

109 學年度大學甄選入學英文讀寫能力測驗試題

Read the following two passages and complete the writing tasks in your own words. You are encouraged to draw on your knowledge of the topics and your personal experiences. This test is 100-minute long.

PASSAGE A

How the World Will Look After the Coronavirus Pandemic

The coronavirus pandemic is changing the world forever. Two American magazines, *Foreign Policy* and *Politico*, have published opinions from leaders in different fields. Here are four experts' opinions.

(1) World Politics: A World Less Open, Prosperous, and Free

By Stephen M. Walt, an American professor of international affairs at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government

(From *Foreign Policy*, March 20th, 2020)

The pandemic will strengthen the state and reinforce nationalism. Governments of all types will adopt emergency measures to manage the crisis, and many will be loath to relinquish these new powers when the crisis is over.

COVID-19 will also accelerate the shift in power and influence from West to East. South Korean and Singapore have responded best, and China has reacted well after its early mistakes. The response in Europe and America has been slow and haphazard by comparison, further tarnishing the aura of the Western "brand."

What won't change is the fundamentally conflictive nature of world politics.

Previous plagues – including the influenza epidemic of 1918-1919 – did not end great-power rivalry nor usher in a new era of global cooperation. Neither will COVID-19. We will see a further retreat from hyperglobalization, as citizens look to national governments to protect them and as states and firms seek to reduce future vulnerabilities.

In short, COVID-19 will create a world that is less open, less prosperous, and less free. It did not have to be this way, but the combination of a deadly virus, inadequate planning, and incompetent leadership has placed humanity on a new and worrisome path.

(2) World Politics: A More China-Centric Globalization

By Kishore Mahbubani, formerly Singapore's Permanent Representative to the United Nations

(From *Foreign Policy*, March 20th, 2020)

The COVID-19 pandemic will not fundamentally alter global economic directions. It will only accelerate a change that had already begun: a move away from US.-centric globalization to a more China-centric globalization.

Why will this trend continue? The American population has lost faith in globalization and international trade. Free trade agreements are toxic, with or without U.S. President Donald Trump. By contrast, China has not lost faith. Why not? There are deeper historical reasons. Chinese leaders now know well that China's century of humiliation from 1842 to 1949 was a result of its own complacency and a futile effort by its leaders to cut it off from the world. By contrast, the past few decades of economic resurgence were a result of global engagement. The Chinese people have also experienced an explosion of cultural confidence. They believe they can compete anywhere.

Consequently, as I document in my new book, *Has China Won?*, the United States has two choices. If its primary goal is to maintain global primacy, it will have to engage in a zero-sum geopolitical contest, politically and economically, with China. However, if the goal of the United States is to improve the well-being of the American people – whose social condition has deteriorated – it should cooperate with China. Wiser counsel would suggest that cooperation would be the better choice. However, given the toxic U.S. political environment toward China, wiser counsel may not prevail.

(3) Lifestyles: The Personal Becomes Dangerous

By Deborah Tannen, a professor of linguistics at Georgetown University

(From *Politico Magazine*, March 19th, 2020)

On 9/11, Americans discovered we are vulnerable to calamities we thought only happened in distant lands. The 2008 financial crisis told us we also can suffer the calamities of past eras, like the economic meltdown of the Great Depression. Now, the 1918 flu pandemic is a sudden specter in our lives.

This loss of innocence, or complacency, is a new way of being-in-the-world that we can expect to change our doing-in-the-world. We know now that touching things, being with other people, and breathing the air in an enclosed space can be risky. How quickly that awareness recedes will be different for different people, but it can never vanish completely for anyone who lived through this year. It could become second nature to recoil from shaking hands or touching our faces – and we might all find we can't stop washing our hands.

The comfort of being in the presence of others might be replaced by a greater comfort with absence, especially with those we don't know intimately. Instead of asking, "Is there a reason to do this online?" we'll be asking, "Is there any good reason to do this in person?" – and might need to be reminded and convinced that there is. Unfortunately, if unintendedly, those without easy access to broadband will be further disadvantaged. The paradox of online communication will be ratcheted up: It creates more distance, yes, but also more connection, as we communicate more often with people who are physically farther and farther away – and who feel safer to us because of that distance.

(4) Lifestyles: Regulatory Barriers to Online Tools Will Fall

By Katherine Mangu-Ward, editor-in-chief of *Reason* magazine, an American monthly magazine that promotes individual liberty

(From *Politico Magazine*, March 19th, 2020)

COVID-19 will sweep away many of the artificial barriers to moving more of our lives online. Not everything can become virtual, of course. But in many areas of our lives, uptake on genuinely useful

online tools has been slowed by powerful legacy players, often working in collaboration with overcautious bureaucrats. ... The resistance – led by teachers’ unions and the politicians beholden to them – to allowing partial homeschooling or online learning for K-12 kids has been swept away by necessity. It will be near-impossible to put that genie back in the bottle in the fall, with many families finding that they prefer full or partial homeschooling or online homework. For many college students, returning to an expensive dorm room on a depopulated campus will not be appealing, forcing massive changes in a sector that has been ripe for innovation for a long time. And while not every job can be done remotely, many people are learning that the difference between having to put on a tie and commute for an hour or working efficiently at home was always just the ability to download one or two apps plus permission from their boss. Once companies sort out their remote work dance steps, it will be harder – and more expensive – to deny employees those options. In other words, it turns out, an awful lot of meetings (and doctors’ appointments and classes) really could have been an email. And now they will be.

Writing Tasks (50%)

- (1) (20%) **In your own words, summarize each of the experts’ opinions above.** You should write one short paragraph (just a few sentences) for each expert’s opinions.

Start paragraph 1 with: “*According to Stephen M. Walt, ...*”

Start paragraph 2 with: “*In Kishore Mahbubanis’ opinion, ...*”

Start paragraph 3 with: “*As for Deborah Tannen, her view is that ...*”

Start paragraph 4 with: “*Finally, Katherine Mangu-Ward believes that ...*”

- (2) (30%) **Write a few paragraphs that state your opinions towards what you summarized above.** Do you agree or disagree with each of the experts’ opinions? Why or why not? Use your own experiences to support your reasons. Make sure that you address all four experts’ opinions, and make proper reference to each of them. **End this part with a few sentences that talk about how the coronavirus pandemic has affected you personally.**

PASSAGE B

...What is the effect of property upon the character? Don't let's touch economics; the effect of private ownership upon the community as a whole is another question--a more important question, perhaps, but another one. Let's keep to psychology. If you own things, what's their effect on you? What's the effect on me of my wood?

In the first place, it makes me feel heavy. Property does have this effect. Property produces men of weight, and it was a man of weight who failed to get into the Kingdom of Heaven. He was not wicked, that unfortunate millionaire in the parable, he was only stout; he he struck out in front, not to mention behind, and as he wedged himself this way and that in the crystalline entrance and bruised his well-fed flanks, he saw beneath him a comparatively slim camel passing through the eye of a needle and being woven into the robe of God. The Gospels all through couple stoutness and slowness. They point out what is perfectly obvious, yet seldom realized: that if you have a lot of things you cannot move about a lot, that furniture requires dusting, dusters require servants, servants require insurance stamps, and the whole tangle of them makes you think twice before you accept an invitation to dinner or go for

a bathe in the Jordan. Sometimes the Gospels proceed further and say with Tolstoy that property is sinful; they approach the difficult ground of asceticism here, where I cannot follow them. But as to the immediate effects of property on people, they just show straightforward logic. It produces men of weight. Men of weight cannot, by definition, move like the lightning from the East unto the West, and the ascent of a fourteen-stone bishop into a pulpit is thus the exact antithesis of the coming of the Son of Man. My wood makes me feel heavy.

In the second place, it makes me feel it ought to be larger.

The other day I heard a twig snap in it. I was annoyed at first, for I thought that someone was blackberrying, and depreciating the value of the undergrowth. On coming nearer, I saw it was not a man who had trodden on the twig and snapped it, but a bird, and I felt pleased. My bird. The bird was not equally pleased. Ignoring the relation between us, it took fright as soon as it saw the shape of my face, and flew straight over the boundary hedge into a field, the property of Mrs. Henessy, where it sat down with a loud squawk. It had become Mrs. Henessy's bird. Something seemed grossly amiss here, something that would not have occurred had the wood been larger. I could not afford to buy Mrs. Henessy out, I dared not murder her, and limitations of this sort beset me on every side. Ahab did not want that vineyard--he only needed it to round off his property, preparatory to plotting a new curve--and all the land around my wood has become necessary to me in order to round off the wood. A boundary protects. But--poor little thing--the boundary ought in its turn to be protected. Noises on the edge of it. Children throw stones. A little more, and then a little more, until we reach the sea. Happy Canute! Happier Alexander! And after all, why should even the world be the limit of possession? A rocket containing a Union Jack, will, it is hoped, be shortly fired at the moon. Mars. Sirius. Beyond which . . . But these immensities ended by saddening me. I could not suppose that my wood was the destined nucleus of universal dominion--it is so very small and contains no mineral wealth beyond the blackberries. Nor was I comforted when Mrs. Henessy's bird took alarm for the second time and flew clean away from us all, under the belief that it belonged to itself.

Forster, E. M. "My Wood." (1926)

Writing Tasks (50%)

1. Please briefly summarize the article (10%).
2. What is the tone that Forster is using in the article? What effect does it produce on the reader? (20%)
3. Please imitate Forster's writing style and tell us what you think could be the third effect on you. (20%)

Note: There is no right or wrong answer because this is an English reading and writing test. It's most important to voice your opinions completely and comprehensively. Try to write as much as you can in the best English that you know. Thank you.