺术形式：建筑和绘画。在更重要的建筑中，人们经常看到社会观念和迫切需求的折射。但是，在近一个世纪以来较为重要的绘画中，人们见到的却是艺术家个人的、更具特性的审美理念。

我们先看公共建筑，人们在古代和文艺复兴形式的建筑中看到是超越人类环境的冲动。很显然，那些时期最重要的建筑的目的在于使神性更加荣耀，并促使人类步入来世。举个例子，参看一下朝向众星与天空修建的古代金字塔和欧洲大教堂。贯穿整个中世纪时期最重要的建筑形式就是城堡，它反映出在很长一段时期内，在相对混乱的割据的状况下，高于一切的对军事安全和控制实力的关注。进入 20 世纪以来，先是钢铁铸造的艺术装饰，然后是摩天而起的高级写字楼主导着公共建筑。这些形式反映出现代更加世俗的对工业和科技进步的关注。

我们再来看看重要的绘画和画家。我觉得，先前几个世纪的艺术所反映出来的主流文化的态度和理念似乎要远比当今艺术所反映的程度更深。例如，中世纪和文艺复兴时期艺术家的方向总是基督教主旨——圣灵、圣父、圣子的三位一体，耶稣基督的诞生，耶稣的复活，等等——这些在当时社会普遍占着主导地位。后来，到了 18、19 世纪，新兴的上流社会在印象主义画家，例如雷诺阿和莫奈的资产阶级主题中看到了自己的影子。

但是最近一个世纪的绘画却大大不同了。我们可以看看 20 世纪最具影响力的三位画家：毕加索、达利和波洛克（Pollock）。在毕加索的绘画生涯中，他的风格经历了一系列的根本性的改变。导致毕加索拥有不同的“时期”的原因是因为社会观念和冲动的一系列的根本性的变更，还是或许它是社会的每一次变更中所隐藏的冲动的反映？抑或毕加索自己迥异的风格仅仅反映出一个行为古怪的艺术家自身的复杂的心理特征？达利以他超现实主义的画像闻名于世，但是这些画像是画家对社会存在的担忧的揭示，还是仅仅表达了个人怪癖的审美观？波拉克的趣味在于以滴墨的形式在地板上绘画以达到创作抽象画的目的，这些抽象的作品具有他一贯追求的触目惊心的效果。事实上，波洛克是在尝试用画笔和画板以常规方法进行创作失败的情况下才转而采用这种绘画方式的。因此，波拉克的惊世抽象壁画是 20 世纪中期一些社会冲动的折射吗？抑或仅仅是一位不屈不挠的艺术家误打误撞上了自己擅长之事的结果？在上述三个案例中，艺术仿佛仅仅反映艺术家而不是整个社会的状况。

总而言之，在绘画方面，人们可以看到风格和主旨这样一种变更：反映广阔社会冲动转变成近来对明确的个人冲动和创造性的迫切要求的关注。相反，更加公众化的建筑艺术形式通常都折射出社会的理念和冲动，而且可能会一如既往地对此进行反映——因为相对于绘画作品，建筑更加公众化。

论点 平衡观点 对于艺术是在什么时候和什么地点由什么人创作，以及其对社会的反映和影响，作者做了一分为二的论述：这种断言有其正确的一面，但它对艺术的概括并不公平。

开头方式 表明立场 + 概述理由 这个开头很不标准，因为第一句话其实是在重复题目的观点，后面的部分才是标准的表明立场 + 概述理由。

论证过程 比较型 其实这个题目大可不必写成这种讨论艺术的比较型论证，因为中国考生最头疼的 Issue 题目有三种题材：哲学、伦理道德和艺术（包括文学、音乐和绘画等）。其中的难中之难就是有效的例子，其实大家看了以上的这么多范文就会发现，这种学术类文章是以例子作

为载体来展示我们的逻辑论证方法和综合能力的。但是想讲清楚雷诺阿 (Renoir) 和莫奈 (Monet), 或者是毕加索、达利 (Dali)、波洛克 (Pollock) 并不容易。

◆ **Tip** 这道题目可以当成是问题解决型, 即揭示社会隐藏观点和动力的不只有艺术形式, 还有其他的方面。这样不就可以紧扣题目而避开讨厌的艺术问题了么?

论证模式

- ① Turning first to public architecture. . .
- ② Turning next to important paintings and painters. . .
- ③ But in the most recent century the picture has been much different. Consider. . .

Issue 138 Are mistakes necessary for **discovery or progress**?

"Only through mistakes can there be discovery or progress."

失败是成功之母。

The speaker contends that discovery and progress are made only through mistakes. I strongly agree with this contention, for two reasons. First, it accords with our personal experiences. Secondly, history informs us that on a societal level trial-and-error provides the very foundation for discovery and true progress, in all realms of human endeavor.

To begin with, the contention accords with our everyday experience as humans from early childhood through adulthood. As infants we learn how to walk by falling down again and again. As adolescents we discover our social niche, and develop self confidence and assertiveness, only by way of the sorts of awkward social encounters that are part-and-parcel of adolescence. Through failed relationships not only do we discover who we are and are not compatible with, we also discover ourselves in the process. And, most of us find the career path that suits us only through trying jobs that don't.

This same principle also applies on a societal level. Consider, for example, how we progress in our scientific knowledge. Our scientific method is essentially a call for progress through trial-and-error. Any new theory must be tested by empirical observation, and must withstand rigorous scientific scrutiny. **Moreover,** the history of theoretical science is essentially a history of trial-and-error. One modern example involves two contrary theories of physics: wave theory and quantum theory. During the last quarter-century scientists have been struggling to disprove one or the other—or to reconcile them. As it turns out, a new so-called "string" theory shows that the quantum and wave theories are mistakes in the sense that each one is inadequate to explain the behavior of all matter; yet both so-called "mistakes" were necessary for physics to advance, or progress, to this newer theory.

The value of trial-and-error is not limited to the sciences. In government and politics, progress usually comes about through dissension and challenge—that is, when people point out the mistakes of those in power. In fact, without our challenging the mistaken notions of established institutions, political oppression and tyranny would go unchecked. Similarly, in the fields of civil and criminal law, jurists and legislators who uphold and defend legal precedent must face continual opposition from those who question the fairness and relevance of current laws. This ongoing challenge is critical to the vitality and relevance of our system of laws.

In sum, the speaker correctly asserts that it is through mistakes that discovery and true progress are made. Indeed, our personal growth as individuals, as well as advances in science, government,

and law, depends on making mistakes.

错误对新事物的发现或发展来说是必需的吗?

发言者认为,新的发现和发展都是通过某些错误来得以实现的。对此,我非常赞同,有两点原因。第一,这符合我们个人的经历。第二,通过历史我们可以看出,在社会的层面上,在人类所有努力的领域,通过不断实验改正错误为新的发现和真正的进步奠定了基础。

首先,论点符合我们人类从孩童时期并贯穿整个成人阶段的日常经历。当我们还是婴儿的时候,我们正是通过一次又一次的跌倒而学会如何走路的。当我们步入青少年的时候,正是青春期非常重要的组成部分——各种各样的社会挫折——使我们发现自己的社会小环境,并充分建立自己的自信。通过各种人际关系的挫折,我们不仅可以发现我们与哪些人合得来、合不来,还可以在这个过程中发现我们自己。而且,我们中的大多数人都是在不断尝试不适合自己的职业的过程中找到自己的事业之路的。

相同的法则在社会的层面上同样适用。试想,例如,我们是如何在我们的科学知识方面取得进步的。我们的科学方法从本质上来说就是通过不断的尝试和失败而取得的进步。任何新的理论都必须通过实验性的观察加以检测,而且必须经受起严格的科学审查。而且,理论科学的历史从本质上来说就是不断实验和失败的历史。一个现代的例子就是物理学上的两个相对的理论:波动说和量子论。在上个世纪最后 25 年的期间内,科学家们一直在试图推翻这个或另一个理论——或是调和它们。而结果呢?一项新的所谓“弦性”理论表明,不论波动说还是量子论,在某种意义上都是错误的,这两种理论都不足以阐明所有物质的状态;但是,对于物理学的发展或进步或是这个新理论而言,这两个所谓的“错误”都是必不可少的。

不断尝试和失败的价值并不仅限于科学领域。在政府和政治方面,所取得的进步通常都经历了意见的分歧和质疑——也就是在人们指出当权者的错误的时候。事实上,如果我们不对已经建立起来的机构的错误意图提出质疑,政治压迫和暴政就会肆无忌惮。同样,在民法和刑法方面,支持并为法规上的先例辩护的法理学家和立法者,就必须面对来自那些质疑现行法律的公正性和适当性的人们的频繁挑战。对于我们法律体系的生命力和适当性来说,这种持续不断的质疑是至关重要的。

总而言之,发言人正确地断言,新的发现和真正的进步正是通过不断的错误而促成的。确实,我们个人的成长,以及科学、政府以及法律法规的进步,都依赖于出错。

论点 完全赞成 该题目虽然是抽象类题目,但是写成完全赞成的类型有很大风险,因为题目中的第一个词“only”就属于极端词汇,说“只有失败是成功之母”似乎有些过于武断了。如果让你来写这个题目,你会选择什么样的观点呢?

开头方式 表明立场 + 概述理由 典型的提纲型开头。

论证过程 结论型 作者遵从把抽象类题目简单化的原则,论证部分分成三个层面:整个成人阶段的日常经历、社会的层面和政府、政治方面,在这些层面中,作者都找到了支持的论据,因此得出了支持的结论。

论证模式

- ① To begin with, the contention accords with our everyday experience as humans from early childhood through adulthood.
- ② This same principle also applies on a societal level.
- ③ The value of trial-and-error is not limited to the sciences.

Issue 174 Should laws be **rigid or flexible**?

"Laws should not be rigid or fixed. Instead, they should be flexible enough to take account of various circumstances, times, and places."

法律不应该是僵化或固定的,而应该足够灵活以照顾到不同的环境、时期和地点。

Some measure of consistency and stability in the law is critical for any society to function. Otherwise, **I strongly agree with the speaker's assertion that laws should be flexible enough to adapt to different circumstances, times and places.** The law of marital property aptly illustrates this point.

On the one hand, a certain measure of consistency, stability, and predictability in our laws is required in order for us to understand our legal obligations and rights as we go about our day-to-day business as a society. For example, in order for private industry to thrive, businesses must be afforded the security of knowing their legal rights and obligations vis-à-vis employees, federal regulatory agencies, and tax authorities—as well as their contractual rights and duties vis-à-vis customers and suppliers. Undue uncertainty in any one of these areas would surely have a chilling effect on business. **Moreover,** some measure of consistency in the legal environment from place to place promotes business expansion as well as interstate and international commerce, all of which are worthwhile endeavors in an increasingly mobile society.

On the other hand, rigid laws can result in unfairness if applied inflexibly in all places at all times. The framers of the U.S. Constitution recognized the need both for a flexible legal system and for flexible laws—by affording each state legal jurisdiction over all but interstate matters. The framers understood that social and economic problems, as well as standards of equity and fairness, can legitimately change over time and vary from region to region—even from town to town. And our nation's founders would be pleased to see their flexible system that promotes equity and fairness as it operates today.

Consider, for example, marital property rights, which vary considerably from state to state, and which have evolved considerably over time as inflexible, and unfair, systems have given way to more flexible, fairer ones. In earlier times husbands owned all property acquired during marriage as well as property brought into the marriage—by either spouse. Understandably, this rigid and unfair system ultimately gave way to separate-property systems, which acknowledged property rights of both spouses. More recently certain progressive states have adopted even more flexible, and fairer, "community property" systems, under which each spouse owns half of all property acquired during the marriage, while each spouse retains a separate-property interest in his or her other property. Yet even these more egalitarian community-property systems can operate unfairly whenever spouses contribute unequally; accordingly, some community-property states are now modifying their systems for even greater flexibility and fairness.

Thus, the evolution of state marital-property laws aptly illustrates the virtue of a legal system that allows laws to evolve to keep pace with changing mores, attitudes, and our collective sense of equity. This same example also underscores the point that inflexible laws tend to operate unfairly, and properly give way to more flexible ones—as our nation's founders intended.

法律应该更严格还是应该更灵活?

某些程度的法律的连贯性和稳定性对于任何社会的正常运转都是至关重要的。除此之外,

我极力赞同发言人关于法律应该更具灵活性以适应不同的情况、时间和地点的论断。婚姻财产法非常适宜地证明了这一点。

一方面，我们的法律必须具备一定程度的连贯性、稳定性和可预言性，以便让我们更能理解我们在日常事物和社会中的法定义务和权利。比如，为了使私营工业更加繁荣，必须给予商行获知其相对于雇员、联邦管制机构和税务当局的法定权利和义务以及他们相对于顾客和供应商的契约性的权利和义务的保障。在上述范围内的任何一个不恰当的非稳定因素一定会对业务带来不良影响。而且，不同地域之间某种程度上的较为连贯的法律有利于促进商业的发展，也同样能够有利于州际间乃至国际的商业，而这些在流动性越来越强的社会中是值得付出努力的。

另一方面，如果在所有的地方和所有的场合都不能灵活运用严格的法律，将会导致不公正。美国宪法的撰拟者认识到了灵活的法律制度和灵活的法律法规的需求——给予各个州全方位的法律权限，仅跨州事件除外。宪法的撰拟者明白，和公平与公正的标准一样，社会的和经济的问题可以合理地随时间改变，也可以根据地点的变化——甚至不同的城镇而改变。而我们国家的创始人也会欣喜地看到他们灵活的制度促进了公平与公正，正如它现在运行的一样。

例如，在各个州之间存在极大差异的婚姻财产权利。由于最初它们并不灵活而且不公平，随着时间发生了巨大的演化，它们逐渐被更加灵活、更加公平的法规体系所取代。在早期，丈夫拥有婚姻期间获得的全部财产，也同样拥有双方婚前全部财产。可以理解，这种严格而且不公平的制度最终被承认夫妻双方的财产权利的单独财产体系所取代。特别是最近，一些更加进步的州已经采用更加灵活、更加公平的“共有财产”体制。在这个体制下，丈夫和妻子在分别保留自己的财产的同时，平均拥有婚姻期间获得的全部财产。然而，当夫妻双方的贡献不均等时，即使这种更加灵活的共有财产制度也不能确保完全的公平性。因此，一些采用共有财产体制的州府现在正在修改它们的体制，以便具备更大的灵活性和公平性。

这样，不断健全的每个州的婚姻财产法，恰如其分地说明了这样的法律体系的优越性：允许法律自行发展以便适应不断变化的习俗、态度以及我们对公正的共同的认识。同样的例子也强调了这样一个观点：不具备灵活性的法律容易导致不公，而且会被灵活的法规合理地取代——正如我们国家的创建者所希望的那样。

论点 有保留的赞成 作者没有全盘赞成题目的主张，即法律应该灵活，而是先做出让步，承认法律稳定的好处。

开头方式 表明立场 + 概述理由 该文章开头的主体就是它的中心句，作者惟一使用的有分量的理由就是婚姻财产法这个例子。这篇文章写得并不工整，与前面讲过的文章不在一个档次上。

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① On the one hand, a certain measure of consistency, stability, and predictability in our laws is required in order for us to...
- ② On the other hand, rigid laws can result in unfairness if applied inflexibly in all places at all times.
- ③ Consider, for example, marital property rights...

Issue 176 The value and function of science and art

"The function of science is to reassure; the purpose of art is to upset. Therein lies the value of

each.”

科学的作用是安心；艺术的目的是颠覆。只有这样他们才各得其所。

The speaker maintains that the function of art is to “upset” while the function of science is to “reassure,” and that it is in these functions that the value of each lies. **In my view, the speaker unfairly generalizes about** the function and value of art, while completely missing the point about the function and value of science.

Consider first the intent and effect of art. In many cases artists set about to reassure, not to upset. Consider the frescos of Fra Angelico and others monks and nuns of the late medieval period, who sought primarily through their representations of the Madonna and Child to reassure and be reassured about the messages of Christian redemption and salvation. **Or consider** the paintings of impressionist and realist painters of the late nineteenth century. Despite the sharp contrast in the techniques employed by these two schools, in both genres we find soothing, genteel, pastoral themes and images—certainly nothing to upset the viewer.

In other cases, artists set about to upset. For example, the painters and sculptors of the Renaissance period, like the artists who preceded them, approached their art as a form of worship. Yet Renaissance art focuses on other Christian images and themes—especially those involving the crucifixion and apocalyptic notions of judgment and damnation—which are clearly “upsetting” and disconcerting, and clearly not reassuring. Or consider the works of two important twentieth-century artists; few would argue that the surrealist images by Salvador Dali or the jarring, splashy murals by abstract painter Jackson Pollock serve to “upset,” or at the very least disquiet, the viewer on a visceral level.

When it comes to the function and value of science, in my view the speaker’s assertion is simply wrongheaded. The final objective of science, in my view, is to discover truths about our world, our universe, and ourselves. Sometimes these discoveries serve to reassure, and other times they serve to upset. For example, many would consider reassuring the various laws and principles of physics which provide unifying explanations for what we observe in the physical world. These principles provide a reassuring sense of order, even simplicity, to an otherwise mysterious and perplexing world.

On the other hand, many scientific discoveries have clearly “upset” conventional notions about the physical world and the universe. The notions of a sun-centered universe, that humans evolved from lower primate forms, and that time is relative to space and motion are all disquieting notions to anyone whose belief system depends on contrary assumptions. And more recently, researchers have discovered that many behavioral traits are functions of individual neurological brain structure, determined at birth. This notion has “upset” many professionals in fields such as behavioral psychology, criminology, mental health, and law, whose work is predicated on the notion that undesirable human behavior can be changed—through various means of reform and behavior modification.

In sum, the speaker over-generalizes when it comes to the function and value of art and science—both of which serve in some cases to reassure and in other cases to upset. In any event, the speaker misstates the true function and value of science, which is to discover truths, whether reassuring or upsetting.

科学和艺术的价值和功能

发言者主张艺术的功能在于“颠覆”而科学的功能在于“安心”，而它们各自的价值都存在

于它们的这些功能之中。我认为，发言者对艺术的功能和价值的概括并不公平，而他又完全错误地解释了科学的功能和价值。

首先我们来看艺术的目的和作用。在很多情况下，艺术家的目的在于“安心”而不是“颠覆”。例如，中世纪晚期安吉里柯教士以及其他许多男女教士所作的壁画，他们最初通过圣母和圣子的画像保证并被保证基督教救赎和拯救的信息。或者我们来看 19 世纪晚期的印象派作家和现实主义画家的油画。暂且不论这两个派别所采用的差别迥然的绘画技巧，我们在每个流派中都可以发现令人宽慰的、上流社会的田园牧歌式的主题和画面——显然，没有任何“颠覆”视者的东西。

在其他情况下，艺术家有意地进行“颠覆”。例如，文艺复兴时期的画家和雕刻家，像在他们之前的艺术家一样，将他们的艺术作为一种膜拜的形式。然而，文艺复兴时期的艺术更着重于其他带有基督教色彩的画面和主题——尤其是那些涉及磨难和关于审判和诅咒的启示性意图的画面和主题——它们很明显地带有“颠覆”的意味，令人非常不安，显然并非“安心”。或者我们来看看 20 世纪两位重要艺术家的作品：几乎没有人会认为萨尔瓦多·达利的超现实主义绘画或抽象派画家杰克逊·波洛克略显杂乱的泼墨壁画带有“颠覆”的色彩，甚至连最低限度的令人不安的因素都没有。

我们再来看看科学的功能和价值，我认为发言人的断言是根本性的判断错误。科学的最根本的目标，我认为，在于发掘我们这个世界、我们的宇宙以及我们自身的真理。有时这些发现会带来“安心”的效果，但另外一些时候它们会有“颠覆”的作用。例如，很多人会考虑到对物理学的各种法则和原理的确定，可以对我们在物理世界所观测到的现象做出统一的解释。这些原理为其他神秘而且复杂的世界提供了一种令人安心的条理感，甚至是简易感。

另一方面，很多科学发现都明显“颠覆”了有关物理世界和宇宙的常规概念。对于任何信仰系统以相反的假设为基础的人来说，宇宙的日心说理论、人类由低级灵长目动物进化而来的理论以及时间与空间和运动相对的理论都是扰乱人心的概念。而在近期，研究人员发现，很多动作特征是大脑神经结构的功能，是与生俱来的。这个理论令很多行为主义心理学、犯罪学、精神健康以及法律等等领域内的专家感到“不安”——他们的工作是以这样的理论为基础的：人类的不良行为是可以通过各种感化和行为校正手段加以改变的。

总而言之，当涉及艺术和科学的功能和价值的时候，发言者给出了不恰当的总结——这两者在某些情况下使人安心，而在另外一些情况下，则有颠覆的作用。在很多情况下，发言者错误地对科学的真正功能和价值做出论断，其真正的功能和价值在于发现真理，无论是令人安心的真理还是颠覆的真理。

论点 有保留的反对 作者对于题目给艺术下的定义不置可否，而对于题目给科学下的定义只做出了小小的让步，主要以驳论为主。

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场 请注意作者在开头时对原题所做的改动。

论证过程 比较型 作者把面铺得比较大，对于艺术和科学都在文内进行了正反分析，这其实也是由题目的设计所决定的，因为这道题目比较特殊的地方，就是它的题目设计的结构很松散，讲了两个方面的问题。

论证模式

- ① Consider first the intent and effect of art. In many cases artists set about to reassure, not to upset.

- ② In other cases, artists set about to upset.
- ③ When it comes to... in my view the speaker's assertion is simply wrongheaded.
- ④ On the other hand, many scientific discoveries have clearly "upset" conventional notions about the physical world and the universe.

Issue 221 The chief benefit of the study of history

"The chief benefit of the study of history is to break down the illusion that people in one period of time are significantly different from people who lived at any other time in history."

研究历史最大的好处就是打破了这种假象:生活在不同时代的人们之间在很大程度上是不同的。

I concede that basic human nature has not changed over recorded history, and that coming to appreciate this fact by studying history can be beneficial in how we live as a society. **However, I disagree with the statement in two respects.** First, in other ways there are marked differences between people of different time periods, and learning about those differences can be just as beneficial. Second, studying history carries other equally important benefits as well.

I agree with the statement insofar as through the earnest study of human history we learn that basic human nature—our desires and motives, as well as our fears and foibles—has remained constant over recorded time. And through this realization we can benefit as a society in dealing more effectively with our enduring social problems. History teaches us, for example, that it is a mistake to attempt to legislate morality, because humans by nature resist having their moral choices forced upon them. History also teaches us that our major social ills are here to stay, because they spring from human nature. For instance, crime and violence have troubled almost every society; all manner of reform, prevention, and punishment have been tried with only partial success. Today, the trend appears to be away from reform toward a "tough-on-crime" approach, to no avail.

However beneficial it might be to appreciate the unchanging nature of humankind, **it is equally beneficial to understand and appreciate significant differences between peoples of different time periods**—in terms of cultural mores, customs, values, and ideals. For example, the ways in which societies have treated women, ethnic minorities, animals, and the environment have continually evolved over the course of human history. Society's attitudes toward artistic expression, literature, and scientific and intellectual inquiry are also in a continual state of evolution. And, perhaps the most significant sort of cultural evolution involves spiritual beliefs, which have always spun themselves out, albeit uneasily, through clashes between established traditions and more enlightened viewpoints. A heightened awareness of all these aspects of cultural evolution help us formulate informed, reflective, and enlightened values and ideals for ourselves; and our society clearly benefits as a result.

Another problem with the statement is that it undervalues other, equally important benefits of studying history. Learning about the courage and tenacity of history's great explorers, leaders, and other achievers inspires us to similar accomplishments, or at least to face own fears as we travel through life. Learning about the mistakes of past societies helps us avoid repeating them. For instance, the world is slowly coming to learn by studying history that political states whose authority stems from suppression of individual freedoms invariably fall of their own oppressive weight. And, learning about one's cultural heritage, or roots, fosters a healthy sense of self and cultivates an inter-

est in preserving art, literature, and other cultural artifacts—all of which serve to enrich society.

To sum up, history informs us that basic human nature has not changed, and this history lesson can help us understand and be more tolerant of one another, as well as develop compassionate responses to the problems and failings of others. Yet, history has other lessons to offer us as well. It helps us formulate informed values and ideals for ourselves, inspires us to great achievements, points out mistakes to avoid, and helps us appreciate our cultural heritage.

研究历史的主要益处

我勉强认同在整个有记录的历史中,人类最基本的本性并没有改变,通过研究历史而认识到这个事实,对我们如何作为一个社会而生活是有利的。但是,在两个方面我不能认同文章的论点。第一,在很多方面,不同时期的人类存在着显著的区别,而认识到这些区别是同样有好处的。第二,对历史的研究还可以带来其他同等重要的益处。

通过认真地研究人类的历史,我们可以认识到人类的基本本性——我们的欲望和动机,以及我们的恐惧和弱点——自从有记录以来就一直保留至今,在这个范围内,我同意文章的观点。而且,通过这种认识,作为社会整体,我们在有效处理我们长期以来的社会问题上会获益匪浅。例如,历史教导我们,尝试在道德上进行立法是错误的,人类的本性抵制强加给他们道德上的选择。历史还教导我们,我们主要的社会弊病会存在下去,因为它们源自人类的本性。例如,犯罪行为 and 暴行几乎困扰着每一个社会,各种各样的革新、预防措施和惩罚措施都尝试过了,但只是取得了部分的成功。现在的趋势是“严厉打击犯罪”方法逐渐取代感化措施,但收效甚微。

对没有改变的人类本性的了解无论看上去是多么有益,了解人类在不同时期在文化道德观念、习俗、价值和理想方面的显著区别也是有着同样好处的。例如,在整个人类历史过程中,各个社会对妇女、少数民族、动物以及环境等问题的处理方式都在不断地发展完善。而社会对艺术表达、文学以及科学的、学术研究的态度也一直在不断地发展。而且,或许是最为显著的文化演变的类型涉及精神信仰,尽管并不容易,但它们经常在已经确立起来的传统和更具启迪性的观点的碰撞中自我发展。对文化演变所有这些方面的高度理解可以帮助我们为自己总结出有事实根据的、深思熟虑的、具有启迪性的价值观和理想,最终我们的社会很明显会从中得益。

文章的另一个问题在于,它低估了研究历史所带来的其他同等重要的好处。通过学习历史上伟大的探索者、领袖和其他成功者的勇气和坚韧,可以激发我们取得类似的成就,或者至少会鼓励我们在人生的旅途上直面自己的恐惧。学习以往各个社会的错误,可以帮助我们避免重蹈覆辙。例如,通过对历史的研究,全世界正在慢慢明白,那些将权力建立在对个人自由的镇压之上的国家,都会因为压迫深重而不可避免地步入灭亡。而且,研究人们的文化遗产或者文化根源,可以对自己认识得更加清楚,而且也会培养出对保留艺术、文学和其他文化遗产的兴趣——所有这些都有助于社会的充实。

总而言之,历史告诉我们,人类的基本本性并没有改变,这个历史教训可以帮助我们增强人与人之间的相互了解,对彼此更加宽容,同样对他人的困难和失败更富同情心。然而,历史还可以教导我们其他的东西。它可以帮助我们为自己总结正确的价值观和理想,激励我们取得更大的成就,指出我们的错误,让我们设法避免,并有助于我们欣赏我们的文化遗产。

论点 有保留的反对 作者用的是最常规的方法,让步赞成,再倾向于反对。

开头方式 表明立场 + 概述理由 开头的最后部分把作者驳论的两个方面提前暴露出来,这对于一篇论证比较复杂的文章来说无疑是很明智的。

论证过程 结论型**论证模式**

- ① I agree with the statement insofar as through...
- ② However beneficial it might be to appreciate... it is equally beneficial to understand and appreciate significant differences between peoples of different time periods...
- ③ Another problem with the statement is that it undervalues other, equally important benefits of studying history.

Issue 1 Do we learn the most from people whose views we share?

"We learn more from people whose views we share in common than from those whose ideas contradict ours."

比起那些和我们意见相左的人,我们能从志同道合者那里学到更多的东西。

Do we learn more from people whose views we share in common than from those whose ideas contradict ours? **The speaker claims so**, for the reason that disagreement can cause stress and inhibit learning. **I concede that** undue discord can impede learning. **Otherwise, in my view** we learn far from discourse and debate with those whose ideas we oppose than from people whose ideas are in accord with our own.

Admittedly, under some circumstances disagreement with others can be counterproductive to learning. For supporting examples, one need look no further than a television set. On today's typical television or radio talk show, disagreement usually manifests itself in meaningless rhetorical bouts and shouting matches, during which opponents vie to have their own message heard, but have little interest either in finding any common ground with or in acknowledging the merits of the opponent's viewpoint. **Understandably**, neither the combatants nor the viewers learn anything meaningful. **In fact**, these battles only serve to reinforce the predispositions and biases of all concerned. The end result is that learning is impeded.

Disagreement can also inhibit learning when two opponents disagree on fundamental assumptions needed for meaningful discourse and debate. For example, a student of paleontology learns little about the evolution of an animal species under current study by debating with an individual whose religious belief system precludes the possibility of evolution to begin with. And, economics and finance students learn little about the dynamics of a laissez-faire system by debating with a socialist whose view is that a centralized power should control all economic activity.

Aside from the foregoing two provisos, however, I fundamentally disagree with the speaker's claim. Assuming common ground between two rational and reasonable opponents willing to debate on intellectual merits, both opponents stand to gain much from that debate. Indeed it is primarily through such debate that human knowledge advances, whether at the personal, community, or global level.

At the personal level, by listening to their parents' rationale for their seemingly oppressive rules and policies, teenagers can learn how certain behaviors naturally carry certain undesirable consequences. At the same time, by listening to their teenagers concerns about autonomy and about peer pressures parents can learn the valuable lesson that effective parenting and control are two different things. **At the community level**, through dispassionate dialogue an environmental activist can come to

understand the legitimate economic concerns of those whose jobs depend on the continued profitable operation of a factory. Conversely, the latter might stand to learn much about the potential public-health price to be paid by ensuring job growth and a low unemployment rate. Finally, **at the global level**, two nations with opposing political or economic interests can reach mutually beneficial agreements by striving to understand the other's legitimate concerns for its national security, its political sovereignty, the stability of its economy and currency, and so forth.

In sum, unless two opponents in a debate are each willing to play on the same field and by the same rules, I concede that disagreement can impede learning. **Otherwise**, reasoned discourse and debate between people with opposing viewpoints is the very foundation upon which human knowledge advances. **Accordingly**, on balance the speaker is fundamentally correct.

我们从那些和我们意见一致的人那儿学到的东西最多吗？

比起那些和我们意见相左的人，我们能从志同道合者那里学到更多的东西吗？发言人是这样认为的，理由是分歧会形成压力并阻碍学习。我承认不恰当的争议会妨碍学习。除此之外，在我看来，我们从与那些不同意见者的言谈辩论中，比从和我们观点一致者那里可以学到更多的东西。

必须承认，在一些场合下，同别人争论是会降低学习效率的。例如，人们只需看一下电视就能找到有力的证据。在今天的电视或收音机里典型的脱口秀节目中，意见分歧常常表现为毫无意义的唇枪舌剑和吵架比赛，其中的各方都抢着宣传各自的观点，而对发现共识和承认对方观点的有理之处都不感兴趣。（从而）可以理解的是，无论是辩手还是观众都学不到任何有价值的东西。事实上，这些（口水）仗只能用于强化所有相关人员的偏见和癖好，其最终的结果是学习受到了抑制。

有意义的言谈辩论需要一些基本的假设，当双方在这些基本假定上存在争议时，意见不同也会阻碍认知。例如，一个古生物学学生和一个宗教信仰体系中首先就排除进化可能的人辩论，那么从中他对目前正在研究的某个动物物种进化状况几乎学习不到什么；或是经济学和金融学的学生，同一个主张中央集权控制所有经济行为的社会学家辩论，那么他们几乎学不到关于放任经济驱动系统论。

然而，除了上述两种情况，我基本上不赞同发言人的观点。如果愿意论辩的、有理性讲道理的双方，都是为了学术成果，那么他们都会从辩论中受益匪浅。事实上，人类知识主要就是通过这样的论辩而前进的，不论是在个人、社会或是全球的层面上。

在个人层面上，十来岁的孩子们可以通过听从其父母表面上强制性规定和方法，学到特定行为自然会产生某种不好的结果。同时，通过听取孩子们有关独立和同伴压力的忧虑，家长们可以学到宝贵的一课：有效的教子方式与控制是决然不同的两码事。在社会的层面上，一个环保积极分子在经过一番冷静对话之后，会逐渐理解那些靠工厂不断的营利经营为生者的合理经济考虑。反过来，后者可能会更多地了解到，确保工作增加和低失业率有可能会是以公共健康为代价。最后，在全球的层面上，两个有着相互冲突政治或经济利益的国家，通过努力了解对方的国家安全、政治主权、经济和货币的稳定等合理的诉求，是可以达成互利的协议的。

综上所述，我认为争议会妨碍学习，除非辩论双方都乐于在同一范围内遵守相同的游戏规则。要不然，合理的讨论和持不同观点的双方之间的辩论，正是人类知识进步的基础。因此，总的来看他说的是基本正确的。

论点 平衡观点 赞成和反对在文中平分秋色，论点在开头和结尾中前后呼应，总之就是“具体

情况具体分析”。

开头方式 提出问题 + 回答 + 表明立场 问句是一种很“投机”的开头方式，一方面省去了挖空心思琢磨开头的工夫，另一方面，在切题的同时，又不会让考官觉得你懒惰到照抄题目的地步。

论证过程 比较型 论证部分的四个自然段分成两个层次，前两段认同题目观点，每一段都是一种令题目观点成立的情况并举出具体例子。后两段驳斥题目观点，前一段承上启下引出反对题目的观点：分歧有助于交流和学习；后一段接着上一段展开，分别举出这三个层面中的例子。

论证模式

- ① Admittedly, under some circumstances disagreement with others can be counterproductive to learning.
- ② Disagreement can also inhibit learning when two opponents disagree on fundamental assumptions needed for meaningful discourse and debate.
- ③ Aside from the foregoing two provisos, however, I fundamentally disagree with the speaker's claim.
- ③ At the personal level, . . . At the community level, . . . at the global level . . .

Issue 17 Our duty to disobey unjust laws

“There are two types of laws: just and unjust. Every individual in a society has a responsibility to obey just laws and, even more importantly, to disobey and resist unjust laws.”

有两种法律：公正的和不公正的。每个社会成员都有责任遵守公正的法律，但是更重要的是，更应该不遵守和反抗不公正的法律。

According to this statement, each person has a duty to not only obey just laws but also disobey unjust ones. In my view this statement is too extreme, in two respects. First, it wrongly categorizes any law as either just or unjust; and secondly, it recommends an ineffective and potentially harmful means of legal reform.

First, whether a law is just or unjust is rarely a straightforward issue. The fairness of any law depends on one's personal value system. This is especially true when it comes to personal freedoms. Consider, for example, the controversial issue of abortion. Individuals with particular religious beliefs tend to view laws allowing mothers an abortion choice as unjust, while individuals with other value systems might view such laws as just.

The fairness of a law also depends on one's personal interest, or stake, in the legal issue at hand. After all, in a democratic society the chief function of laws is to strike a balance among competing interests. Consider, for example, a law that regulates the toxic effluents a certain factory can emit into a nearby river. Such laws are designed chiefly to protect public health. But complying with the regulation might be costly for the company; the factory might be forced to lay off employees or shut down altogether, or increase the price of its products to compensate for the cost of compliance. At stake are the respective interests of the company's owners, employees, and customers, as well as the opposing interests of the region's residents whose health and safety are impacted. In short, the fairness of the law is subjective, depending largely on how one's personal interests are affected by it.

The second fundamental problem with the statement is that disobeying unjust laws often has the opposite affect of what was intended or hoped for. Most anyone would argue, for instance, that our

federal system of income taxation is unfair in one respect or another. Yet the end result of widespread disobedience, in this case tax evasion, is to perpetuate the system. Free-riders only compel the government to maintain tax rates at high levels in order to ensure adequate revenue for the various programs in its budget.

Yet another fundamental problem with the statement is that by justifying a violation of one sort of law we find ourselves on a slippery slope toward sanctioning all types of illegal behavior, including egregious criminal conduct. Returning to the abortion example mentioned above, a person strongly opposed to the freedom-of-choice position might maintain that the illegal blocking of access to an abortion clinic amounts to justifiable disobedience. **However,** it is a precariously short leap from this sort of civil disobedience to physical confrontations with clinic workers, then to the infliction of property damage, then to the bombing of the clinic and potential murder.

In sum, because the inherent function of our laws is to balance competing interests, reasonable people with different priorities will always disagree about the fairness of specific laws. Accordingly, radical action such as resistance or disobedience is rarely justified merely by one's subjective viewpoint or personal interests. And in any event, disobedience is never justifiable when the legal rights or safety of innocent people are jeopardized as a result.

反对不公正的法律是我们的责任

按照这一观点，每一个人都既有遵守合理法律的义务，又有反对不公正法律的责任。我认为，这就太绝对了，分两方面来说。一、法律不能以要么公正要么不公正来划分；二、这个观点推荐的是一种低效并具有潜在危害的法律改革方式。

首先，一部法律是否公正很少一眼就可以看出的。任何法律的合理性都取决于个人的价值体系。有关个人自由的问题尤为如此。例如，就人工流产这一有争议的问题，特定宗教信仰的个人倾向于把允许母亲堕胎看成是不合理，而其他价值体系的人又可能认为这种法律是合理的。

一部法律的公正合理与否还取决于人们的个人利益或在眼前的司法问题中的利害关系。毕竟，在一个民主社会中，法律的主要功用就是协调相互竞争利益之间的平衡。举例言之，一部关于某一工厂向附近河流排放污水的管制法，主要是为保护公共健康而订立的。但遵守管制对公司来说就可能意味着巨大的损失，工厂可能会被迫减员或整个停产，或者增加产品价格来弥补守法的损失。事关公司老板、雇员及顾客各方的利益，以及健康和受到冲击的地区居民的相对的利益。简言之，法律公正性是主观的，主要取决于个人的利益受影响的程度。

该观点的第二个基本问题在于反对不公正法律经常会产生事与愿违的作用。例如，大多数人会认为联邦个人所得税系统在这个方面或那个方面是不合理的。但广泛违法——在这个例子里就是逃税——的结果却是使这一系统永存。目无法纪者只能迫使政府保持高税率来确保各种预算计划的充足资金来源。

然而该观点还有一个基本问题，就是通过使违背某类法律的合理化会让我们滑向支持所有违法行为，包括惊人的犯罪行为的深渊。回到上面谈及的堕胎问题，一个持强烈反对自由选择立场的人可能主张非法地封锁堕胎渠道是合理的违背。但是，从这种民事违背，到对医护人员身体侵害，到财产蒙受损失，再到诊所爆炸和可能的谋杀，这之间仅仅是危险的一步之遥。

总而言之，正因为我们法律的内在功用在于平衡彼此竞争的利益，有着不同优先考虑的理性的人总会质疑特定法律的合理性。因此，像反抗或违背等激进行为很少会仅仅由人的主观看法来变得合理。在任何情况下，当无辜者的合法权利或安全最终受到侵害时，违背就永远不会是合理的。

论点 完全反对 作者从两个层次驳斥题目的观点：一、法律不能以公正不公正来划分；二、题目所推崇的是一种低效并具有潜在危害的法律改革方式。这种写法非常类似于 Argument 的找错误，尤其是第一个层次，完全在被题目牵着鼻子走。ETS 曾经明确表示过，如果考生把 Issue 写成了 Argument 题目，也就是挑题目的逻辑错误的话，那么就属于不符合考试要求，毕竟它们考查的方向是不一样的。而第二个层次，又提到了题目中从未提过的“法律改革”，可以说是论证得比较牵强。你可以试试用安全的方法进行正反论证。

开头方式 表明立场 + 概述理由

论证模式

- ① First, whether a law is just or unjust is rarely a straightforward issue.
- ② The fairness of a law also depends on one's personal interest...
- ③ The second fundamental problem with the statement is that...
- ④ Yet another fundamental problem with the statement is that...

Issue 46 Preparing young people for leadership

“While some leaders in government, sports, industry, and other areas attribute their success to a well-developed sense of competition, a society can better prepare its young people for leadership by instilling in them a sense of cooperation.”

政界、体育界、工业界和其他领域中的一些领导者将他们的成功归因于一种高度的竞争意识，而一个社会通过向年轻人灌输一种合作的意识却可以更好地为他们成为领导做准备。

Which is a better way to prepare young people for leadership: developing in them a spirit of competitiveness or one of cooperation? **The speaker favors the latter approach**, even though some leaders attribute their success to their keenly developed competitive spirit. **I tend to agree with the speaker, for reasons having to do with** our increasingly global society, and with the true keys to effective leadership.

The chief reason why we should stress cooperation in nurturing young people today is that, as tomorrow's leaders, they will face pressing societal problems that simply cannot be solved apart from cooperative international efforts. For example, all nations will need to cooperate in an effort to disarm themselves of weapons of mass destruction; to reduce harmful emissions that destroy ozone and warm the Earth to dangerous levels; to reduce consumption of the Earth's finite natural resources; and to cure and prevent diseases before they become global epidemics. Otherwise, we all risk self-destruction. In short, global peace, economic stability, and survival of the species provide powerful reasons for developing educational paradigms that stress cooperation over competition.

A second compelling reason for instilling in young people a sense of cooperation over competition is that effective leadership depends less on the latter than the former. A leader should show that he or she values the input of subordinates—for example, by involving them in decisions about matters in which they have a direct stake. Otherwise, subordinates might grow to resent their leader and become unwilling to devote themselves wholeheartedly to the leader's mission. In extreme cases they might even sabotage that mission, or even take their useful ideas to competitors. And after all, without other people worth leading a person cannot be a leader—let alone an effective one.

A third reason why instilling a sense of cooperation is to be preferred over instilling a sense of competition is that the latter serves to narrow a leader's focus on thwarting the efforts of competitors. With such tunnel vision it is difficult to develop other, more creative means of attaining organizational objectives. Moreover, such means often involve synergistic solutions that call for alliances, partnerships, and other cooperative efforts with would-be competitors.

Those who would oppose the speaker might point out that a thriving economy depends on a freely competitive business environment, which ensures that consumers obtain high-quality goods and services at low prices. Thus, key leadership positions, especially in business, inherently call for a certain tenacity and competitive spirit. And, a competitive spirit seems especially critical in today's hyper-competitive technology-driven economy, where any leader failing to keep pace with ever-changing business and technological paradigms soon falls by the wayside. However, a leader's effectiveness as a competitor is not necessarily inconsistent with his or her ability to cooperate with subordinates or with competitors, as noted above.

In sum, if we were to take the speaker's advice too far we would risk becoming a world without leaders, who are bred of a competitive spirit. We would also risk the key benefits of a free-market economy. **Nevertheless**, on balance I agree that it is more important to instill in young people a sense of cooperation than one of competition. The speaker's preference properly reflects the growing role of cooperative alliances and efforts in solving the world's most pressing problems. **After all**, in a world in which our very survival as a species depends on cooperation, the spirit of even healthy competition, no matter how healthy, is of little value to any of us.

培养年轻人的领导才能

怎样才能更好地培养年轻人的领导才能：发展他们的竞争精神抑或合作精神？演讲者倾向于后者，即使一些领袖们将他们的成就归功于敏锐的竞争精神。我同意他，理由与我们日益全球化的社会和有效领导的真正关键因素有关。

今天我们培育青年人之所以要强调合作是因为，作为明天的领袖，他们将面临紧迫的社会问题。这些问题如果缺少国际合作的努力是不能得到解决的。比如，所有的国家都需要共同合作去消除他们的大规模杀伤性武器；减少破坏臭氧层的气体排放以防止地球气温上升到危险的程度；减少消耗地球的有限自然资源；以及治疗和预防某些疾病使其不至于成为全球流行病。否则，我们要冒自我毁灭之险。简言之，全球和平、经济稳定、物种生存等为发展强调合作多过竞争的教育范例提供了强有力的理由。

另一个为青年灌输合作多过竞争意识的理由在于，有效的领导力依赖后者少于依赖前者。一个领导人应该表现出重视下属的参与——比如，令他们加入到与之直接相关的事务决策中来。否则，下属可能会逐渐对上级产生厌恶感，变得不愿意对领导人的目标全心投入。极端的例子可能是破坏那个目标，或把他们有用的想法提供给竞争者。毕竟，没有可领导的人是不能被称为领导的——更别提有效的领导了。

第三个强调合作胜于竞争的理由是，后者会窄化领导挫败竞争对手种种努力的关注。以这种短浅的目光很难开发出更有创造力实现组织目标的手段。而且，这些手段总牵涉到需要与潜在的竞争者联盟、参与或其他合作的努力的协同解决方案。

那些反对演讲者的人可能会指出，一个繁荣的经济体依赖于自由竞争的商业环境，那将确保消费者以低廉的价格获得高质的商品和服务。因此，重要的领导位置，尤其在商业中，天然地就需要某种特定的坚韧和竞争精神。还有，竞争的精神在今天高度竞争的技术驱动型社会，显得

格外重要。在这样的社会中任何跟不上朝夕瞬变的商业与技术范式的领袖很快都会跌倒在路边。但是，作为竞争者领袖的效率与以上所述他或她和下属或竞争者合作的能力并不是矛盾的。

总而言之，如果把演讲者的看法理解得过于绝对，我们可能会令这个世界不再有领袖——那是些有着竞争精神的人。我们也将失去自由市场经济的一些关键好处。但不论如何，总体上我同意给青年灌输多于竞争意识的合作意识。演讲者的偏好恰当地反映了合作的联盟和努力在解决世界最为紧迫问题中日益重要的作用。毕竟，在这个世界上，作为一个物种我们的生存依赖于合作。健康的竞争精神，不论它有多健康，对我们来说都价值甚少。

论点 有保留的赞成

开头方式 提出问题 + 回答 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① The chief reason why we should stress cooperation in nurturing young people today is that...
- ② A second compelling reason for instilling in young people a sense of cooperation over competition is that...
- ③ A third reason why instilling a sense of cooperation is to be preferred over instilling a sense of competition is that...
- ④ Those who would oppose the speaker might point out that...

Issue 144 The value of art vs. that of art critic

"It is the artist, not the critic, * who gives society something of lasting value."

*** a person who evaluates works of art, such as novels, films, music, paintings, etc.**

是艺术家而不是评论家带给了社会一些具有持久价值的东西。

* 评论家指的是评价例如小说、电影、绘画等这些艺术作品的人。

This statement asserts that art, not the art critic, provides something of lasting value to society. I strongly agree with the statement. Although the critic can help us understand and appreciate art, more often than not, critique is either counterproductive to achieving the objective of art or altogether irrelevant to that objective.

To support the statement the speaker might point out the three ostensible functions of the art critic. First, critics can help us understand and interpret art; a critic who is familiar with a particular artist and his or her works might have certain insights about those works that the layperson would not. **Secondly**, a critic's evaluation of an art work serves as a filter, which helps us determine which art is worth our time and attention. For example, a new novel by a best-selling author might nevertheless be an uninspired effort, and if the critic can call our attention to this fact we gain time to seek out more worthwhile literature to read. **Thirdly**, a critic can provide feedback for artists; and constructive criticism, if taken to heart, can result in better work.

However, reflecting on these three functions makes clear that the art critic actually offers very little to society. The first function is better accomplished by docents and teachers, who are more able to enhance a layperson's appreciation and understanding of art by providing an objective, educated inter-

pretation of it. Besides, true appreciation of art occurs at the moment we encounter art; it is the emotional, even visceral impact that art has on our senses, spirits, and souls that is the real value of art. A critic can actually provide a disservice by distracting us from that experience.

The critic's second function—that of evaluator who filters out bad art from the worthwhile—is one that we must be very wary of. History supports this caution. In the role of judge, critics have failed us repeatedly. Consider, for example, Voltaire's rejection of Shakespeare as barbaric because he did not conform to neo-classical principles of unity. Or, consider the complete dismissal of Beethoven's music by the esteemed critics of his time. The art critic's judgment is limited by the narrow confines of old and established parameters for evaluation. Moreover, critical judgment is often misguided by the ego; thus, its value is questionable in any event.

I turn finally to the critic's third function: to provide useful feedback to artists. The value of this function is especially suspect. Any artist, or anyone who has studied art, would agree that true art is the product of the artist's authentic passion, a manifestation of the artist's unique creative impulse, and a creation of the artist's spirit. If art were shaped by the concern for integrating feedback from all criticism, it would become a viable craft, but at the same time would cease to be art.

In sum, none of the ostensible functions of the critic are of much value at all, let alone of lasting value, to society. **On the other hand**, the artist, through works of art, provides an invaluable and unique mirror of the culture of the time during which the work was produced—a mirror for the artist's contemporaries and for future generations to gaze into for insight and appreciation of history. The art critic in a subordinate role, more often than not, does a disservice to society by obscuring this mirror.

艺术的价值 VS. 艺术批评的价值

对于艺术而非艺术批评为社会提供了持续的价值这一论断,我非常同意。虽然批评能帮助我们理解和欣赏艺术,但通常批评对于艺术的目标起反作用或者与那个目标毫不相关。

为了支持这样的论断,演讲者可能举出了三个艺术批评的表面功能。首先,批评能帮助我们理解和解释艺术;一个熟悉某位艺术家及他或她作品的批评者或许对于这些作品有着某种门外汉没有的洞察力。其次,批评家对一件艺术作品的评价就类似一个筛子,帮助我们决定哪种艺术值得我们的时间和注意。比如,一个畅销书作者的新小说或许是没有创见的作品,如果批评家能提请我们的注意,那么我们就能把时间花在阅读更有意义的文学作品上。再次,批评可以为艺术家们提供反馈,建设性的批评如果被真心采纳,就会产生更好的作品。

然而,反思这三个功能却使人明白,艺术批评实际上对社会贡献甚少。第一个功能代课教师和教师们完成得更好,通过提供一个对艺术客观的有水平的解释,他们更有能力提高门外汉对该艺术的欣赏和理解水平。另外,真正理解艺术的时刻发生在我们与它接触的那一刹,艺术对我们的感官、精神、灵魂的感性的甚至是本能的冲击,才是艺术的真正价值。艺术批评会使我们从那种体验上分心,事实上在起反作用。

批评的第二个功能——把坏艺术视为无价值而加以滤去的评价者的功能——是我们必须非常谨慎的功能。历史支持着这种谨慎。艺术批评的判断作用不断地使我们失望。比如,伏尔泰拒斥莎士比亚为野蛮,因为后者没有遵从新古典的一体性原则。再考虑贝多芬的音乐在他那个时代被自负的评论所完全排斥的事实吧。艺术批评的判断为既有的、老旧的评价标准所限。更有甚者,批评时常为自负所误导。因此在任何情况中,它的价值都值得怀疑。

我最后谈谈批评的第三个功能:为艺术家提供有益的反馈。这一功能的价值尤其值得质疑。任何艺术家或者艺术学习者都会同意这样的一个观点,真正的艺术是艺术家真实激情的产品,

是他独有创造冲动的体现，也是他精神的凝结。如果艺术被要整合所有批评者的反馈这种顾虑所塑造的话，那它只会是件合格的工艺品，同时不再是艺术了。

总而言之，对于社会，那些表面的功能没有一个拥有足够的，更别说是持续的价值了。另一方面，艺术家通过艺术品，提供了一面无价和独特的镜子，其中折射出作品产生时代的文化——以便艺术家的同代和后代从这面镜子中获得对历史的洞察和欣赏。艺术批评是个从属的角色，经常通过模糊那面镜子而危害社会。

论点 有保留的赞成 作者虽然在开头“强烈”地同意，但是他在论述过程中还是很小心地用了正反论证，即使他的倾向性非常“明显”。

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场

论证过程 结论型

论证模式

- ① To support the statement the speaker might point out the three ostensible functions of the art critic.
- ② However, reflecting on these three functions makes clear that the art critic actually offers very little to society.
- ③ The critic's second function—is one that we must be very wary of.
- ④ I turn finally to the critic's third function:...

Issue 201 Should educators provide students with a set of ideas or with job preparation?

“The purpose of education should be to provide students with a value system, a standard, a set of ideas—not to prepare them for a specific job.”

教育的目的应该是给予学生一个价值体系，一个标准，一整套理念——而不是为一个具体工作培养他们。

Should educators teach values or focus instead on preparing students for jobs? **In my view the two are not mutually exclusive.** It is by helping students develop their own principles for living, as well as by instilling in them certain fundamental values, that educators best prepare young people for the world of work.

One reason for my viewpoint is that rote learning of facts, figures, and technical skills does not help us determine which goals are worthwhile and whether the means of attaining those goals are ethically or morally acceptable. In other words, strong values and ethical standards are needed to determine how we can best put our rote knowledge to use in the working world. Thus, by helping students develop a thoughtful, principled value system educators actually help prepare students for jobs.

Another reason for my viewpoint lies in the fact that technology-driven industries account for an ever-increasing portion of our jobs. As advances in technology continue to accelerate, specific knowledge and skills needed for jobs will change more and more quickly. Thus it would be a waste of our education system to focus on specific knowledge and job skills that might soon become obsolete—at the expense of teaching values. It seems more appropriate today for employers to provide the training our

workforce needs to perform their jobs, freeing up our educators to help students develop guiding principles for their careers.

Besides helping students develop their own thoughtful value systems, **educators should instill in students certain basic values** upon which any democratic society depends; otherwise, our freedom to choose our own jobs and careers might not survive in the long term. These values include principles of fairness and equity upon which our system of laws is based, as well as the values of tolerance and respect when it comes to the viewpoints of others. It seems to me that these basic values can best be instilled at an early age in a classroom setting, where young students can work out their value systems as they interact with their peers. Moreover, as students grow into working adults, practicing the basic values of fairness and respect they learned as students serves them well in their jobs. At the workplace these values manifest themselves in a worker's ability to cooperate, compromise, understand various viewpoints, and appreciate the rights and duties of coworkers, supervisors, and subordinates. This ability cannot help but serve any worker's career goals, as well as enhancing overall workplace productivity.

Admittedly, values and behavioral standards specific to certain religions are best left to parents and churches. After all, by advocating the values and teachings of any particular religion public educators undermine our basic freedom of religion. However, by exposing students to various religious beliefs, educators promote the values of respect and tolerance when it comes to the viewpoints of others. Besides, in my observation certain fundamental values—such as compassion, virtue, and humility—are common to all major religions. By appreciating certain fundamental values that we should all hold in common, students are more likely to grow into adults who can work together at the workplace toward mutually agreed-upon goals.

In sum, only when educators help students develop their own principles for living, and when they instill certain fundamental values, do young people grow into successful working adults. Although there will always be a need to train people for specific jobs, in our technological society where knowledge advances so rapidly, employers and job training programs are better equipped to provide this function—leaving formal educators to equip students with a moral compass and ballast to prevent them from being tossed about aimlessly in a turbulent vocational sea.

教育者该为学生提供一套理念还是职业准备?

教育者们是该教给学生价值观还是关注怎样为职业做准备?在我看来,这二者并不互相排斥。正是通过帮助学生发展他们自己的生活原则并灌输一定的基本价值观,教育者们才能为年轻人在今后的工作世界做最佳准备。

我的这个观点的一个理由是,熟知事实、数据与技巧并不能帮我们决定什么样的目标是值得的,以及这些目标的手段是否为伦理道德所接受。换句话说,我们需要强烈的价值观和伦理标准去决定如何最好地将所熟知的知识应用于这个世界。因此,通过帮助学生发展出一套周详的、有原则的价值系统,教育者们实际上是帮助他们为职业做准备。

另外一个理由在于这样的事实,技术驱动的产业占据着越来越多的就业份额。因为技术发展的脚步正持续加快,职业所需求的具体知识和技能将越来越快地发生改变。因此,如果教育系统以牺牲教育价值观为代价,将重点集中在提供或许很快就会过时的专业知识和技能,就会是一种浪费。今天,对雇主们而言为雇员提供我们的劳力所需要的技能培训,而使教育者们得以解脱去帮助学生们发展他们职业的指导性原则似乎更为合适。

除了帮助学生发展自己的周详的价值系统外,教育者们还应向他们灌输某些任何民主社会赖以依存的基本价值观。否则,我们选择工作和职业的自由长远来看不会存在下去。这些价值观包括我们的法律系统作为基础的公平和平等,还有对他人观点的宽容和尊重。在我看来这些基本的价值在教室里可以最好地被灌输给年纪尚小的人,在那里年少的学生们可以在与同龄人的交往中实践这些价值。而且,随着学生们长大成为从业的成人,实践学生时期所学会的公平和尊重他人的基本价值在工作中将对他们大有裨益。在工作场所,这些价值表现为工人的合作、妥协、理解不同的观点的能力和欣赏同事、上级以及下级的权利和义务的能力。这种能力不仅有助于实现工作者本人的职业目标,也能提高经营体的整体生产率。

诚然,涉及某一宗教的具体价值观和行为标准最好留给父母或者教堂来教育。毕竟,公共的教育者们通过提倡任何一种特定宗教的价值观和教义将有损于我们基本的宗教自由原则。然而,通过将不同的宗教信仰展示给学生,教育者们实际上帮助提升了他们尊重和宽容不同观点的能力。另外,经我观察,一些基本的价值观——如悲悯、美德和谦虚——是所有主要宗教共有的。通过了解这些我们应该共有的基本价值观,学生们更可能成长为能够为取得共识的目标而一起工作的成年人。

总而言之,只有当教育者帮助学生发展自己的生活原则,并提供给他们一些基本价值观的时候,年轻人才能成长为成功的工作者。虽然,总有一种教给人们适应具体工作的技能的需要,但在我们这样一个技术日新月异的社会,雇主和职业训练教程能更好地提供这一功能。正统的教育者应为学生提供一种道德指南针和压舱物,以防止他们在汹涌的职业之海中迷失方向。

论点 平衡观点 比较特殊的一篇文章,没有一半赞成一半反对,而是两者结合起来共同发挥作用,这很像是问题解决型的论点(各种方法结合起来才是最合理、最完整的解决办法)。

开头方式 提出问题 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型 本文没有特别成套路的论证过程,只是在按部就班地说明理由,每一段中都融合两个方面:原则和技能。

论证模式

- ① One reason for my viewpoint is that...
- ② Another reason for my viewpoint lies in the fact that...
- ③ Besides...educators should instill in students certain basic values...
- ④ Admittedly, values and behavioral standards specific to certain religions are best left to parents and churches.

Issue 228 Praising **positive** actions and ignoring negative ones

"The best way to teach—whether as an educator, employer, or parent—is to praise positive actions and ignore negative ones."

无论是作为教育者、雇主或者是父母,教育最好的方法都是赞扬良好的行为而无视不良行为。

The speaker suggests that the most effective way to teach others is to praise positive actions while ignoring negative ones. In my view, this statement is too extreme. It overlooks circumstances under which praise might be inappropriate, as well as ignoring the beneficial value of constructive criticism, and sometimes even punishment.

The recommendation that parents, teachers, and employers praise positive actions is generally good advice. For young children positive reinforcement is critical in the development of healthy self-esteem and self-confidence. For students appropriate positive feedback serves as a motivating force, which spurs them on to greater academic achievement. For employees, appropriately administered praise enhances productivity and employee loyalty, and makes for a more congenial and pleasant work environment overall.

While recommending praise for positive actions is fundamentally sound advice, this advice should carry with it certain caveats. **First**, some employees and older students might find excessive praise to be patronizing or paternalistic. **Secondly**, some individuals need and respond more appropriately to praise than others; those administering the praise should be sensitive to the individual's need for positive reinforcement in the first place. **Thirdly**, praise should be administered fairly and evenhandedly. By issuing more praise to one student than to others, a teacher might cause one recipient to be labeled by classmates as teacher's pet, even if the praise is well deserved or badly needed. If the result is to alienate other students, then the praise might not be justified. Similarly, at the workplace a supervisor must be careful to issue praise fairly and evenhandedly, or risk accusations of undue favoritism, or even discrimination.

As for ignoring negative actions, I agree that minor peccadilloes can, and in many cases should, be overlooked. Mistakes and other negative actions are often part of the natural learning process. Young children are naturally curious, and parents should not scold their children for every broken plate or precocious act. Otherwise, children do not develop a healthy sense of wonder and curiosity, and will not learn what they must in order to make their own way in the world. Teachers should avoid rebuking or punishing students for faulty reasoning, incorrect responses to questions, and so forth. Otherwise, students might stop trying to learn altogether. And employees who know they are being monitored closely for any sign of errant behavior are likely to be less productive, more resentful of their supervisors, and less loyal to their employers.

At the same time, some measure of constructive criticism and critique, and sometimes even punishment, is appropriate. Parents must not turn a blind eye to their child's behavior if it jeopardizes the child's physical safety or the safety of others. Teachers should not ignore behavior that unduly disrupts the learning process; and of course teachers should correct and critique students' class work, homework and tests as needed to help the students learn from their mistakes and avoid repeating them. Finally, employers must not permit employee behavior that amounts to harassment or that otherwise undermines the overall productivity at the workplace. Acquiescence in these sorts of behaviors only serves to sanction them.

To sum up, the speaker's dual recommendation is too extreme. Both praise and criticism serve useful purposes in promoting a child's development, a student's education, and an employee's loyalty and productivity. Yet both must be appropriately and evenhandedly administered; otherwise, they might serve instead to defeat these purposes.

赞赏良好的而忽略不良行为

演讲者认为最有效的教育他人的办法就是对良好的行为给予赞赏而忽略不良行为。在我看来,这样的陈述过于极端。它忽略了赞赏有时可能并不恰当的情况,也忽视了富有建设性的批评、甚至惩戒的有益的价值。

推荐父母、老师、雇主们对于积极行为给予表扬在总体上说来是一个不错的建议。对孩子们来说，正面的强化对于他们自尊和自信的养成是至关重要的。对于学生们而言，恰当的积极反馈是一种激励的动力，将刺激他们在学术上取得更大成就。对雇员们而言，恰当地施予的赞赏将提高生产率和员工的忠实度，并有助于产生一个总体上更统一、更宜人的工作环境。

赞赏良好行为的建议基本上很好，但是这个建议也存在一些需要警戒的地方。首先，一些员工和年纪较大的学生或许认为过多的赞赏是屈尊俯就的和家长式作风的做法。其次，一些个人比他人需要和回应更恰如其分的赞扬，因此赞扬的施与者们必须首先对个人对积极强化的需求要敏锐。再次，赞扬应当被公正平等地给与。如果对一个学生给予比他人更多的褒扬，即使是应得的和急需的，也可能导致这位被表扬学生被同学贴上“老师宠物”的标签。如果结局是疏离其他的学生，那么这种赞赏可能就是不合理的。同样，在工作场所，一个主管也必须小心地、公正平等地给予赞赏，否则将有被指责为不当地偏护甚至是歧视的风险。

至于忽略不良行为，我同意对一些错误可以，在许多时候甚至是应该被略过的。错误和其他的不良行为常常是自然学习过程中的一部分。孩子们总是天性好奇，父母们不应当为每个破碎的碟子或者是不成熟行为责备他们。否则孩子们将不能养成健康的惊异和好奇心，也不能学到那些对他们在世界上独自立足所必要的东西。教师们应当避免因为错误地推理和不正确地回答问题等等而责备或惩罚学生。不然，学生们也许会彻底放弃学习。了解到自身受到严密监视以防止任何过失行为的员工，可能生产率会降低，对于上级产生更深的厌恶感，对雇主的忠诚度更低。

与此同时，一定程度的建设性批评甚至惩戒却是恰当的。如果孩子的行为有可能伤害到自身安全或者他人的安全，父母千万不能视而不见。教师们对不当打断教学进程的行为也不能置之不理。当然他们还要批改学生的课堂作业和课后作业及测试题，需要这种批改来帮助他们从错误中学习并避免再犯。最后，如果员工的行为构成了骚扰或者损害了工作场所的整体生产率，雇主不应纵容，否则便是对他们自身的惩罚。

总的说来，演讲者的双重推荐过于极端。赞扬和批评对于促进孩子们的发展、学生的教育、员工的忠诚和生产率都能发挥有用的作用。但这两种手段都必须恰当、平等地实施，否则将阻碍最后目的的达到。

论点 有保留的反对

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场

论证过程 结论型

论证模式

- ① The recommendation that parents, teachers, and employers praise positive actions is generally good advice.
- ② While recommending praise for positive actions is fundamentally sound advice, this advice should carry with it certain caveats.
- ③ As for ignoring negative actions, I agree that minor peccadilloes can, and in many cases should, be overlooked.
- ④ At the same time, some measure of constructive criticism and critique, and sometimes even punishment, is appropriate.

Issue 239 Should all so-called facts be mistrusted?

“Much of the information that people assume is ‘factual’ actually turns out to be inaccurate. Thus, any piece of information referred to as a ‘fact’ should be mistrusted since it may well be proven false in the future.”

大多数人们认为是事实的信息实际上最终都是不准确的。因此,任何一条据称是事实的信息都应该被质疑,因为它在将来很可能会被证明为是错误的。

The speaker contends that so-called “facts” often turn out to be false, and therefore that we should distrust whatever we are told is factual. **Although** the speaker overlooks certain circumstances in which undue skepticism might be counterproductive, and even harmful, **on balance I agree that** we should not passively accept whatever is passed off as fact; otherwise, human knowledge would never advance.

I turn first to so-called “scientific facts,” by which I mean current prevailing notions about the nature of the physical universe that have withstood the test of rigorous scientific and logical scrutiny. The very notion of scientific progress is predicated on such scrutiny. Indeed the history of science is in large measure a history of challenges to so-called “scientific facts”—challenges which have paved the way for scientific progress. For example, in challenging the notion that the earth was in a fixed position at the center of the universe, Copernicus paved the way for the corroborating observations of Galileo a century later, and ultimately for Newton’s principles of gravity upon which all modern science depends. The staggering cumulative impact of Copernicus’ rejection of what he had been told was true provides strong support for the speaker’s advice when it comes to scientific facts.

Another example of the value of distrusting what we are told is scientific fact involves the debate over whether human behavioral traits are a function of internal physical forces (“nature”) or of learning and environment (“nurture”). Throughout human history the prevailing view has shifted many times. The ancients assumed that our behavior was governed by the whims of the gods; in medieval times it became accepted fact that human behavior is dictated by bodily humours, or fluids; this “fact” later yielded to the notion that we are primarily products of our upbringing and environment. Now researchers are discovering that many behavioral traits are largely a function of the unique neurological structure of each individual’s brain. Thus only by distrusting facts about human behavior can we advance in our scientific knowledge and, in turn, learn to deal more effectively with human behavioral issues in such fields as education, juvenile delinquency, criminal reform, and mental illness.

The value of skepticism about so-called “facts” is not limited to the physical sciences. When it comes to the social sciences we should always be skeptical about what is presented to us as historical fact. Textbooks can paint distorted pictures of historical events, and of their causes and consequences. After all, history in the making is always viewed firsthand through the eyes of subjective witnesses, then recorded by fallible journalists with their own cultural biases and agendas, then interpreted by historians with limited, and often tainted, information. And when it comes to factual assumptions underlying theories in the social sciences, we should be even more distrusting and skeptical, because such assumptions inherently defy deductive proof, or disproof. Skepticism should extend to the law as well. While law students, lawyers, legislators, and jurists must learn to appreciate traditional legal doctrines and principles, at the same time they must continually question their correctness—in terms of their fairness and continuing relevance.

Admittedly, in some cases undue skepticism can be counterproductive, and even harmful. For instance, we must accept current notions about the constancy of gravity and other basic laws of physics; otherwise, we would live in continual fear that the world around us would literally come crashing down on us. Undue skepticism can also be psychologically unhealthy when distrust borders on paranoia. Finally, common sense informs me that young people should first develop a foundation of experiential knowledge before they are encouraged to think critically about what they are told is fact.

To sum up, a certain measure of distrust of so-called “facts” is the very stuff of which human knowledge and progress are fashioned, whether in the physical sciences, the social sciences, or the law. Therefore, with few exceptions I strongly agree that we should strive to look at facts through skeptical eyes.

是不是全部所谓的事实都应该被怀疑？

演讲者主张所谓的“事实”经常最后被证明是错误的，因此我们应该怀疑任何被告知是事实的东西。虽然演讲者忽略了在某些情形下不正当的怀疑可能起到反作用，甚至有害，但总体上我同意我们不该被动地接受一切冒充的事实，否则人类的知识将无从进步。

我首先说说所谓的“科学事实”，我指的是当下正流行的、已经经过了严格的科学和逻辑检验的有关宇宙本质的一些概念。科学进步的概念本身正是基于这些检验。的确，科学史在很大程度上是一部挑战所谓“科学事实”的历史，正是这些挑战为科学的发展扫平了道路。举个例子，通过挑战地球居于宇宙中心的一个固定位置的说法，哥白尼为伽利略一个世纪后的观察和牛顿提出全部现代科学所依据的地心引力说扫清了障碍。在科学事实方面，哥白尼拒绝接受被告知的事情是真的这个事实的惊人的、累计影响为演讲者的观点提供了有力的支持。

怀疑被告知是科学事实的价值的另一个例子，涉及关于人类性格是内在物理力量（天性）的功能还是后天学习和环境（培养）的功能的辩论。通观人类历史，主流观点几易其变。在古代，人们认为我们的行为是由神的兴致所统辖的；到了中世纪被广为接受的事实是人类的行为是由体液决定的，这样的“事实”不久又被我们主要是抚养和环境的产物的论断所取代。现在研究者发现许多行为特征在很大程度上是个体大脑的独特神经网络的一个功能。因此只有通过质疑关于人类行为的事实，我们才能推进科学知识的发展，反过来也学到了更有效地应对在诸如教育、青少年犯罪、刑罚改革以及精神疾病等领域内的人类行为问题。

怀疑所谓“事实”的价值并不局限于物理科学。当涉及社会科学，我们也应当总是对被呈现于眼前的历史事实保持怀疑。教科书会扭曲历史事实的图像及其原因和结果。毕竟，形成中的历史总是先由主观的目击者的眼睛所见，然后由难免受自身文化偏见和日程影响而犯错的记者记录下来，再由历史学家根据有限的、经常被篡改的信息加以解释。当涉及作为社会科学理论基础的事实上的假定时，我们更应该持怀疑态度，因为这样的假定就其本质而言无法进行推断性的证明或反证。怀疑主义也应被拓展到法律领域。法律系的学生、律师、立法者以及法官必须学习领会传统的法律条文和原则，同时他们也必须持续地质问它们的正确性——在它们的公正性和持续的适用性方面的正确性。

诚然，在某些情景中不适当的怀疑主义可能会起反作用，甚至是有害的。比如，我们必须接受目前的关于引力永恒和其他的物理基本法则，否则我们将会陷入对于周遭世界简直就要把我们压扁的持久恐慌中。当不信任的边界扩展到偏执的程度时，不适当的怀疑主义在心理上可能也是不健康的。最后，常识提醒我们，年轻人必须首先发展出一个经验知识根基，然后才能鼓励他们批判性地思考被告知的何为事实。

总而言之,对于所谓“事实”一定程度上的怀疑是人类知识和进步形成的题中之意,不论是物理科学、社会科学还是法律方面。因此,除了罕见的例外,我强烈认同我们必须用怀疑的眼光去看待事实。

论点 有保留的赞成

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① I turn first to so-called “scientific facts,” . . .
- ② Another example of the value of distrusting what we are told is scientific fact involves the debate over . . .
- ③ The value of skepticism about so-called “facts” is not limited to the physical sciences.
- ④ Admittedly, in some cases undue skepticism can be counterproductive, and even harmful.

Issue 49 Imaginative works vs. factual accounts

“Imaginative works such as novels, plays, films, fairy tales, and legends present a more accurate and meaningful picture of human experience than do factual accounts. Because the creators of fiction shape and focus reality rather than report on it literally, their creations have a more lasting significance.”

想像作品,比如小说、戏剧、电影、童话和传奇要比真实的叙事作品更能精确而有意地展现人类的经历。因为虚构作品的作者们塑造和关注现实而不是一板一眼地报道现实,所以他们的创作具有更加深远的意义。

Do imaginative works hold more lasting significance than factual accounts, for the reasons the speaker cites? **To some extent the speaker overstates fiction’s comparative significance. On balance, however, I tend to agree with the speaker.** By recounting various dimensions of the human experience, a fictional work can add meaning to and appreciation of the times in which the work is set. Even where a fictional work amounts to pure fantasy, with no historical context, it can still hold more lasting significance than a factual account. Examples from literature and film serve to illustrate these points.

I concede that most fictional works rely on historical settings for plot, thematic, and character development. By informing us about underlying political, economic, and social conditions, factual accounts provide a frame of reference needed to understand and appreciate imaginative works. Fact is the basis for fiction, and fiction is no substitute for fact. **I would also concede that** factual accounts are more “accurate” than fictional ones—insofar as they are more objective. **But this does not mean that** factual accounts provide a “more meaningful picture of the human experience.” To the contrary, only imaginative works can bring a historical period alive—by way of creative tools such as imagery and point of view. And, only imaginative works can provide meaning to historical events—through the use of devices such as symbolism and metaphor.

Several examples from literature serve to illustrate this point. Twain’s novels afford us a sense of

how nineteenth-century Missouri would have appeared through the eyes of 10-year old boys. Melville's "Billy Budd" gives the reader certain insights into what travel on the high seas might have been like in earlier centuries, through the eyes of a crewman. And the epic poems "Beowulf" and "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight" provide glimpses of the relationships between warriors and their kings in medieval times. Bare facts about these historical eras are easily forgettable, whereas creative stories and portrayals such as the ones mentioned above can be quite memorable indeed. In other words, what truly lasts are our impressions of what life must have been like in certain places, at certain times, and under certain conditions. Only imaginative works can provide such lasting impressions.

Examples of important films underscore the point that creative accounts of the human experience hold more lasting significance than bare factual accounts. Consider four of our most memorable and influential films: *Citizen Kane*, *Schindler's List*, *The Wizard of Oz*, and *Star Wars*. Did Welles' fictional portrayal of publisher William Randolph Hearst or Spielberg's fictional portrayal of a Jewish sympathizer during the holocaust provide a more "meaningful picture of human experience" than a history textbook? Did these accounts help give "shape and focus" to reality more so than newsreels alone could? If so, will these works hold more "lasting significance" than bare factual accounts of the same persons and events? I think anyone who has seen these films would answer all three questions affirmatively. Or consider *The Wizard of Oz* and *Star Wars*. Both films, and the novels from which they were adapted, are pure fantasy. Yet both teem with symbolism and metaphor relating to life's journey, the human spirit, and our hopes, dreams, and ambitions—in short, the human experience. Therein lies the reason for their lasting significance.

In sum, without prior factual accounts fictional works set in historical periods lose much of their meaning. Yet only through the exercise of artistic license can we convey human experience in all its dimensions, and thereby fully understand and appreciate life in other times and places. And it is human experience, and not bare facts and figures, that endures in our minds and souls.

想像作品 VS. 事实记述

想像作品是否因演讲者所持之理由要比事实记述拥有更为持久的影响力呢？在某种程度上演讲者夸大了小说的相对意义。但总体上我倾向于认同演讲者。通过重新考量各个方面的人类经验，一部虚构的作品能为作品产生的背景时代增加意义和加深对该时代的理解。即使一部虚构作品纯粹是幻想，而完全没有历史的背景，它仍然能比事实的记述拥有持久的意义。文学和电影的例子形象地说明了这些观点。

我承认大多数虚构作品在情节、主题和角色的发展方面有赖于历史背景。通过提醒我们基本的政治、经济和社会情况，事实的记述提供了一套理解和欣赏想像作品所必需的参考框架。事实是虚构的基础，虚构不能替代事实。我同样也承认事实的记述要比虚构更为“准确”——就其更为客观而言。但是这并不意味着事实的记述提供了一种“更为有意义的人类生活经历的图景”。相反，只有想像作品才能使一段历史时期生动——通过创造性的工具，诸如形象化的描述和视角。也只有想像作品能为历史事件提供意义——通过象征和隐喻等手段的运用。

许多文学作品的例子可用来证明这一观点。吐温的小说使我们通过一个 10 岁大的男孩的眼睛感知到了 19 世纪的密苏里会是什么样子。麦尔维尔的《巴特尔比》让读者通过船夫的眼睛看到了早几个世纪的远洋旅行。史诗《贝奥武甫》和《高文爵士和绿衣骑士》使我们得以窥探中世纪骑士和他们的封君的关系。有关这些历史时代的明摆着的事实使人容易遗忘，而如上的富有创造性的故事和描写则确实令人难以忘怀。换句话说，真正持久的是我们对在某地某时和某种

条件下的生活必然情形的印象。只有想像作品可以提供这样的持久印象。

许多重要电影的例子也强调了,创造性地记述人类经历要比仅仅是事实记录拥有更持久的影响力。看看四部我们最为记忆深刻的电影吧:《公民凯恩》、《辛德勒的名单》、《绿野仙踪》、《星球大战》。是不是威尔士对威廉·鲁登道夫·希尔斯特的虚构描写和斯皮尔博格对大屠杀期间的一个犹太同情者的虚构描画比一本历史教科书提供了一幅更为“有意义的人类经历的图景”?这些记述是不是比单独的新闻报道更能赋予现实以“形态和专注”?如果是的话,这些作品是不是比赤裸的对事实和个人的记述要具有更为“持久的影响力”呢?我认为任何看过这些电影的人都能对这三个问题给出肯定的答案。或者看看《绿野仙踪》和《星球大战》,这两部电影以及它们改编所依据的小说纯属幻想。然而两者都充满了与生命旅程,人类精神,我们的希望、理想和雄心——简言之,人类历程——紧密相关的象征和隐喻。它们如此长盛不衰的原因就在于此。

总而言之,如果没有先前的事实记述,设定在历史时期的虚构作品便失去了意义。然而只有通过艺术加工我们才能从多方面传递人类经验,从而彻底理解和欣赏其他时空的生活。长存于我们的头脑与灵魂中的是人类经验,而不仅仅是事实和数据。

论点 有保留的赞成

开头方式 提出问题 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① I concede that most fictional works rely on historical settings for plot, thematic, and character development.
- ② Several examples from literature serve to illustrate this point.
- ③ Examples of important films underscore the point that...

Issue 99 Pragmatic vs. idealistic behavior

“In any realm of life—whether academic, social, business, or political—the only way to succeed is to take a practical, rather than an idealistic, point of view. Pragmatic behavior guarantees survival, whereas idealistic views tend to be superceded by simpler, more immediate options.”

在任何生活领域中——无论学术、社会、商业还是政治——获得成功的惟一道路就是采取现实的而不是理想化的观点。实用的行为确保了生存,反之理想化的观点正在趋于被更简化的和更直接的选择所取代。

I agree with the speaker insofar as that a practical, pragmatic approach toward our endeavors can help us survive in the short term. However, idealism is just as crucial—if not more so—for long-term success in any endeavor, whether it be in academics, business, or political and social reform.

When it comes to academics, students who we would consider pragmatic tend not to pursue an education for its own sake. Instead, they tend to cut whatever corners are needed to optimize their grade average and survive the current academic term. But, is this approach the only way to succeed academically? Certainly not. Students who earnestly pursue intellectual paths that truly interest them are more likely to come away with a meaningful and lasting education. In fact, a sense of mission about one's area of fascination is strong motivation to participate actively in class and to study

earnestly, both of which contribute to better grades in that area. Thus, although the idealist-student might sacrifice a high overall grade average, the depth of knowledge, academic discipline, and sense of purpose the student gains will serve that student well later in life.

In considering the business world it might be more tempting to agree with the speaker; after all, isn't business fundamentally about pragmatism—that is, “getting the job done” and paying attention to the “bottom line”? Emphatically, no. Admittedly, the everyday machinations of business are very much about meeting mundane short-term goals: deadlines for production, sales quotas, profit margins, and so forth. Yet underpinning these activities is the vision of the company's chief executive—a vision that might extend far beyond mere profit maximization to the ways in which the firm can make a lasting and meaningful contribution to the community, to the broader economy, and to the society as a whole. Without a dream or vision—that is, without strong idealist leadership—a firm can easily be cast about in the sea of commerce without clear direction, threatening not only the firm's bottom line but also its very survival.

Finally, when it comes to the political arena, again at first blush it might appear that pragmatism is the best, if not the only, way to succeed. Most politicians seem driven by their interest in being elected and reelected—that is, in surviving—rather than by any sense of mission, or even obligation to their constituency or country. Diplomatic and legal maneuverings and negotiations often appear intended to meet the practical needs of the parties involved—minimizing costs, preserving options, and so forth. But, it is idealists—not pragmatists—who sway the masses, incite revolutions, and make political ideology reality. Consider idealists such as America's founders, Mahatma Gandhi, or Martin Luther King. Had these idealists concerned themselves with short-term survival and immediate needs rather than with their notions of an ideal society, the United States and India might still be British colonies, and African Americans might still be relegated to the backs of buses.

In short, the statement fails to recognize that idealism—keeping one's eye on an ultimate prize—is the surest path to long-term success in any endeavor. Meeting one's immediate needs, while arguably necessary for short-term survival, accomplishes little without a sense of mission, a vision, or a dream for the long term.

务实行为 VS. 理想行为

在实际、务实的努力方法能使我们取得短期的成绩这点上,我同意演讲者的观点。然而,对于任何长期的成就,无论是学术的、商业还是政治与社会变革,理想主义却同样至关重要——如果不是更为重要的话。

涉及学术,我们视为务实的学生不会为了获得教育本身而接受教育。相反,他们会尽量投机取巧地取得最好的成绩水平,挨过眼下的学期。但这是学术成功的惟一路径吗?当然不。认真地在智力的道路上追求他们兴趣所在的学生会获得更为有意义和连贯的教育。实际上,对于某个迷人领域的一种使命感为他在课堂上主动参与和勤勉学习提供强烈的动力,而主动参与和勤勉学习都有助于在该领域中取得更好的成绩。因此,虽然理想主义学生也许会牺牲一点整体的成绩,但他们获得的知识的深度、学术的规范以及目的感在他们今后的生活中让他们获益匪浅。

考虑到商界,人们可能更倾向于同意演讲者。毕竟,难道做生意基本上不就是务实——“干完活儿”和注重“盈亏”吗?绝不是。诚然,日常的商业机制大多是为了实现短期的目标:生产期限、销售定额、利润空间等等。但首席执行官的设想是加强这些活动,他的设想远超过利润最大化,而推至公司为社区、为更宏观的经济乃至整个社会提供持续和有意贡献的种种方式。如果

没有这样的一个设想或梦想，即没有强烈理想主义的领导——一个公司将在商海中迷失方向，威胁到的不仅仅是公司的盈亏，更危及生存。

最后，在政治领域务实主义猛一看似乎也是最好（如果不是惟一的）的成功方法。许多政客仅仅为当选与连任——生存——的利益所驱使，而不是出于对宪法和国家的任何使命感和义务。外交和法律的操作与谈判总是倾向于实现有关各方的实际需要——成本最小化、保留多种选择等等。但正是理想主义者——而非务实主义者——指挥着民众、煽动着革命，使政治的意识形态变为现实。看看理想主义者诸如美国建国者们、甘地或者马丁·路德·金吧。如果这些人仅仅考虑到短期的生存和直接的需要而不是他们心中的理想社会，那么美利坚和印度可能都仍然还是英国的殖民地呢，而非裔美国人或许还坐在公共汽车的后面。

简言之，那样的论断没有认识到理想主义——始终关注终极的奖赏——是任何一种努力长远成功的最可靠之路。实现一个人的直接需要，或许对短期生存必要，却因为使命感、视角、理想的缺失而成就甚少。

论点 有保留的反对

开头方式 表明立场 + 概述理由 作者在开头明确给出了支持自己观点的三个层次上的理由：学术方面的、商业方面的还有政治与社会变革方面的。

论证过程 比较型 作者在三个层次内部逐一进行正反论证，得出的结论当然都是统一的。

论证模式

- ① When it comes to academics,...
- ② In considering the business world...
- ③ Finally, when it comes to the political arena...

Issue 164 Imagination vs. experience

"Sometimes imagination is a more valuable asset than experience. People who lack experience are free to imagine what is possible and thus can approach a task without constraints of established habits and attitudes."

有时候想像力是比经验更有价值的财富。缺少经验的人得以自由地想像任何可能性，并且由此可以达成一个目标而不受既定习惯和态度的限制。

The speaker asserts that imagination is "sometimes" more valuable than experience because individuals who lack experience can more freely imagine possibilities for approaching tasks than those entrenched in established habits and attitudes. **I fundamentally agree; however,** as the speaker implies, it is important not to overstate the comparative value of imagination. Examples from the arts and the sciences aptly illustrate both the speaker's point and my caveat.

One need only observe young children as they go about their daily lives to appreciate the role that pure imagination can play as an aid to accomplishing tasks. Young children, by virtue of their lack of experience, can provide insights and valuable approaches to adult problems. Recall the movie *Big*, in which a young boy magically transformed into an adult found himself in a high-power job as a marketing executive. His inexperience in the adult world of business allowed his youthful imagination free reign to contribute creative—and successful—ideas that none of his adult colleagues, set in their ways

of thinking about how businesses go about maximizing profits, ever would have considered. Admittedly, *Big* was a fictional account; yet, I think it accurately portrays the extent to which adults lack the kind of imagination that only inexperience can bring to solving many adult problems.

The speaker's contention also finds ample empirical support in certain forms of artistic accomplishment and scientific invention. History is replete with evidence that our most gifted musical composers are young, relatively inexperienced, individuals. Notables ranging from Mozart to McCartney come immediately to mind. Similarly, the wide-eyed wonder of inexperience seems to spur scientific innovation. Consider the science fiction writer Jules Verne, who through pure imagination devised highly specific methods and means for transporting humans to outer space. What makes his imaginings so remarkable is that the actual methods and means for space flight, which engineers settled on through the experience of extensive research and trial-and-error, turned out to be essentially the same ones Verne had imagined nearly a century earlier!

Of course, there are many notable exceptions to the rule that imagination unfettered by experience breeds remarkable insights and accomplishments. Duke Ellington, perhaps jazz music's most prolific composer, continued to create new compositions until late in life. Thomas Edison, who registered far more patents with the U.S. patent office than any other person, continued to invent until a very old age. Yet, these are exceptions to the general pattern. Moreover, the later accomplishments of individuals such as these tend to build on earlier ones, and therefore are not as truly inspired as the earlier ones, which sprung from imagination less fettered by life experience.

On the other hand, it is important not to take this assertion about artistic and scientific accomplishment too far. Students of the arts, for instance, must learn theories and techniques, which they then apply to their craft—whether music performance, dance, or acting. And, creative writing requires the cognitive ability to understand how language is used and how to communicate ideas. Besides, creative ability is itself partly a function of intellect; that is, creative expression is a marriage of one's cognitive abilities and the expression of one's feelings and emotions. In literature, for example, a rich life experience from which to draw ideas is just as crucial to great achievement as imagination. For example, many critics laud Mark Twain's autobiography, which he wrote on his death bed, as his most inspired work. And, while the direction and goals of scientific research rely on the imaginations of key individuals, most scientific discoveries and inventions come about not by sudden epiphanies of youthful star-gazers but rather by years and years of trial-and-error in corporate research laboratories.

In sum, imagination can serve as an important catalyst for artistic creativity and scientific invention. **Yet,** experience can also play a key role; in fact, in literature and in science it can play just as key a role as the sort of imagination that inexperience breeds.

想像 VS. 经验

演讲者认为想像“有时”比经验更有价值,原因在于那些缺少经验的个人能比被习惯和态度所束缚的个人在完成任务时能够更自由地想像各种可能性。我基本上同意这种观点。然而,正如演讲者所暗示的,不要过分夸大想像的相对价值是很重要的。艺术和科学领域的例子能形象地证明演讲者的论点和我的提示。

要了解纯粹的想像帮助人们完成任务时起到的作用,那只需要看看孩子们的日常生活。孩子们由于缺少经验,在大人的问题方面往往能提供有见地和有价值的方案。想想《大》那部电影中神奇地将自己变为市场主管这样高位的那个孩子。他在大人的商业世界中的缺少经验,使想

像力能产生出具有创造性的——并且是成功的——的点子。这些点子在他那些被利润最大化的思维方式所局限的大人同事看来，是绝对无法想像的。诚然，《大》是一部虚构作品，但我认为它准确地刻画出，在许多问题的解决中大人缺少那种只有无经验才能导致的想像。

演讲者同样也在某些艺术成就和科学发明中找到了足够的经验上的支持。我们许多杰出的作曲家都是年少的、相对而言缺乏经验的人，这样的例子在历史中不胜枚举。我们马上就会想到从莫扎特到麦卡尼这些名人。同样，由于没有经验而产生的令人吃惊的奇妙之事也能刺激科技的创新。想想朱尔斯·凡尔纳的科幻小说，他通过纯想像设计了许多将人类运送到外层空间的具体方式与手段。他的想像惊人之处就在于，科学家们通过广泛的经验研究和反复实验所发明的实际解决方法，与一个世纪前凡尔纳的想像基本相同！

当然，在不被经验束缚的想像能滋生出惊人的洞察和成就这点上，也有些值得注意的例外。爵士乐中可能最多产的作曲家杜克·艾林顿，即使在晚年他也能创造出新的作品。托马斯·爱迪生，他比任何人注册的专利都多，直到非常大的年纪仍然继续发明。但这是对总体的一些例外。人们后来的这些成就大多建筑在早期成就的基础上，因此不如那些不受生活经验束缚的想像富有灵感。

在另一方面，不要把关于这些艺术和科学成就的论断绝对化是很重要的。比如，学习艺术的学生必须学习理论和技艺，然后应用到他们的作品中去，不论是音乐、舞蹈或者表演。创作性的写作需要对语言是如何运用以及如何交流思想有所感知。同时，创造能力本身是智力功能的一部分，因此创造性的表达是个人感知能力与他的感觉和情感表达能力的共同产物。比如在文学方面，从中汲取思想的丰富生活经验与想像对于取得伟大成就是同等重要的。举个例子，许多评论家推崇马克·吐温的自传为他最有灵感的作品，而那是他在病床上写就的。当科学研究的方向和目标依赖于关键人物的想像的同时，许多科学发现和发明不是由年轻梦想家们的顿悟产生，而是在共同实验室中经多年的反复实验得来的。

总而言之，想像是艺术创造和科学发明的重要催化剂。但经验也能发挥重要的作用。事实上在文学和科学方面，经验和因缺少经验所滋生的想像能发挥同样重要的作用。

论点 有保留的赞成

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① One need only observe young children as they go about their daily lives...
- ② Of course, there are many notable exceptions to the rule that imagination unfettered by experience breeds remarkable insights and accomplishments.
- ③ Of course, there are many notable exceptions to the rule that imagination unfettered by experience breeds remarkable insights and accomplishments.
- ④ On the other hand, it is important not to take this assertion about... too far.

Issue 210 Are people free to choose a career?

"Most people choose a career on the basis of such pragmatic considerations as the needs of the economy, the relative ease of finding a job, and the salary they can expect to make. Hardly anyone is free to choose a career based on his or her natural talents or interest in a particular kind of work."

大多数人选择职业是基于一些实用考虑,诸如经济需求、较易谋职和称心的报酬之类。很少有人能够根据自己的天赋或者在某方面的兴趣来随心地择业。

The speaker believes that economic and other pragmatic concerns are what drive people's career decisions, and that very few people are free to choose their careers based on their talents and interests. **I tend to disagree;** although practical considerations often play a significant role in occupational trends, ultimately the driving forces behind people's career decisions are individual interest and ability.

At first glance the balance of empirical evidence would seem to lend considerable credence to the speaker's claim. The most popular fields of study for students today are the computer sciences—fields characterized by a relative glut of job opportunities. Graduates with degrees in liberal arts often abandon their chosen fields because they cannot find employment, and reenter school in search of more “practical” careers. Even people who have already achieved success in their chosen field are often forced to abandon them due to pragmatic concerns. For example, many talented and creative people from the entertainment industry find themselves looking for other, less satisfying, kinds of work when they turn 40 years of age because industry executives prefer younger artists who are “tuned in” to the younger demographic group that purchases entertainment products.

However, upon further reflection it becomes clear that **the relationship between career-seekers and the supply of careers is an interdependent one**, and therefore it is unfair to generalize about which one drives the other. Consider, for example, the two mainstream fields of computer science and law. In the computer industry it might appear that supply clearly drives job interest—and understandably so, given the highly lucrative financial rewards. But, would our legions of talented programmers, engineers, scientists, and technicians really pursue their careers without a genuine fascination, a passion, or at least an interest in those areas? I think not.

Conversely, consider the field of law, in which it would appear that **demand drives the job market, rather than vice versa**. The number of applications to law schools soared during the civil rights movement of the 1960s, and again in the 1980s during the run of the popular television series *L. A. Law*. More recently, the number of students pursuing paralegal and criminal-justice careers spiked during and immediately after the O.J. Simpson trial. Query, though, whether these aspiring lawyers and paralegals would have been sufficiently motivated had the supply of jobs and the financial rewards not already been waiting for them upon graduation.

Another compelling argument against the speaker's claim has to do with the myriad of ways in which people earn their living. Admittedly, the job market is largely clustered around certain mainstream industries and types of work. Nevertheless, if one peers beyond these mainstream occupational areas it becomes evident that many, many people do honor their true interests and talents—in spite of where most job openings lie and regardless of their financial rewards. Creative people seem to have a knack for creating their own unique vocational niche—whether it be in the visual or the performing arts; many animal lovers create work which allows them to express that love. Caregivers and nurturers manage to, find work teaching, socializing, counseling, and healing others. And people bitten by the travel bug generally have little trouble finding satisfying careers in the travel industry.

In sum, the speaker's threshold claim that it is strictly the pragmatic concerns of job availability and financial compensation that drive people's career decisions oversimplifies both why and how peo-

ple make career choices. Besides, the speaker's final claim that people are not free to choose their work violates my intuition. In the final analysis, people are ultimately free to choose their work; it's just that they often choose to betray their true talents and interests for the sake of practical, economic considerations.

人们可以自由地选择职业吗？

说话者相信人们做出职业决定的驱动力是经济和其他实际的考虑，并且很少有人自由地根据他们的才能和兴趣选择职业。我倾向于不同意。虽然实际的考虑经常在择业趋势中扮演重要角色，但是最终躲藏在人们职业决定背后的驱动力是个人的兴趣和能力。

一眼看来，经验上的证据的对比似乎可以使说者的主张有了相当大的可信度。对于学生来说，今天最受欢迎的专业领域是计算机科学——一个被描绘成相对拥有许多工作机会的领域。文科学位的毕业生因为找不到工作通常放弃他们选择的领域，重新进入学校寻求更加“实用”的职业。甚至那些已经在所从事的领域中取得成功的人通常出于实际的考虑也会放弃自己的职业。比如，许多在娱乐业有才华和创造力的人当到了40岁的年龄时，发现他们不得不寻找其他的令人较不满意的工作，因为业内的经理们更欣赏比较年轻的艺术家的，这些年轻人能够和那些购买娱乐产品的年轻的统计群体“和谐相处”。

尽管如此，通过进一步反思就会清楚地看到择业者和职业的供给之间是一种相互依赖的关系，所以草率地概括谁决定谁并不公正。拿计算机科学和法律两个主流领域举例。在计算机行业也许似乎是供给明显地决定工作利益——在经济回报丰厚的情况下，这也是可以理解的。但是，是不是我们大批有才华的程序师、工程师、科学家和技术员真的对他们所从事领域中的职业没有真实的迷恋、激情或者说兴趣呢？我认为并不是这样。

反过来，我们看到在法律领域中好像是需求决定工作市场，而不是反之亦然。在20世纪60年代的民权运动中申请到法律学校的人数剧增，并且在20世纪80年代随着广受欢迎的电视系列剧“法律代理人的法律”的热播再次激增。更近以来，从事律师专职助手和犯罪审判职业的学生数量，在O.J.辛普森审判的过程中和接下来日子里达到顶峰。但是，我怀疑，如果他们一毕业没有充分的工作机会和经济回报在等着他们的话，这些积极的律师和律师助手是否还有这么大的动力。

另一个与演讲者主张相悖的令人信服的论据和人们谋生的无数途径有关。诚然，求职市场大量地聚集在某种主流工业和一定类型的工作周围。然而，如果超越这些主流职业领域去看的话，很明显，有许多许多人的确珍视他们的真实兴趣和才能——尽管大多数工作机会都存在于主流职业领域，也不顾及他们的经济报酬。有创造性的人似乎有一套创造他们独特职业地位的诀窍——不管是在视觉艺术还是表演艺术方面。许多喜爱动物的人创造了可以让他们表达那种喜爱的工作。照护者和育人者成功地找到了教育、社交、建议、治疗他人的工作。并且那些有旅游癖的人通常在旅游行业中几乎不会找不到满意工作。

综上所述，说话者开始宣称的，对工作可获得性和经济回报的实际考虑全然驱使着人们做有关职业选择的决定，这过分简单化了人们为什么和怎么样选择职业。另外，说话者最终宣称的人们没有自由选择他们的工作与我的直觉相左。归根结底，人们从根本上可以自由选择他们的工作，只是出于实际、经济的考虑，他们才经常选择违背他们真实的才能和兴趣。

论点 有保留的反对

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场

论证过程 结论型**论证模式**

- ① At first glance the balance of empirical evidence would seem to lend considerable credence to the speaker's claim.
- ② However...the relationship between career-seekers and the supply of careers is an interdependent one,...
- ③ Conversely...demand drives the job market, rather than vice versa.
- ④ Another compelling argument against the speaker's claim has to do with the myriad of ways in which people earn their living.

Issue 26 Historic buildings—preservation vs. practicality

"Most people would agree that buildings represent a valuable record of any society's past, but controversy arises when old buildings stand on ground that modern planners feel could be better used for modern purposes. In such situations, modern development should be given precedence over the preservation of historic buildings so that contemporary needs can be served."

大多数人都会同意建筑物是任何一个社会有价值的历史的代表,但是当现代规划者们觉得这些以前的建筑物所占据的土地可以被更有价值地用于现代目的时,就产生了争议。在这种情形下,现代发展应该比保留历史建筑物更受重视以便于满足眼下的需求。

The speaker asserts that wherever a practical, utilitarian need for new buildings arises this need should take precedence over our conflicting interest in preserving historic buildings as a record of our past. **In my view, however,** which interest should take precedence should be determined on a case-by-case basis—and should account not only for practical and historic considerations but also aesthetic ones.

In determining whether to raze an older building, planners should of course consider the community's current and anticipated utilitarian needs. For example, if an additional hospital is needed to adequately serve the health-care needs of a fast-growing community, this compelling interest might very well outweigh any interest in preserving a historic building that sits on the proposed site. Or if additional parking is needed to ensure the economic survival of a city's downtown district, this interest might take precedence over the historic value of an old structure that stands in the way of a parking structure. **On the other hand,** if the need is mainly for more office space, in some cases an architecturally appropriate add-on or annex to an older building might serve just as well as razing the old building to make way for a new one. Of course, an expensive retrofit might not be worthwhile if no amount of retrofitting would meet the need.

Competing with a community's utilitarian needs is an interest preserving the historical record. Again, the weight of this interest should be determined on a case-by-case basis. Perhaps an older building uniquely represents a bygone era, or once played a central role in the city's history as a municipal structure. Or perhaps the building once served as the home of a founding family or other significant historical figure, or as the location of an important historical event. Any of these scenarios might justify saving the building at the expense of the practical needs of the community. On the other hand, if several older buildings represent the same historical era just as effectively, or if the building's history

is an unremarkable one, then the historic value of the building might pale in comparison to the value of a new structure that meets a compelling practical need.

Also competing with a community's utilitarian needs is the aesthetic and architectural value of the building itself—apart from historical events with which it might be associated. A building might be one of only a few that represents a certain architectural style. Or it might be especially beautiful, perhaps as a result of the craftsmanship and materials employed in its construction—which might be cost-prohibitive to replicate today. Even retrofitting the building to accommodate current needs might undermine its aesthetic as well as historic value, by altering its appearance and architectural integrity. Of course it is difficult to quantify aesthetic value and weigh it against utilitarian considerations. Yet planners should strive to account for aesthetic value nonetheless.

In sum, whether to raze an older building in order to construct a new one should never be determined indiscriminately. Instead, planners should make such decisions on a case-by-case basis, weighing the community's practical needs against the building's historic and aesthetic value.

历史性建筑——保存 vs. 实用

说话者宣称,对新建筑的实际、功利的需求应该在与保存过去见证的历史性建筑的利益冲突中居于优先地位。尽管如此,我的观点是哪种利益应该占优先地位应该就事论事地决定——并且不仅要出于实际的和历史性的考虑,而且还要有美学的考虑。

在决定是否摧毁一个古老的建筑时,规划者当然应该考虑到社区当前和预期的实际需求。比如,如果还需要一个医院才能充分地满足一个快速发展社区的保健需求,那么这个必要性就会比任何力图在规划的位置上保护历史性建筑的价值要重要得多。或者是需要一个额外的停车场来维持一个城市市区的经济生存需要,那么这种利益可能就优先于那些妨碍停车场位的古老建筑的历史价值。另一方面,如果主要是为了扩大更多的办公室空间,有些情况下,在一个建筑上适当地添加或连接一个旧建筑可能和拆掉古老的建筑为新建筑腾地方的效果一样好。当然,如果这些改造怎么也满足不了需求的话,一次昂贵的改造也许就是不值得的。

与一个社区的功利性需求相竞争的是一种保存历史记录的利益。同样,这种利益的重要性还是应该就事论事地决定。也许一幢比较古老的建筑独一无二地代表了一个过去的年代,或在一个城市的历史中作为一个市政结构曾一度扮演过一个中心角色。或者也许这幢建筑曾经是某个领域奠定人或是其他显赫历史人物的住宅,或者曾是一个重要的历史事件的发生地。任何这些情况中可能都可以使牺牲社区的实际需要而保留这幢建筑变得合情合理。另一方面,如果几个古老建筑等效地代表了相同的历史时代,或者说如果这幢建筑的历史并不突出,那么它的历史价值比起一幢能够满足一种迫切的实际需求的新建筑就微不足道了。

与社区实际需求相竞争的除了可能与之有关联的历史事件以外,还有建筑本身的审美价值和建筑上的价值。一幢建筑可能是少数代表某种建筑风格的建筑中的一个。或是一栋建筑也许因其建筑工艺和使用材料而特别地美丽,今天复制它的费用高得惊人。甚至为了提供当前的需求而通过改变它的外观和建筑上的整体性来进行翻新,都会破坏它的美学和历史价值。当然,想要量化其美学价值并与功利的考虑衡量孰重孰轻是很困难的。但虽然如此,规划者也应该努力说明其美学价值。

总之,是否应该为建一幢新建筑而拆掉一幢比较旧的建筑从来就不应该一刀切地下定论。相反,规划者应该在社区的实际需要与建筑的历史和美学价值间衡量,就事论事地做决定。

论点 平衡观点 作者持的是典型的“具体问题具体分析”的态度:应该在个案的基础上决定。

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① In determining whether to raze an older building, planners should of course consider the community's current and anticipated utilitarian needs.
- ② Competing with a community's utilitarian needs is an interest preserving the historical record.
- ③ Also competing with a community's utilitarian needs is the aesthetic and architectural value of the building itself. . .

Issue 36 Can only history determine an individual's greatness?

"The greatness of individuals can be decided only by those who live after them, not by their contemporaries."

一个人是否伟大只能是由后人评定，而非他同时代的人。

Can a person's greatness be recognized only in retrospect, by those who live after the person, as the speaker maintains? In my view the speaker unfairly generalizes. In some areas, especially the arts, greatness is often recognizable in its nascent stages. However, in other areas, particularly the physical sciences, greatness must be tested over time before it can be confirmed. In still other areas, such as business, the incubation period for greatness varies from case to case.

We do not require a rear-view mirror to recognize artistic greatness—whether in music, visual arts, or literature. The reason for this is simple: art can be judged at face value. There's nothing to be later proved or disproved, affirmed or discredited, or even improved upon or refined by further knowledge or newer technology. History is replete with examples of artistic greatness immediately recognized, then later confirmed. Through his patronage, the Pope recognized Michelangelo's artistic greatness, while the monarchs of Europe immediately recognized Mozart's greatness by granting him their most generous commissions. Mark Twain became a best-selling author and household name even during his lifetime. And the leaders of the modernist school of architecture marveled even as Frank Lloyd Wright was elevating their notions about architecture to new aesthetic heights.

By contrast, in the sciences it is difficult to identify greatness without the benefit of historical perspective. Any scientific theory might be disproved tomorrow, thereby demoting the theorist's contribution to the status of historical footnote. Or the theory might withstand centuries of rigorous scientific scrutiny. In any event, a theory may or may not serve as a springboard for later advances in theoretical science. A current example involves the ultimate significance of two opposing theories of physics: wave theory and quantum theory. Some theorists now claim that a new so-called "string" theory reconciles the two opposing theories—at least mathematically. Yet "strings" have yet to be confirmed empirically. Only time will tell whether the string theory indeed provides the unifying laws that all matter in the universe obeys. In short, the significance of contributions made by theoretical scientists cannot be judged by their contemporaries—only by scientists who follow them.

In the realm of business, in some cases great achievement is recognizable immediately, while in other cases it is not. Consider on the one hand Henry Ford's assembly-line approach to manufacturing affordable cars for the masses. Even Ford could not have predicted the impact his innovations would

have on the American economy and on the modern world. On the other hand, by any measure, Microsoft's Bill Gates has made an even greater contribution than Ford; after all, Gates is largely responsible for lifting American technology out of the doldrums during the 1970s to restore America to the status of economic powerhouse and technological leader of the world. And this contribution is readily recognizable now—as it is happening. Of course, the DOS and Windows operating systems, and even Gates' monopoly, might eventually become historical relics. Yet his greatness is already secured.

In sum, the speaker overlooks many great individuals, particularly in the arts and in business, whose achievements were broadly recognized as great even during their own time. Nevertheless, other great achievements, especially scientific ones, cannot be confirmed as such without the benefit of historical perspective.

只有历史才能决定一个人的伟大吗？

正如说话者主张的那样，一个人的伟大只有通过那些活在他身后的人的回顾才能得到确认吗？我认为他的概括有失公允。在某些领域中，特别是艺术领域，在起初阶段其伟大就经常得到认可。然而，在其他领域，特别是自然科学，其伟大必须通过长时间的检验才能被证实。还有其他领域，例如商业，伟大与否的潜伏期则根据情况的不同而不同。

要识别艺术的伟大我们并不需要一个后视镜——无论是在音乐、视觉艺术还是文学方面。理由很简单：艺术可以从其表面价值进行判定。没有什么需要后来证明或反证、确认或怀疑或者甚至是通过更进一步的知识或新的技术来改进或完善的。在历史中，伟大的艺术立即被认可，后来被证实，这样的例子有很多。通过赞助，罗马教皇识出了米开朗基罗艺术的伟大，而欧洲的帝王立刻看出了莫扎特的伟大，并给予他最慷慨的资助。马克·吐温甚至一生都是一个畅销作家和家喻户晓的人物。甚至在弗兰克·劳埃德·莱特把建筑学的现代主义学派的领袖们有关建筑学的观念提高到新的美学高度的时候，就已经使得他们惊叹不已了。

相反地，在科学领域，没有历史观察的帮助很难鉴别科学的伟大。任何科学的理论也许会在明天被证伪，从而降低了该理论家对于历史注脚的贡献地位。除非这个理论能经受几个世纪严厉的科学审查。无论如何，在理论科学中，一个理论可能会成为后来理论进展的跳板，也可能不能。一个当前的例子涉及物理学中最为重要的两种相反的理论——波动理论和量子理论。一些理论家现在宣称一个新的所谓“超弦”理论能协调这两种相反的理论，至少在数学上是如此。但是“超弦”理论还得被经验所证实。只有时间才能说明超弦理论是否的确提供了所有的宇宙物质都服从的统一法则。简而言之，理论科学家做出的贡献的重要性不能够被他们同时代的人判定，只有那些后来的科学家才能做到这一点。

在商业的王国内，在某些情况下卓越的成就会被马上认可，而在其他情况下却不是。一方面看看亨利·福特所采用的装配线方法，为大众制造负担得起的汽车。甚至福特自己也不能预测出他的革新给美国经济和现代世界带来的影响。另一方面，不管怎么比较，微软的比尔·盖茨已经做出了比福特更大的贡献。毕竟，是盖茨把美国的技术从20世纪70年代的萎靡不振中拉了出来，使美国恢复到世界经济动力和技术领袖的地位。并且这个贡献现在容易得到公认——正如它现在发生的那样。当然，DOS和Windows操作系统，甚至盖茨的垄断最终可能会成为历史的遗迹。但是他的伟大已经确定无疑。

总的说来，说话者忽略了许多伟大的个人，特别是在艺术和商业领域里的重要人物，即使在他们自己生活的时代，他们的成就就广泛地被认可为伟大的了。然而，其他伟大的成就，尤其是科学成就，在没有历史观察的帮助是不能像这样被证实的。

论点 平衡观点 很完整的一个平衡观点：一方面赞成，一方面认为有失公允，持具体个案具体分析的态度。

开头方式 提出问题 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① We do not require a rear-view mirror to recognize artistic greatness—whether in music, visual arts, or literature.
- ② By contrast, in the sciences it is difficult to identify greatness without the benefit of historical perspective.
- ③ In the realm of business, in some cases great achievement is recognizable immediately...

Issue 103 Is history relevant to our daily lives?

“The study of history has value only to the extent that it is relevant to our daily lives.”

对历史的研究只有与我们的日常生活相关时才有价值。

The speaker alleges that studying history is valuable only insofar as it is relevant to our daily lives. **I find this allegation to be specious.** It wrongly suggests that history is not otherwise instructive and that its relevance to our everyday lives is limited. To the contrary, studying history provides inspiration, innumerable lessons for living, and useful value-clarification and perspective—all of which help us decide how to live our lives.

To begin with, learning about great human achievements of the past provides inspiration. For example, a student inspired by the courage and tenacity of history's great explorers might decide as a result to pursue a career in archeology, oceanography, or astronomy. This decision can, in turn, profoundly affect that student's everyday life—in school and beyond. Even for students not inclined to pursue these sorts of careers, studying historical examples of courage in the face of adversity can provide motivation to face their own personal fears in life. In short, learning about grand accomplishments of the past can help us get through the everyday business of living, whatever that business might be, by emboldening us and lifting our spirits.

In addition, mistakes of the past can teach us as a society how to avoid repeating those mistakes. For example, history can teach us the inappropriateness of addressing certain social issues, particularly moral ones, on a societal level. Attempts to legislate morality invariably fail, as aptly illustrated by the Prohibition experiment in the U.S. during the 1930s. Hopefully, as a society we can apply this lesson by adopting a more enlightened legislative approach toward such issues as free speech, criminalization of drug use, criminal justice, and equal rights under the law.

Studying human history can also help us understand and appreciate the mores, values, and ideals of past cultures. A heightened awareness of cultural evolution, in turn, helps us formulate informed and reflective values and ideals for ourselves. Based on these values and ideals, students can determine their authentic life path as well as how they should allot their time and interact with others on a day-to-day basis.

Finally, it might be tempting to imply from the speaker's allegation that **studying history has little relevance even for the mundane chores** that occupy so much of our time each day, and therefore is of little value. However, from history we learn not to take everyday activities and things for granted. By understanding the history of money and banking we can transform an otherwise routine trip to the bank into an enlightened experience, or a visit to the grocery store into an homage to the many inventors, scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs of the past who have made such convenience possible today. And, we can fully appreciate our freedom to go about our daily lives largely as we choose only by understanding our political heritage. In short, appreciating history can serve to elevate our everyday chores to richer, more interesting, and more enjoyable experiences.

In sum, **the speaker fails to recognize that** in all our activities and decisions—from our grandest to our most rote—history can inspire, inform, guide, and nurture. In the final analysis, to study history is to gain the capacity to be more human—and I would be hard-pressed to imagine a worthier end.

历史和我们的日常生活相关吗？

说话者宣称仅在和我们的日常生活相关的范围内研究历史才是有价值的。我认为这个断言似是而非。它错误地暗示，历史在其他方面就不是有益的以及它和我们每天生活的联系是有限的。正相反，学习历史能够提供灵感、无数的生活经验和有用的澄清价值的方法和洞察力，所有这些都有助于我们决定怎样度过我们的人生。

首先，学习过去伟人的成就赋予我们灵感。比如，一个学生因受到历史上伟大探险家勇气和坚忍的鼓舞，结果可能决定在考古学、海洋学、天文学领域开创事业。这个决定，反过来会深刻地影响那个学生在学校和其他地方每天的生活。甚至对于那些无意于从事这类工作的学生而言，学习一些以勇气面对不幸的历史事实，也能够给他们提供在生活中战胜恐惧的动力。简而言之，学习关于昔日的重大成就可以通过鼓起我们的勇气并且提升我们的精神面貌来帮助我们解决每天的生活琐事，无论事情可能是什么。

除此以外，昔日的错误能够教给我们社会如何避免重复那些错误。举例来说，历史能告诉我们在社会层面上处理某种社会问题的不当之处，特别是伦理问题。尝试制定有关道德的立法总是以失败而告终，在 20 世纪 30 年代期间美国禁酒令试验正好阐明了这一点。希望我们社会能够吸取这一教训，采取一个更开明的立法途径处理这样的问题：言论自由、吸毒定罪、刑事审判和法律下的平等权利。

学习人类的历史也能够帮助我们理解和鉴赏过去文化的习俗、价值和理想。更高的对文化发展的意识反过来会帮助我们自己形成明达的和周详的价值观和理想。基于这些价值观和理想，学生能够决定他们的真实生活路径，以及他们每天应该如何分配时间和如何与他人交往。最后，从说话者的论断中可能很容易得出这样的暗示，学习历史对于占据我们每天大多数时间的世俗琐事，几乎没什么关系，因此没什么价值。然而，从历史中我们得知不要把每天的活动和事物想得理所当然。通过理解货币和银行的历史，我们能够把一种本来是例行的去一趟银行转变成一种文明的经历，或者是把一次到食杂店购物转变为一种向过去的许多发明家、科学家、工程师和企业家的致敬，是这些人创造了今天如此便利的生活。并且，只是通过理解我们的政治遗产才能完全了解我们绝大多数情况下按我们自愿的方式处理日常事务的自由。简而言之，了解历史能使我们每天的家务杂事变成更丰富、更有趣而且更令人愉快的体验。

总的说来，说话者没有认识到历史在我们所有的活动和决议中——从最宏大的到最死板的——都能起到启示、告知、引导和教育的作用。总而言之，学习历史是为了获得更加人性化的能力——我很难想像一个比这更有价值的目标了。

论点 有保留的反对

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场 + 概述理由

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① To begin with, learning about great human achievements of the past provides inspiration.
- ② In addition, mistakes of the past can teach us as a society how to avoid repeating those mistakes.
- ③ Studying human history can also help us understand and appreciate the mores, values, and ideals of past cultures.
- ④ Finally...studying history has little relevance even for the mundane chores...

Issue 120 Studying the past to help us live in the present

"So much is new and complex today that looking back for an understanding of the past provides little guidance for living in the present."

现代社会是如此地崭新和复杂以至于对过去的回首了解对当代生活已经没有什么指导了。

The speaker claims that since so much in today's world is new and complex the past provides little guidance for living in the present. **I agree with this assertion insofar as** history offers few foolproof panaceas for living today. **However, I disagree with the speaker's claim that** today's world is so unique that the past is irrelevant. One good example that supports my dual position is the way society has dealt with its pressing social problems over time.

Admittedly, history has helped us learn the appropriateness of addressing certain social issues, particularly moral ones, on a societal level. Attempts to legislate morality invariably fail, as illustrated by Prohibition in the 1930s and, more recently, failed federal legislation to regulate access to adult material via the Internet. We are slowly learning this lesson, as the recent trend toward legalization of marijuana for medicinal purposes and the recognition of equal rights for same-sex partners both demonstrate.

However, the only firm lesson from history about social ills is that they are here to stay. Crime and violence, for example, have troubled almost every society. All manner of reform, prevention, and punishment have been tried. Today, the trend appears to be away from reform toward a "tough-on-crime" approach. Is this because history makes clear that punishment is the most effective means of eliminating crime? No; rather, the trend merely reflects our current mores, attitudes, and political climate.

Another example involves how we deal with the mentally-ill segment of the population. History reveals that neither quarantine, treatment, nor accommodation solves the problem, only that each approach comes with its own trade-offs. Also undermining the assertion that history helps us to solve social problems is the fact that, despite the civil-rights efforts of Martin Luther King and his progenies, the cultural gap today between African Americans and white Americans seems to be widening. It seems that racial prejudice is a timeless phenomenon.

To sum up, in terms of how to live together as a society I agree that studying the past is of some value; for example, it helps us appreciate the futility of legislating morality. However, history's primary sociological lesson seems to be that today's social problems are as old as society itself, and that there are no panaceas or prescriptions for solving these problems—only alternate ways of coping with them.

学习过去有助于我们生活在现在

演讲者认为既然今天的世界有如此多的新鲜和复杂的事物，过去的东西能为我们现在的生活提供的指导少之又少。如果说历史为我们今天的生活几乎提供不了简单易行的万能药，那我同意这种观点。然而，对于演讲者认为今天的世界是如此独特与过去毫无关联的说法，我不能苟同。一个不错的例子有助于说明我的双重立场：今天的社会处理紧迫的遗留问题的方式。

诚然，历史有助于使我们明白在社会层面处理某些社会问题，特别是道德方面的恰当性。对道德进行立法的尝试总是归于失败，就像 20 世纪 30 年代的禁酒令和未果的近期联邦立法对通过互联网浏览色情内容的管制。我们吸取教训的速度太慢，最近对大麻医用以及认可同性关系平等权利的立法化潮流都证明了这点。

但是，从历史中我们学到的有关社会痼疾的惟一牢固的教训是，它们会存在下去。就像犯罪和暴力，它们几乎困扰着每个社会。任何形式的感化、预防和惩戒都使用过。今天，社会的趋势似乎不再是感化而是采用“严打犯罪”的方式。是不是因为历史告诉了我们惩罚是最有效的消除犯罪的方法呢？不。而是这种趋势只是反映了我们当下的惯例、态度和政治气候。

另一个例子与我们对患有精神疾病的人的处置有关。历史告诉我们隔离、治疗和迁就都无助于问题的解决，每种方式都有它的代价。同样不利于历史帮助我们解决社会问题这一论断的事实是，尽管马丁·路德·金和他的后裔在民权运动中的努力，今天非裔美国人和美国白人的文化差异却似乎越来越深。种族歧视似乎是个永恒的现象。

总而言之，在关于如何作为一个社会共同生活这个方面，我同意学习历史有所裨益。比如，它帮助我们领会道德立法的无用。然而，历史的主要社会学上的教训在于今天的社会问题看来与社会本身一样古老。解决它们似乎没有什么万能药方——只有更换处理的手段而已。

论点 平衡观点

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型 论证部分的三个自然段分析了社会处理紧迫遗留问题的三例个案：对道德立法的尝试、犯罪和罪犯这样的社会痼疾和对精神疾病人员的隔离处置。

论证模式

- ① Admittedly, history has helped us learn the appropriateness of addressing certain social issues...
- ② However, the only firm lesson from history about social ills is that they are here to stay.
- ③ Another example involves how we deal with the mentally-ill segment of the population.

Issue 173 To what extent is **originality** truly original?

“Originality does not mean thinking something that was never thought before; it means putting old ideas together in new ways.”

创新并不意味着一定要想到一些人们从未想过的东西；它意味着用新方法重组老观点。

Does “originality” mean putting together old ideas in new ways, as the speaker contends, rather than conjuring up truly new ideas? **Although I agree that** in various realms of human endeavor, such as linguistics, law, and even the arts, so-called “new” or “original” ideas rarely are. **However**, when it comes to the physical sciences originality more often entails chartering completely new intellectual territory.

The notion that so-called “originality” is actually variation or synthesis of existing ideas finds its greatest support in linguistics and in law. Regarding the former, in spite of the many words in the modern English language that are unique to Western culture, modern English is derived from, and builds upon, a variety of linguistic traditions—and ultimately from the ancient Greek and Latin languages. Were we to insist on rejecting tradition in favor of purely modern language we would have essentially nothing to say. The same holds true for all other modern languages. As for law, consider the legal system in the United States, which is deeply rooted in traditional English common-law principles of equity and justice. The system in the U.S. requires that new, so-called “modern” laws be consistent with—and indeed build upon—those traditional principles.

Even in the arts—where one might think that true originality must surely reside—so-called “new” ideas almost always embrace, apply, or synthesize what came earlier. For example, most “modern” visual designs, forms, and elements are based on certain well-established aesthetic ideals—such as symmetry, balance, and harmony. Admittedly, modern art works often eschew these principles in favor of true originality. Yet, in my view the appeal of such works lies primarily in their novelty and brashness. Once the ephemeral novelty or shock dissipates, these works quickly lose their appeal because they violate firmly established artistic ideals. An even better example from the arts is modern rock-and-roll music, which upon first listening might seem to bear no resemblance to classical music traditions. Yet, both genres rely on the same 12-note scale, the same notions of what harmonies are pleasing to the ear, the same forms, the same rhythmic meters, and even many of the same melodies.

When it comes to the natural sciences, however, some new ideas are truly original while others put established ideas together in new ways. **One striking example of** truly original scientific advances involves what we know about the age and evolution of the Earth. In earlier centuries the official Church of England called for a literal interpretation of the Bible, according to which the Earth’s age is determined to be about 6,000 years. If Western thinkers had simply put these established ideas together in new ways the fields of structural and historical geology might never have advanced further. A more recent example involves Einstein’s theory of relativity. Einstein theorized, and scientists have since proven empirically, that the pace of time, and possibly the direction of time as well, is relative to the observer’s motion through space. This truth ran so contrary to our subjective, linear experience, and to previous notions about time and space, that I think Einstein’s theory can properly be characterized as truly original.

However, in other instances great advances in science are made by putting together current theories or other ideas in new ways. For example, only by building on certain well-established laws of physics were engineers able to develop silicon-based semiconductor technology. And, only by struggling to reconcile the quantum and relativity theories have physicists now posited a new so-called

“string” theory, which puts together the two preexisting theories in a completely new way.

To sum up, for the most part originality does not reject existing ideas but rather embraces, applies, or synthesizes what came before. In fact, in our modern languages, our new laws, and even our new art, existing ideas are reflected, not shunned. But, when it comes to science, whether the speaker's claim is true must be determined on a case-by-case basis, with each new theory or innovation.

在何种程度上原创性是真正的原创?

原创性是如演讲者所说的那样将旧的思想用新的方式整合,还是思考出真正的新想法?虽然我同意在人类行为的许多领域,比如语言、法律,甚至是艺术,所谓的“新”和“原创”的想法极为罕见。但当涉及物理科学,原创性往往意味着开拓出全新的智力领域。

所谓“原创性”事实上是既有想法的变异或是综合这个概念,在语言和法律领域最能找到支持。关于前者,尽管许多英语词汇是西方文化所独有的,但现代英语是建筑在多种语言传统融合的基础上——最终是来自古希腊语和拉丁语。如果我们坚持将传统抛弃取而代之以全新的语言,那我们将无话可说。这点同样适用于其他现代语言。至于法律,以美国法律系统为例,它深深地植根于传统英语国家的平等与正义的普通法准则。美国法系要求那些新的,所谓“现代”的法律与这些传统原则相匹配——其实是以其为根基。

甚至在艺术中——人们可能认为那是真正原创性的必然所在——所谓的“新”思想也几乎总是会包容、应用和综合以前的东西。比如,最为“现代”的视觉设计、形式与成分也是基于某些早已确立的审美理想——如对称、平衡和和谐。诚然,现代艺术作品常避开这些原则以利于真实的创新。但在我看来,这些作品的吸引人之处主要在于它们的新颖和活跃。一旦这种转瞬即逝的新意渐渐消去,作品便因为它们对既有审美理想的违背而立刻失去了吸引力。艺术中的一个更好的例子是现代的摇滚乐,乍听起来似乎与古典音乐毫不相干。但两种类型的音乐都依靠同样的12个音符、相同的悦耳概念、同样的形式、同样的韵律节奏甚至许多都是同样的旋律。

但是当谈到自然科学时,有些想法是真正原创的而其他的就是重新整合旧的想法。一个最有力的真正原创科学进步的例子是关于我们对地球年龄和演进的认识。在早先的世纪里,英国的官方教会要求对《圣经》进行字面上的翻译,根据《圣经》地球的年龄被定为是6000年。如果西方的思想家只是简单地重新整合这些既有的观点,那么结构地理学和历史地理学领域可能永远也不会得到发展。另一个近一点儿的例子涉及爱因斯坦的相对论。爱因斯坦提出这个理论,从此许多科学家通过经验证明了,时间的步调或许还有它的方向对于观察者在空间中的移动是相对的。这样的真理与我们的主观、线性经验以及以前对时空的概念反差如此之大,我认为爱因斯坦的理论可谓真正的原创。

但是,在其他的一些例子中科学的重大进展是用新的方法重新整合既有的理论和其他的想法。比如,只有在遵从许多既有物理法则的基础上,工程师们才能发明出以硅为原料的半导体技术。只有通过尝试去调和量子理论和相对论,物理学家现在才能提出所谓的“弦”理论,后者是以一种全新的方式将既有的两种理论整合了。

总而言之,在大多数情况下原创性不会拒斥而是包容、应用和综合以往的东西。实际上,在我们的现代语言、新的法律甚至新艺术中,既有的思想也被反映出来,不是被回避。但是,当涉及科学的时候,演讲者观点的真实性则必须视每个新理论或创新的具体情况而定。

开头方式 提出问题 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① The notion that so-called “originality” is actually variation or synthesis of existing ideas finds its greatest support in linguistics and in law.
- ② Even in the arts...
- ③ When it comes to the natural sciences...
- ④ However, in other instances...

Issue 207 **Rituals and ceremonies** and cultural identity

“Rituals and ceremonies help define a culture. Without them, societies or groups of people have a diminished sense of who they are.”

仪式和礼仪有助于定义一个文化。如果没有这些，社会或者团体就会逐渐地迷失自我。

The speaker asserts that rituals and ceremonies are needed for any culture or group of people to retain a strong sense of identity. I agree that one purpose of ritual and ceremony is to preserve cultural identity, at least in modern times. However, this is not their sole purpose; nor are ritual and ceremony the only means of preserving cultural identity.

I agree with the speaker insofar as one purpose of ritual and ceremony in today's world is to preserve cultural identity. Native American tribes, for example, cling tenaciously to their traditional ceremonies and rituals, which typically tell a story about tribal heritage. The reason for maintaining these rituals and customs lies largely in the tribes' 500-year struggle against assimilation, even extinction, at the hands of European intruders. An outward display of traditional customs and distinct heritage is needed to put the world on notice that each tribe is a distinct and autonomous people, with its own heritage, values, and ideas. Otherwise, the tribe risks total assimilation and loss of identity.

The lack of meaningful ritual and ceremony in homogenous mainstream America underscores this point. Other than a few gratuitous ceremonies such as weddings and funerals, we maintain no common rituals to set us apart from other cultures. The reason for this is that as a whole America has little cultural identity of its own anymore. Instead, it has become a patchwork quilt of many subcultures, such as Native Americans, Hasidic Jews, Amish, and urban African Americans—each of which resort to some outward demonstration of its distinctiveness in order to establish and maintain a unique cultural identity.

Nevertheless, preserving cultural identity cannot be the only purpose of ritual and ceremony. Otherwise, how would one explain why isolated cultures that don't need to distinguish themselves to preserve their identity nevertheless engage in their own distinct rituals and ceremonies? In fact, the initial purpose of ritual and ceremony is rooted not in cultural identity but rather superstition and spiritual belief. The original purpose of a ritual might have been to frighten away evil spirits, to bring about weather conditions favorable to bountiful harvests, or to entreat the gods for a successful hunt or for victory in battle. Even today some primitive cultures engage in rituals primarily for such reasons.

Nor are ritual and ceremony the only means of preserving cultural identity. For example, our Amish culture demonstrates its distinctiveness through dress and lifestyle. Hasidic Jews set themselves

apart by their dress, vocational choices, and dietary habits. And African Americans distinguish themselves today by their manner of speech and gesture. Of course, these subcultures have their own distinct ways of celebrating events such as weddings, coming of age, and so forth. Yet ritual and ceremony are not the primary means by which these subcultures maintain their identity.

In sum, to prevent total cultural assimilation into our modern-day homogenous soup, a subculture with a unique and proud heritage must maintain an outward display of that heritage—by way of ritual and ceremony. Nevertheless, ritual and ceremony serve a spiritual function as well—one that has little to do with preventing cultural assimilation. Moreover, rituals and ceremonies are not the only means of preserving cultural identity.

仪式和礼仪与文化认同性

演讲者认为仪式与礼仪对于任何要保持强烈的身份感的文化或人群来说都是必要的。我同意至少在现代，仪式与礼仪的一个目的是保持文化身份。但这不是它们的惟一的目的，而保持文化身份仪式和礼仪也不是惟一的方式。

仪式与礼仪在今日世界的一个目标是保持文化认同，对于这点我表示同意。比方说，美洲的原始部落顽强地保持着那些反映它们部落遗产的仪式和礼仪。原因在于他们与欧洲入侵者长达500年的反同化、反灭绝斗争。需要外在地展示传统习俗与显著遗产以使世界认识到，每个部落都是独特自主的民族，有其自己的遗产、价值观和思想。否则，这些部落就有被完全同化和丧失身份的危险。

美国同质的主流文化中缺少有意义的仪式和礼仪这个事实加强了这种观点。除了婚礼和葬礼等无关紧要的仪式外，我们少有区别于其他文化的共同的仪式。原因在于美国人整体上缺少其自己的文化身份。相反，美国文化是由一些亚文化所拼凑而成的，诸如美洲原著民、哈西德派的犹太人、阿门宗派、城市的非裔美国人——每一类人为了建立和保持一种独特的文化身份都诉诸于外在地展示其与众不同之处。

尽管如此，保持文化身份并不是仪式和礼仪的惟一目的。否则我们怎么解释一些孤立的并不需要与他人区分以保持身份的文化，仍旧从事他们显著的仪式和礼仪？事实上，仪式和礼仪的最初目的并不植根于文化身份，而与迷信和精神信仰密切相关。仪式的最初目的也许是为了震慑邪恶，为了带来利于丰收的好气候或者是为了一次成功的狩猎和战役的胜利而祈神。即使今天一些原始文化还主要是出于这些目的而从事仪式。

仪式和礼仪也不是保持文化身份的惟一手段。比如，我们的阿门宗派文化通过穿着和生活方式来显示它的不同。哈西德犹太人通过穿着、职业的选择和饮食习惯与其他人相区别。而今天的非裔美国人则通过他们讲话的方式和手势来区别于其他人。当然，这些亚文化也有他们自己庆祝婚礼、成年等事件的独特方式。但是仪式和礼仪并不是这些亚文化用来保持身份的主要手段。

总而言之，为了防止被我们今日的同质文化完全同化，有着独特而骄傲传统的亚文化必须有保持外在地展示自己的那种传统——通过仪式和礼仪。尽管如此，仪式和礼仪也有精神方面的功用——而这与防止文化同化无关。而且，仪式和礼仪也不是保持文化认同的惟一手段。

论点 有保留的赞成

开头方式 陈述题目观点 + 表明立场

论证过程 问题解决型

论证模式

- ① I agree with the speaker insofar as one purpose of ritual and ceremony in today's world is to preserve cultural identity.
- ② The lack of meaningful ritual and ceremony in homogenous mainstream America underscores this point.
- ③ Nevertheless, preserving cultural identity cannot be the only purpose of ritual and ceremony.
- ④ Nor are ritual and ceremony the only means of preserving cultural identity. For example,...

Issue 226 Are we facing increasingly complex and challenging problems?

"People are mistaken when they assume that the problems they confront are more complex and challenging than the problems faced by their predecessors. This illusion is eventually dispelled with increased knowledge and experience."

人们总是错误地认为自己面临的问题要比前人来得更复杂和更具有挑战性。随着知识和经验的不断增加这种假象最终会被消除。

Is any sense that the problems we face are more complex and challenging than those which our predecessors faced merely an illusion—one that can be dispelled by way of knowledge and experience? **The speaker believes so, although I disagree. In my view**, the speaker unfairly generalizes about the nature of contemporary problems, some of which have no analog from earlier times and which in some respects are more complex and challenging than any problems earlier societies ever confronted. **Nevertheless, I agree that** many of the other problems we humans face are by their nature enduring ones that have changed little in complexity and difficulty over the span of human history; and I agree that through experience and enlightened reflection on human history we grow to realize this fact.

I turn first to my chief point of contention with the statement. The speaker overlooks certain societal problems unique to today's world, which are complex and challenging in ways unlike any problems that earlier societies ever faced. Consider three examples. The first involves the growing scarcity of the world's natural resources. An ever-increasing human population, together with over-consumption on the part of developed nations and with global dependencies on finite natural resources, have created uniquely contemporary environmental problems that are global in impact and therefore pose political and economic challenges previously unrivaled in complexity.

A second uniquely contemporary problem has to do with the fact that the nations of the world are growing increasingly interdependent—politically, militarily, and economically. Interdependency makes for problems that are far more complex than analogous problems for individual nations during times when they were more insular, more self-sustaining, and more autonomous.

A third uniquely contemporary problem is an outgrowth of the inexorable advancement of scientific knowledge, and one that society voluntarily takes up as a challenge. Through scientific advancements we've already solved innumerable health problems, harnessed various forms of physical energy, and so forth. The problems left to address are the ones that are most complex and challenging—for example, slowing the aging process, replacing human limbs and organs, and colonizing other worlds in the event ours becomes inhabitable. In short, as we solve each successive scientific puzzle we move on to more challenging and complex ones.

I turn next to my points of agreement with the statement. Humans face certain universal and timeless problems, which are neither more nor less complex and challenging for any generation than for preceding ones. These sorts of problems are the ones that spring from the failings and foibles that are part-and-parcel of human nature. Our problems involving interpersonal relationships with people of the opposite sex stem from basic differences between the two sexes. The social problems of prejudice and discrimination know no chronological bounds because it is our nature to fear and mistrust people who are different from us. War and crime stem from the male aggressive instinct and innate desire for power. We've never been able to solve social problems such as homelessness and hunger because we are driven by self-interest.

I agree with the statement also in that certain kinds of intellectual struggles—to determine the meaning of life, whether God exists, and so forth—are timeless ones whose complexities and mystery know no chronological bounds whatsoever. The fact that we rely on ancient teachings to try to solve these problems underscores the fact that these problems have not grown any more complex over the course of human history.

And, with respect to all the timeless problems mentioned above I agree that knowledge and experience help us to understand that these problems are not more complex today than before. In the final analysis, by studying history, human psychology, theology, and philosophy we come to realize that, aside from certain uniquely contemporary problems, we face the same fundamental problems as our predecessors because we face the same human condition as our predecessors whenever we look in the mirror.

我们是否面临日益增加的复杂和挑战性的问题？

觉得我们面对的问题比前人要更复杂和具有挑战性只是幻觉——一种能被知识和经验所驱散的幻觉吗？演讲者这么认为，但我不同意。在我看来，演讲者为当代问题的本质做的概括并不公正，当代问题中的一些的确为以前所没有，并在一些方面比我们以前社会面临的问题更复杂，更具挑战性。尽管如此，我同意这样的一种观点，我们人类面临的其他问题中有许多由于它们本质上是持久的，所以其复杂性和难度在人类历史的漫长时期中鲜有变化。我也同意，通过经验和反省人类历史我们正在逐渐意识到这一事实。

我首先说说我与该论断相左的主要观点。演讲者忽视了某些为今天的世界所独有的社会问题，它们因不同于以往社会所面临的社会问题而显得复杂而具有挑战性。我举三个例子。第一个与世界自然资源越来越少有关。持续增长的人口，加上发达国家的过度消耗，以及全球对于有限自然资源的依赖，造成了当代独有的环境问题，它具有全球性的影响，因此成为空前复杂的政治与经济挑战。

第二个当代独有的问题与这样的—个事实有关，世界上的国家正日益在政治、军事和经济上互相依赖。这种互相依存造成的问题要比国家在更加与世隔绝、更加自力更生和更自行其是的时代所产生的问题要复杂得多。

第三个当代独有的问题是科学知识的爆炸性发展，社会情愿地以之为挑战。通过科技发展，我们已经解决了无数的健康问题，驾驭了各种形式的能源等等。剩下要解决的问题大多是最为复杂和具有挑战性的——比如，减慢老龄化进程，更换人类的肢体和器官，征服其他地方以备我们的世界不再适于居住。简言之，随着我们接二连三地解决科学难题，我们又会遭遇更具挑战性和更为复杂的难题。

我下面说说我肯定该论断的观点。人类的确碰到一些普遍而永恒的问题。这些问题在任何

一代人看来都比前人面临的同样复杂和具有挑战性。这类问题与作为人类本性中必不可少部分的缺陷密切相关。我们处理异性之间关系的问题根源于男女两性的基本差异。偏见与歧视这些社会问题并没有时间范围，因为恐惧和不信任与我们不同的人是我们的天性。战争和犯罪起源于男性攻击的本能和对权力的内在渴望。我们永远也不能解决诸如流浪和饥饿等社会问题，因为我们总是为自身利益所驱动。

在这方面我也肯定该论断，即某种学术斗争——确定生命的意义，神是否存在等等——是永恒的，其复杂性与神秘性也没有任何时间范围。我们依靠古代经验来解决这些问题，这一事实强调了这些问题在人类历史进程中并没有变得更为复杂。

从以上我所谈到的永恒问题中，我认为知识与经验帮助我们理解到，这些难题在今天并不比以前更复杂。总之，通过学习历史、人类心理学、神学和哲学我们逐渐意识到，除了一些当代独有的问题外，我们与前人面临的基本问题相同，因为不论什么时候我们审视自己，我们都面对着与前人同样的人类条件。

论点 平衡观点

开头方式 提出问题 + 回答 + 表明立场

论证过程 比较型

论证模式

- ① I turn first to my chief point of contention with the statement.
- ② A second uniquely contemporary problem has to do with the fact that...
- ③ A third uniquely contemporary problem is...
- ④ I turn next to my points of agreement with the statement.

Issue 5 The merits of a national curriculum for schools

The speaker would prefer a national curriculum for all children up until college instead of allowing schools in different regions the freedom to decide on their own curricula. I agree insofar as some common core curriculum would serve useful purposes for any nation. At the same time, however, individual states and communities should have some freedom to augment any such curriculum as they see fit; otherwise, a nation's educational system might defeat its own purposes in the long term.

A national core curriculum would be beneficial to a nation in a number of respects. First of all, by providing all children with fundamental skills and knowledge, a common core curriculum would help ensure that our children grow up to become reasonably informed, productive members of society. In addition, a common core curriculum would provide a predictable foundation upon which college administrators and faculty could more easily build curricula and select course materials for freshmen that are neither below nor above their level of educational experience. Finally, a core curriculum would ensure that all school-children are taught core values upon which any democratic society depends to thrive, and even survive—values such as tolerance of others with different viewpoints, and respect for others.

However, a common curriculum that is also an exclusive one would pose certain problems, which might outweigh the benefits, noted above. First of all, on what basis would certain course work be included or excluded, and who would be the final decision-maker? In all likelihood these decisions would be in the hands of federal legislators and regulators, who are likely to have their own quirky notions of what should and should not be taught to children—notions that may or may not reflect those of most communities, schools, or parents. Besides, government officials are notoriously susceptible to influence-peddling by lobbyists who do not have the best interests of society's children in mind.

Secondly, an official, federally sanctioned curriculum would facilitate the dissemination of propaganda and other dogma—which because of its biased and one-sided nature undermines the very purpose of true education: to enlighten. I can easily foresee the banning of certain text books, programs, and Web sites that provide information and perspectives that the government might wish to suppress—as some sort of threat to its authority and power. Although this scenario might seem far-fetched, these sorts of concerns are being raised already at the state level.

Thirdly, the inflexible nature of a uniform national curriculum would preclude the inclusion of programs, courses, and materials that are primarily of regional or local significance. For example, California requires children at certain grade levels to learn about the history of particular ethnic groups who make up the state's diverse population. A national curriculum might not allow for this feature,