



Unit 1

Politics



报刊英语阅读的方法和技巧

在第二语言习得过程中，阅读是获取知识和信息的重要手段。其中，美英报刊文章因其题材广泛、体裁多样、内容鲜活、语言表达生动自然，为学习者搭建了一个获得各种语言信息的平台。一方面，通过美英报刊阅读，学习者可以扩大报刊词汇量，培养和提高阅读外刊的基本能力，增强语言感知的敏锐性，提高英语综合应用能力；另一方面，学习者可以了解西方文化背景知识，提高社会认知能力，进而培养跨文化交流意识，提高综合人文素质，以满足国家和社会对于大学生应具备较高人文素养的要求。

社会科技发展日新月异，社会生活各个方面的新事物和新动态迅速涌现，新的词语和表达法也在源源不断地出现。报刊英语除兼具时效性和鲜活性以外，其内容丰富多彩、实用性强。可以说，有效阅读美英媒体报刊是准确把握现代英语脉搏的一条捷径。由于报刊英语在遣词造句、文章结构、题材体裁等方面都具有鲜明的特点，这决定了报刊文章的阅读策略和方法技巧与其他种类的阅读会有所不同。

下面就报刊英语阅读的方法和技巧方面提出几条建议。

一、学会阅读版面

阅读报纸之前，首先要了解报纸的不同版面及各版面的主要内容。版面是每期报刊内容编排布局的整体产物，通过熟悉版面能够了解每种报纸的主要内容的分布位置，使进一步的阅读具有针对性。美英主流报刊每期都在固定位置刊示报纸内容的索引，对比索引就可以看出报刊之间不同的版面安排。比如，我们对比《卫报》（*The Guardian*）、《华盛顿邮报》（*The Washington Post*）和《基督教科学箴言报》（*The Christian Science Monitor*）的内容索引，就可以看出三者办报风格的异同：



《卫报》	《华盛顿邮报》	《基督教科学箴言报》
News; Opinion; Sport; Culture; Lifestyle	Politics; Opinions; Style; Investigations; Climate; Recipes; Well+Being; Business; Tech; World; D.C., Md. & Va.; Sports; Crosswords & Games	News; Culture; Books; Commentary
其中, News 主要包含以下模块: World; US politics; UK; Climate crisis; Middle East; Ukraine; Environment; Science; Global development; Football; Tech; Business; Obituaries		其中, News 主要包含以下模块: Economy; Education; Environment; Foreign Policy; Law & Courts; Olympics; Politics; Science; Security; Society

有些报纸的时事新闻部分会视重要性程度提供不同的要闻索引, 以方便读者快速了解时事。例如, 我们选择不同日期对比了《华盛顿邮报》头版上方的要闻索引, 可以看出时事变化:

- Jul. 30, 2021: Politics; Opinions; Investigations; Tech; World; D.C., Md. & Va.; Sports; Race & Reckoning; Arts & Entertainment; Business; Climate & Environment; Climate Solutions; Coronavirus
- Aug. 9, 2021: Politics; Coronavirus; Tokyo Olympics; Race & Reckoning; Opinions; Tech; Investigations; World; D.C., Md. & Va.; Sports; Arts & Entertainment

这样, 读者可以根据自己的需要和兴趣来选择不同阅读版块的内容, 从而减少盲目性, 提高阅读效率。

二、准确把握标题

标题是新闻报道的点睛之笔, 用以精要概述全文重点, 通常会以不同颜色和字体表示, 凝练醒目。快速而高效地理解标题对整篇新闻的领悟起到提纲挈领的作用。新闻标题在词汇、语法等方面均有显著的特点。比如, 在语法方面有两个显著特点: 一是某些语法功能虚词的省略现象; 二是标题时态的特定习惯用法。由于新闻报道的是新近或刚刚发生的事情, 新闻语言倾向于使用能让读者感受到时效性的表达形式。常见标题的时态用法可以概括为以下四种: 一般现在时表述新近发生的事实; 一般过去时表述往事或历史事实; 现在分词表述正在进行的动作; 不定式表述未来发生的行为。例如:

- New York's Transit Agency Quits Sharing Updates on Twitter (*The New York Times*, Apr. 29, 2023)
- A contest encouraged children to hunt feral cats—until the backlash (*The Washington Post*, Apr. 19, 2023)

- Trump Pressed Justice Dept. to Declare Election Results Corrupt, Notes Show (*The New York Times*, Jul. 31, 2021)
- Going to the Moon via the Cloud (*The New York Times*, Aug. 9, 2021)
- Canada to Reopen Border to Vaccinated U.S. Travelers (*The New York Times*, Jul. 20, 2021)

关于纽约交通局停止在推特上共享更新的新闻标题用了历史现在时 (historical present) 来表述新近发生的事实, 让读者感觉这件事情的发生近在眼前。关于“一竞赛教唆孩子捕猎夜猫——遭强烈反对”的新闻是陈述往事, 因此使用了一般过去时。新闻 Going to the Moon via the Cloud 使用进行时态表达“正在飞向月球”之义。关于“加拿大将向打过疫苗的美国游客开放边境”的新闻则使用动词不定式 to reopen border 表示将来的行为。

三、了解新闻体裁

英语报刊的体裁包括消息报道、特写及专栏、社论和广告。消息报道就是通常意义上的“硬新闻”, 结构上一般采用典型的“倒金字塔”, 即最重要的信息出现在导语中, 其他信息的重要性依次降低。特写着重在某一方面, 既要提供事实, 又要引起读者的兴趣, 因此在文笔上比较讲究。特写包括新闻特写 (news features) 和一般特写 (general features) (廖维娜等, 2008), 可专门写一人、一事、一情、一景, 也可就专门问题写个人的看法, 并由此发展成定期发表文章的“专栏”。特写通常以独特的思想、趣味、观点、风格来吸引读者。报刊上的社论代表报纸或杂志的立场、观点, 常是对某件事做出表态、提出问题或发出号召, 对某行为或某人物进行臧否褒贬。社论的篇章结构与一般议论文相同, 即“论点—论证—论据—结论”。广告是商业宣传的手段, 通过大量使用照片及图画, 做到图文并茂、形式活泼。其中, 文字部分语言凝练、善用修辞、表现力强, 与广告意图紧密结合。

四、正确处理生词

在报刊英语阅读中, 读者会不可避免地遇到一些新词和生词。正确的处理方法包括利用构词法、上下文语境、时事和百科知识等进行合理猜测释义。

首先合理利用构词法。“词缀+词根”的构词法在英语中非常普遍, 在理解基本的词缀和词根含义、熟练掌握构词规律之后, 理解由这些词根和词缀组成的单词意思也就容易多了, 如 un-employ-ment、con-tribu-tion 等。除“词缀+词根”构词法之外, 缩略词是美英报刊文章的另一个常用构词手段。例如:

- ADB: Asian Development Bank (亚洲开发银行)
- APEC: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (亚太经济合作组织)



- ASEAN: Association of the Southeast Asian Nations (东南亚国家联盟)
- IAEA: International Atomic Energy Agency (国际原子能机构)
- IEA: International Energy Agency (国际能源机构)
- IMF: International Monetary Fund (国际货币基金组织)
- IOC: International Olympic Committee (国际奥林匹克委员会)
- NATO: Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization (北大西洋公约组织)
- OPEC: Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (石油输出国组织)
- SALT: Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (限制战略武器会谈)
- UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (联合国教科文组织)
- WTO: World Trade Organization (世界贸易组织)

其次通过上下文猜测单词意义。任何新闻都是一个语篇，都有一定的语域 (register)。在特定的语域内，语言的使用是紧密相关的。单词的意义通常和语域是相契合的，具有可推测性。根据上下文正确推测贴合具体语境的单词意义，是阅读的重要方法之一。例如，对于“Boris Johnson won't need to quarantine, his office says, despite a positive test on his team.” (*The New York Times*, Aug. 7, 2021)，虽然读者有可能对 quarantine 一词有些陌生，但是通过上下文语境不难猜出 quarantine 为“隔离检疫”之义 (to place into enforced isolation, as for medical reasons)。

最后合理利用时事和百科知识进行推测。熟知国际政治经济和人文地理等方面的专有名词，以及一些知名企业和组织的中英文对应名称，对报刊阅读能力的提高会很有帮助。例如，White House (白宫，即美国政府)、No.10 Downing Street (唐宁街 10 号，即英国首相官邸和办公处，指代英国政府)、Élysée (爱丽舍宫，即法国总统官邸和办公处，指代法国政府)、Capitol Hill (美国国会大厦，指代美国国会)、Buckingham (白金汉宫，即英国君主在伦敦的主要寝宫及办公处，指代英国皇室)、Pentagon (五角大楼，指代美国国防部)、Walmart (沃尔玛)、J. P. Morgan Chase (摩根大通银行)、AIG (American International Group, 美国国际集团) 等。

☐ 五、养成良好的阅读习惯

在报刊英语阅读中，除特殊需要之外，一般应努力避免指读、笔读、唇读、默读，以及过于依赖辞典等阅读习惯。指读或笔读是指习惯用手或笔指着文章逐词阅读。但因为眼球的运动远比手指灵活，速度也更快，所以指读和笔读在一定程度上会迫使眼睛跟着手指移动，势必会降低阅读速度。同时，眼睛涉及的阅读范围不应是单个词语，而应是一些意群 (sense group)。由于一个句子通常由若干结构不同的意群构成，阅读意群可以提高阅读效率。如果英语学习者过于依赖有声朗读练习，忽略速读、泛读练习，逐渐养成出声朗读、

动唇拼读或在心里默默拼读的习惯，这些都会降低大脑处理语言信息的速度。另外，阅读过程中碰到生词是正常的，频繁查单词不仅会影响阅读兴趣，而且根据语境猜词义的阅读技能也得不到锻炼和提高。

总之，语言的学习是一个漫长的实践过程。通过阅读英语报刊，可以有效培养英语学习者的语感，提高阅读理解能力，增强精读、略读等阅读技能。同时，阅读英语报刊能使英语学习者在信息激增的时代，积极有效地获取并积累有价值的信息，了解西方文化，培养正确的跨文化交流意识。

Text A

导读

本文源自《周末画报》与《纽约时报》合作出版的2020年年度特刊《转折点》，旨在探讨本年度的关键时刻对未来的象征意义。2020年，在日益恶化的全球新冠疫情大流行中，美国前副总统、民主党人乔·拜登以创纪录的得票数在美国总统大选中胜出，这标志着共和党人唐纳德·特朗普政府谋求连任失败。然而，时任总统特朗普甚至在竞选结果公布之前就公开声明，如败选则拒绝和平移交总统权力。

本文评论了特朗普政府的执政目标、执政手段，以及对美国民主带来的负面影响；分析了美国当下民主制度的弱点以及面临的危机；认为社会两极分化加剧，良性制衡体系陷入了僵局和对抗；指出美国面临着强化民主这一艰巨任务，亟须直面种族不平等、经济不均衡等问题，只有这样才有可能增强互信、凝聚民心，进而修复民主制度的裂痕。

A Chance to repair the cracks in our democracy

By Joseph E. Stiglitz¹

Our norm-shattering president has taught us not to take our norms for granted.

Like many of my fellow Americans, I was aghast when President Trump² refused to commit himself to a peaceful transfer of presidential power if he were to lose in the Nov. 3 election. And he revealed this in October, while consistently trailing the eventual victor, former Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr.³, in the polls.

Then, to make matters worse, Senator Mike Lee⁴ of Utah, a Republican who sits on the



Senate Judiciary Committee⁵, followed that up with this tweet: “Democracy isn’t the objective; liberty, peace, and prosperity are. We want the human condition to flourish. Rank democracy can thwart that.” Rank democracy? The only saving grace for such a pronouncement is that, at last, a Republican politician was being honest about his or her intentions, and this could well be a turning point in the narrative of our country and our national discourse.

If there is to be no peaceful, or even smooth, transition of power, and if people like Senator Lee have their way, and we turn our backs on democracy, then our lives and our conception of the United States as a bastion of popular representation and respect for human rights will change forever.

Over a year ago, in my book *People, Power, and Profits: Progressive Capitalism for an Age of Discontent*, I mused over the quandary facing the Republican Party. It has supported a set of policies that are opposed by the majority of Americans, who have expressed their belief in universal access to health care, better access to education, higher minimum wages, tighter gun control and so on. The only way the Republican Party can hold on to its power is through anti-democratic policies—disenfranchisement (voter suppression), disempowerment (gerrymandering voting districts) and packing the Supreme Court in order to constrain what a Democratic-majority Congress or president might have the ability to do.

We’ve watched what the Republicans have actually been doing, as incongruous as it might be, with their flag-waving and constant appeals to the U.S. Constitution. Now they have begun to speak more openly about their intentions. Now, perhaps, we can have a real conversation about what kind of country we want America to be. Do we agree with Senator Lee on the ends? Do the ends justify the means? Are we willing to give up on our democracy to get them? And would giving up on democracy really get us there? Certainly, history provides us with many warnings.

The past four years have made us aware of just how exquisitely fragile our institutions—such as those ensuring equality, political freedom, a quality Civil Service⁶, a free and active press and the rule of law—are. When I was chief economist of the World Bank⁷ some 20 years ago, we would lecture countries about creating good institutions, and at the time we looked to the United States as a model and paragon. We weren’t certain how you created good institutions; we couldn’t even define what the term meant precisely, but you knew it when you saw it. It involved norms as well as laws. Well-performing societies had both—the rule of law was necessary, but norms respected by all citizens had greater flexibility. One couldn’t encode in laws everything implied by “good behavior”. The world was just too complex and ever-changing.

A little while later, I was chair of an international group called the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress⁸. Our objective was to assess healthy economies, where citizens enjoyed a high level of well-being, and discern what went into the making and sustaining of these societies. One ingredient we focused on, often left out in earlier analyses, was *trust*—the trust of citizens in one another and in their common institutions.

When I was growing up in Gary, Ind., we learned in school about the strengths of America's democracy, about our systems of checks and balances, and the rule of law. We talked about a democracy in which the voice of the majority was heard clearly, but the rights of the minority were respected, too. We didn't talk about trust—it was taken for granted—or institutional fragility, which was the sort of thing that afflicted banana republics⁹. We looked down at other countries where money stained the political process. We hadn't yet had Supreme Court decisions like *Citizens United v. the Federal Election Commission*¹⁰, which enshrined the role of corporate dollars in our politics. And we couldn't even have conceived of an America permanently dominated by a political minority that paid no respect to the rights of the majority.

Well, for the past few years we've had a norm-shattering president. He has taught us not to take our norms for granted, and made it clear that we may have to translate long-established behaviors—such as respect for the role of inspectors general, avoidance of conflicts of interest, and disclosure of tax returns—into laws.

I hope this pivotal juncture in our national discourse will not be a turning point in the course of the nation. If those who disdain democracy like President Trump and Senator Lee continue to call the tune, history tells us where it will lead, and we have already seen hints. The abduction of peaceful protesters by inadequately identified security personnel in unmarked cars in Portland, Ore., last summer instills in us an ugly sense of foreboding, and carries with it the sour odor of Hitler's Brownshirts¹¹—as do the claims of a president that he is, quite simply, above the law, or the results of a free and fair election.

Assuming, however, that our democracy survives, this pivot point may turn us in quite a different direction: We will now face the even more daunting yet invigorating task of reinforcing our democracy. We've seen the weaknesses, the fragility in its structure. We've seen the destructive dynamic of money in our politics, how it undermines trust and creates conditions that exacerbate societal inequalities. We've seen how this process leads to greater polarization, transforming a virtuous system of checks and balances into one of gridlock and confrontation.

We won't succeed in restoring trust and a sense of social cohesion until we confront, head on,



our intertwined racial, ethnic and economic inequalities. These schisms inevitably divide us and undermine the solidarity democracy demands.

(From *The New York Times*, Dec. 8, 2020)

NOTES

1. **Joseph E. Stiglitz:** 约瑟夫·斯蒂格利茨 (1943—), 美国经济学家, 哥伦比亚大学教授, 2001 年诺贝尔经济学奖得主。他曾任美国总统经济顾问委员会成员及主席, 世界银行副行长兼首席经济学家, 国际经济学协会主席。
2. **President Trump:** 第 45 任美国总统唐纳德·特朗普 (Donald Trump)。特朗普生于 1946 年, 美国共和党人、房地产商, 2016 年当选美国总统。2020 年 11 月 7 日, 民主党候选人约瑟夫·拜登赢得 2020 年美国总统大选, 特朗普败选。
3. **Joseph R. Biden Jr.:** 第 46 任美国总统小约瑟夫·罗宾内特·拜登。拜登生于 1942 年, 1970 年开始从政, 1988 年、2008 年竞选美国总统未果, 2008 年、2012 年辅助美国前总统奥巴马并出任美国副总统, 2020 年赢得美国总统大选。
4. **Senator Mike Lee:** 迈克·李 (1971—), 时任美国犹他州共和党参议员。
5. **Senate Judiciary Committee:** 参议院司法委员会, 是美国参议院历史最悠久、最有权力的立法委员会之一, 负责监督参议院任命最高法院法官和联邦法官。其成员通常由民主和共和两党代表担任, 在参议院占多数的政党所占席位也多。
6. **Civil Service:** 政府文职机构, 这里统称行政工作人员。
7. **The World Bank:** 世界银行, 世界银行集团的简称。世界银行是一个成立于 1945 年的联合国专门机构, 包括国际复兴开发银行、国际开发协会、国际金融公司、多边投资担保机构和国际投资争端解决中心五个成员机构。其宗旨是向成员国提供贷款和进行投资, 以推进国际贸易均衡发展。
8. **Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress:** 经济表现和社会进步衡量委员会, 于 2008 年 2 月在法国前总统萨科齐的要求下成立。其主要成员包括诺贝尔经济学奖获得者约瑟夫·斯蒂格利茨、阿马蒂亚·森 (Amartya Sen) 及法国经济学家让-保罗·菲图西 (Jean-Paul Fitouss), 其任务是研究国内生产总值 (GDP) 作为经济表现和社会进步指标的局限性, 并评估其他衡量社会进步指标的可行性。
9. **banana republics:** 香蕉共和国。香蕉共和国是一个政治专有名词, 通常指中美洲或南美洲的一些国家, 经济上为单一经济体系 (如香蕉、可可等), 政治上不民主或不稳定, 往往高度依赖外援。
10. **Citizens United v. the Federal Election Commission:** 联合公民诉联邦选举委员会案, 美国联邦最高法院 2010 年 1 月 21 日判决的一场具有重要意义的诉讼案。该案判定两党选举改革法案条款限制了商业机构资助联邦选举候选人, 违反了宪法中的言论自由原则, 因此判决取消了美国企业的政治献金限制。反对者认为这一判决将导致大量资金介入竞选活动, 腐蚀民主政治。
11. **Hitler's Brownshirts:** 冲锋队, 指以阿道夫·希特勒为领袖的德国纳粹党武装组织, 其队员穿褐

色制服，因此也称“褐衫队”。冲锋队成立于1921年8月3日，宣誓为纳粹党效力并追随领袖希特勒。该组织最初主要从事破坏革命运动、冲击其他党派群众集会及进行街头殴斗等活动。



USEFUL WORDS

abduction	[æb'dʌkʃn]	<i>n.</i> kidnapping 诱拐
bastion	['bæstɪən]	<i>n.</i> sb. or sth. regarded as providing strong defense or support, especially for a belief or cause, or a place where there are such people 堡垒; 捍卫者; 防御工事
confrontation	[,kɒnfrʌn'teɪʃn]	<i>n.</i> ~ with sb.; ~ between A and B a situation in which there is an angry disagreement between people or groups who have different opinions 对抗; 对峙; 冲突对抗
daunt	[daʊnt]	<i>v.</i> ~ sb. to make sb. feel nervous and less confident about doing sth. 使胆怯; 使气馁; 使失去信心威吓
discern	[dɪ'sɜ:n]	<i>v.</i> to know, recognize or understand sth., especially sth. that is not obvious 觉察出; 识别; 了解
disdain	[dɪs'deɪn]	<i>v.</i> ~ sb./sth.; ~ to do sth. to think that sb./sth. is not good enough to deserve your respect 蔑视; 鄙视
disempowerment	[dɪsɪm'paʊəmənt]	<i>n.</i> 失权; 无力感
disenfranchisement	[dɪsɪn'fræntʃɪzmənt]	<i>n.</i> 剥夺公民选举权; 剥夺穷人的权利
enshrine	[ɪn'ʃraɪn]	<i>v.</i> ~ sth. (in sth.) to make a law, right, etc. respected or official, especially by stating it in an important written document 把(法律、权利等)奉为神圣; 把……庄严地载入
exacerbate	[ɪg'zæsəbeɪt]	<i>v.</i> ~ sth. to make sth. worse, especially a disease or problem 使恶化; 使加剧; 使加重
exquisitely	[ɪk'skwɪzɪtli]	<i>adv.</i> in a delicate manner 精美的, 精致的; 剧烈的, 强烈的
foreboding	[fɔ:'bəʊdɪŋ]	<i>n.</i> a strong feeling that sth. unpleasant or dangerous is going to happen (对不祥或危险事情的)强烈预感
gerrymander	['dʒerɪmændə(r)]	<i>v.</i> ~ sth. to change the size and borders of an area for voting in order to give an unfair advantage to one party in an election 不公正地改划(选区), 不公正地划分(选区)(旨在使某政党获得优势)
gridlock	['grɪdlɒk]	<i>n.</i> a situation in which people with different opinions are not able to agree with each other and so no action can be taken 僵局(因意见分歧而无法采取行动)
incongruous	[ɪn'kɒŋgruəs]	<i>adj.</i> unsuitable or out of place in a specific setting or context; not in accord or consistent with sth.; strange because of being very different from other things that happen or exist in



		the same situation 不合适的; 不相称的; 不协调的
instill	[ɪn'stɪl]	v. to impress ideas, principles, or teachings gradually on sb.'s mind; to make sb. have a particular feeling or belief 慢慢灌输
intertwine	[,ɪntə'twain]	v. to be connected so as to be difficult to separate (使) 紧密关联
invigorating	[ɪn'vɪɡəreɪɪŋ]	adj. making sb. feel healthier, less tired, and more energetic 令人充满活力的; 使人精力充沛的
juncture	['dʒʌŋktʃə(r)]	n. a particular point or stage in an activity or a series of events 特定时刻; 关头
pack	[pæk]	v. to ensure that a group such as a jury or committee is made up wholly or mainly of supporters of one side 打包; 包装(使其利于一方)
paragon	['pærəɡən]	n. a person who is perfect or who is a perfect example of a particular good quality 典范; 完人
pivot	['pɪvət]	n. the central or most important person or thing 最重要的人(或事物); 中心, 核心
pivotal	['pɪvətl]	adj. of great importance because other things depend on it 关键性的; 核心的
polarization	[,pəʊləraɪ'zeɪʃn]	n. the condition of having or giving polarity 产生极性; 极化
quandary	['kwɒndəri]	n. a state of uncertainty or indecision as to what to do in a difficult situation 困惑; 进退两难; 困窘
schism	['skɪzəm]/['sɪzəm]	n. a division into two groups caused by a disagreement about ideas, especially in a religious organization 宗派, 派别, 派系; (特指教会的) 分立



EXERCISES

I. Vocabulary

Choose among the four alternatives one word or phrase that is closest in meaning to the underlined part in each statement.

- Like many of my fellow Americans, I was aghast when President Trump refused to commit himself to a peaceful transfer of presidential power if he were to lose in the Nov. 3 election.
A. horrified B. pleasant C. interested D. satisfied
- Over a year ago, in my book *People, Power, and Profits: Progressive Capitalism for an Age of Discontent*, I mused over the quandary facing the Republican Party.
A. listened to B. reminded of C. took over D. thought about

3. Our norm-shattering president has taught us not to take our norms for granted.
A. bringing B. breaking C. shaking D. slapping
4. Over a year ago, in my book *People, Power, and Profits: Progressive Capitalism for an Age of Discontent*, I mused over the quandary facing the Republican Party.
A. amusement B. surprise C. dilemma D. amazement
5. The only way the Republican Party can hold on to its power is through anti-democratic policies—disenfranchisement (voter suppression), disempowerment (gerrymandering voting districts) and packing the Supreme Court in order to constrain what a Democratic-majority Congress or president might have the ability to do.
A. hold back B. control C. exclude D. give up
6. We want the human condition to flourish. Rank democracy can thwart that.
A. encourage B. facilitate C. frustrate D. promote
7. If those who disdain democracy like President Trump and Senator Lee continue to call the tune, history tells us where it will lead, and we have already seen hints.
A. call up B. be in charge C. obey the rule D. call on
8. The past four years have made us aware of just how exquisitely fragile our institutions—such as those ensuring equality, political freedom, a quality Civil Service, a free and active press and the rule of law—are.
A. successful B. delayed C. freak D. weak
9. We didn't talk about trust—it was taken for granted—or institutional fragility, which was the sort of thing that afflicted banana republics.
A. conflicted B. bothered C. insulted D. charged
10. And we couldn't even have conceived of an America permanently dominated by a political minority that paid no respect to the rights of the majority.
A. imagined B. created C. provided D. accepted

II. Comprehension

Decide whether the following statements are true (T) or false (F) according to the information given in the press clipping. Mark T or F for each statement.

1. President Trump refused a peaceful transfer of presidential power when he lost in the Oct. 3 election.
2. It can be inferred from Senator Mike Lee's remarks that democracy is much more important than liberty, peace, and prosperity.
3. According to the author, peaceful transition of power and national discourse has a great impact on democracy in America.
4. The majority of Americans supported a set of policies enforced by the Republican Party, such as higher minimum wages, tighter gun control, and so on.
5. In order to keep its power and restrict the Democratic Party, the Republican Party carried out



- anti-democratic policies and packed the Supreme Court.
6. Twenty years ago, the United States was viewed as an excellent example of creating good institutions which involved norms as well as laws.
 7. According to the author, America's democracy was satisfactory in the good old days when he grew up.
 8. The author implies that politicians like President Trump and Senator Lee may harm American democracy.
 9. According to the text, even if America's democracy survives, there is still a lot to do to fix the crack.
 10. As long as we confront racial discrimination, we will succeed in restoring trust and a sense of social cohesion.

III. Topics for Discussion

1. Please briefly explain why the author was aghast when President Trump refused to commit himself to a peaceful transfer of presidential power if he were to lose in the Nov. 3 election.
2. Donald Trump was voted out after a single term in 2020. What do you think are the causes of his failure in the re-election bid?
3. According to the author, what are the schisms that inevitably divide the U.S. and undermine the solidarity democracy demands?
4. What do you know about the COVID-19 pandemic in America in 2020? Surf the Internet and exchange the information you get with your partners.
5. "Black Lives Matter" is an anti-racism campaign in America. Make a reference to the Internet and present your view about racial inequality in America.

美英政党简介

一、美国

美国是世界上最早出现政党的国家之一，也是实行两党制的代表性国家之一。民主党和共和党是两大主要政党，主导着美国各个层面的政治生态（表 1.1）。美国的两党制，与其政治选举制度、国会制度、行政管理制度、司法制度等的联系都非常密切。美国大选期间，报纸上经常出现两党的党徽：驴和象。前者象征民主党，后者则象征共和党。人们通常将两党的这一政治交锋称为“驴象之争”。两党制在一定程度上对于维护美国的政治稳定、保证公民参与政权等方面发挥了较为积极的作用。

民主党（Democratic Party）起源于 1792 年由托马斯·杰斐逊（Thomas Jefferson）创立的民主共和党（Democratic-Republican Party）。初期主要由种植园主、农民和一些与南方奴

隶主有联系的资本家组成。1828年，该党正式改为现名。民主党在经济上的立场偏左派。1932年，富兰克林·罗斯福（Franklin Roosevelt）实施“新政”以来，民主党的自由派色彩比较浓，强调国家干预社会经济生活，主张建立更完善的福利保障制度。民主党的选民基础是城市中产阶级、蓝领工人、有色人种等（周鑫宇，2020）。哈基姆·杰弗里斯是民主党的现任执政领袖。

共和党（Republican Party）于1854年成立，初期主要由反对扩大奴隶制的北方工商业资本家组成。前身亦为民主共和党。该党于1825年发生分裂，其中一派组成国家共和党（National Republican Party），1834年改称“辉格党”（Whig Party）。共和党的保守派形象更突出，被视为“社会保守主义”“经济古典主义”。共和党更多地主张发挥市场的作用，强调个人自由，反对国家干预，反对国家承担过多的福利保障职能，在外交、国防问题上则采取强硬的右派态度。共和党的选民基础主要是保守的基督教白人和工农商阶层（周鑫宇，2020）。

近年来，全国性政党在代表选举和总统竞选中所起的作用逐渐增大。全国代表大会是政党的最高权力机关，每四年举行一次。大会提名下届总统和副总统的候选人，并通过该政党的纲领。民主党和共和党的全国委员会是两次全国代表大会期间的主要管理实体，其主要任务是为该党的总统候选人进行选举筹款、开展选情调研、从事政策研究等。该委员会还设有外围组织，如妇女联合会和青年联合会（周淑真等，2010）。

表 1.1 美国历任总统及所属党派

任数	姓名（英文）	姓名（中文）	任期	所属党派
1	George Washington	乔治·华盛顿	1789—1797	无
2	John Adams	约翰·亚当斯	1797—1801	联邦党
3	Thomas Jefferson	托马斯·杰斐逊	1801—1809	民主共和党
4	James Madison	詹姆斯·麦迪逊	1809—1817	民主共和党
5	James Monroe	詹姆斯·门罗	1817—1825	民主共和党
6	John Quincy Adams	约翰·昆西·亚当斯	1825—1829	民主共和党
7	Andrew Jackson	安德鲁·杰克逊	1829—1837	民主共和党
8	Martin van Buren	马丁·范·布伦	1837—1841	民主党
9	William Henry Harrison	威廉·亨利·哈里森	1841—1841	辉格党
10	John Tyler	约翰·泰勒	1841—1845	辉格党
11	James Knox Polk	詹姆斯·诺克斯·波尔克	1845—1849	民主党
12	Zachary Taylor	扎卡里·泰勒	1849—1850	辉格党
13	Millard Fillmore	米勒德·菲尔莫尔	1850—1853	辉格党
14	Franklin Pierce	富兰克林·皮尔斯	1853—1857	民主党



续表

任数	姓名 (英文)	姓名 (中文)	任期	所属党派
15	James Buchanan	詹姆斯·布坎南	1857—1861	民主党
16	Abraham Lincoln	亚伯拉罕·林肯	1861—1865	共和党
17	Andrew Johnson	安德鲁·约翰逊	1865—1869	民主党
18	Ulysses Simpson Grant	尤利西斯·辛普森·格兰特	1869—1873	共和党
19	Rutherford Birchard Hayes	拉瑟福德·伯查德·海斯	1877—1881	共和党
20	James Garfield	詹姆斯·加菲尔德	1881—1881	共和党
21	Chester Alan Arthur	切斯特·艾伦·阿瑟	1881—1885	共和党
22	Grover Cleveland	格罗弗·克利夫兰	1885—1889	民主党
23	Benjamin Harrison	本杰明·哈利森	1889—1893	共和党
24	Grover Cleveland	格罗弗·克利夫兰	1893—1897	民主党
25	William McKinley	威廉·麦金莱	1897—1901	共和党
26	Theodore Roosevelt	西奥多·罗斯福	1901—1909	共和党
27	William Howard Taft	威廉·霍华德·塔夫脱	1909—1913	共和党
28	Woodrow Wilson	伍德罗·威尔逊	1913—1921	民主党
29	Warren Gamaliel Harding	沃伦·盖玛利尔·哈定	1921—1923	共和党
30	Calvin Coolidge	卡尔文·柯立芝	1923—1929	共和党
31	Herbert Clark Hoover	赫伯特·克拉克·胡佛	1929—1933	共和党
32	Franklin Delano Roosevelt	富兰克林·德拉诺·罗斯福	1933—1945	民主党
33	Harry Truman	哈里·杜鲁门	1945—1953	民主党
34	Dwight David Eisenhower	德怀特·戴维·艾森豪威尔	1953—1961	共和党
35	John Fitzgerald Kennedy	约翰·菲茨杰拉德·肯尼迪	1961—1963	民主党
36	Lyndon Baines Johnson	林登·贝恩斯·约翰逊	1963—1969	民主党
37	Richard Milhous Nixon	理查德·米尔豪斯·尼克松	1969—1974	共和党
38	Gerald Rudolph Ford Jr.	杰拉尔德·鲁道夫·福特	1974—1977	共和党
39	James Earl Carter	詹姆斯·厄尔·卡特	1977—1981	民主党
40	Ronald Reagan	罗纳德·里根	1981—1989	共和党
41	George Herbert Walker Bush	乔治·赫伯特·沃克·布什	1989—1993	共和党
42	Bill Clinton	比尔·克林顿	1993—2001	民主党
43	George Walker Bush	乔治·沃克·布什	2001—2009	共和党
44	Barack Hussein Obama II	巴拉克·侯赛因·奥巴马	2009—2017	民主党
45	Donald John Trump	唐纳德·约翰·特朗普	2017—2021	共和党
46	Joseph Robinette Biden Jr.	小约瑟夫·罗宾内特·拜登	2021—2025	民主党
47	Donald John Trump	唐纳德·约翰·特朗普	2025—	共和党

二、英国

英国是世界上最早确立政党政治的国家，是现代政党政治的发源地，也是实行两党制的典型国家（表 1.2）。

17 世纪复辟王朝时期，英国诞生了辉格党和托利党（Tory Party）这两大政党，当时辉格党代表新兴资产阶级和新贵族的利益，主张限制王权、提高议会权力；托利党代表地主贵族利益，维护君主特权。随着资产阶级的发展，辉格党以自由贸易的工厂主为核心，在原来的基础上组成自由党（Liberal Party）。托利党以土地贵族为核心，在原来的基础上组成保守党（Conservative Party）。19 世纪末 20 世纪初，自由党逐步衰落。1924 年后，工党（Labour Party）取代自由党，与保守党轮流执政。到 20 世纪 80 年代末，英国除保守党和工党两大政党之外，还有自由民主党（Liberal Democrat Party）、苏格兰民族党（Scottish National Party）等。其中，自由民主党是比较重要的第三政党，通常能够获得 20% 左右的选票。虽然这样的支持率不足以组建政府，但往往能够对保守党和工党的执政前景产生决定性影响。

1979 年，保守党在撒切尔夫人（Margaret Thatcher）的带领下赢得大选后，致力于反对国有化，削弱工会权力，倡导经济自由主义。与之相对，工党推动政治体制改革比较积极；经济上推行国有化，强调一定程度的国家干涉，主张建立福利型国家。现任首相基尔·斯塔默（Keir Starmer）是工党的党魁。

表 1.2 英国历任首相及所属党派

任数	姓名（英文）	姓名（中文）	任期	所属党派
1	Robert Walpole	罗伯特·沃波尔	1721—1742	辉格党
2	Spencer Compton	斯宾塞·康普顿	1742—1743	辉格党
3	Henry Pelham	亨利·佩勒姆	1743—1754	辉格党
4	Thomas Pelham-Holles	托马斯·佩勒姆 - 霍利斯	1754—1756	辉格党
5	William Cavendish	威廉·卡文迪许	1756—1757	辉格党
6	Thomas Pelham-Holles	托马斯·佩勒姆 - 霍利斯	1757—1762	辉格党
7	John Stuart	约翰·斯图尔特	1762—1763	托利党
8	George Grenville	乔治·格伦维尔	1763—1765	辉格党
9	Charles Watson-Wentworth	查尔斯·沃森 - 文特沃斯	1765—1766	辉格党
10	William Pitt	威廉·皮特	1766—1768	辉格党
11	Augustus Henry Fitzroy	奥古斯都·亨利·菲茨罗伊	1768—1770	辉格党
12	Frederick North	腓特烈·诺斯	1770—1782	托利党
13	Charles Watson-Wentworth	查尔斯·沃森 - 文特沃斯	1782	辉格党
14	William Petty	威廉·配第	1782—1783	辉格党



续表

任数	姓名 (英文)	姓名 (中文)	任期	所属党派
15	William Bentinck	威廉·本廷克	1783	托利党 / 联合内阁
16	William Pitt	威廉·皮特	1783—1801	托利党
17	Henry Addington	亨利·阿丁顿	1801—1804	托利党
18	William Pitt	威廉·皮特	1804—1806	托利党
19	William Wyndam Grenville	威廉·温德姆·格伦维尔	1806—1807	辉格党 / 联合内阁
20	William Bentinck	威廉·本廷克	1807—1809	托利党
21	Spencer Perceval	斯宾塞·珀西瓦尔	1809—1812	托利党
22	Robert Banks Jenkinson	罗伯特·班克斯·詹金逊	1812—1827	托利党
23	George Canning	乔治·坎宁	1827	托利党
24	Frederick John Robinson	弗雷德里克·约翰·罗宾逊	1827—1828	托利党
25	Arthur Wellesley	阿瑟·韦尔斯利	1828—1830	托利党
26	Charles Grey	查尔斯·格雷	1830—1834	辉格党
27	William Lamb	威廉·兰姆	1834	辉格党
28	Arthur Wellesley	阿瑟·韦尔斯利	1834	保守党
29	Robert Peel	罗伯特·皮尔	1834—1835	保守党
30	William Lamb	威廉·兰姆	1835—1841	辉格党
31	Robert Peel	罗伯特·皮尔	1841—1846	保守党
32	John Russell	约翰·罗素	1846—1851	辉格党
33	Edward Smith-Stanley	爱德华·史密斯 - 斯坦利	1852	保守党
34	George Hamilton-Gordon	乔治·汉密尔顿 - 戈登	1852—1855	保守党 / 联合内阁
35	Henry John Temple Palmerston	亨利·约翰·坦普尔·帕麦斯顿	1855—1858	辉格党
36	Edward Smith-Stanley	爱德华·史密斯 - 斯坦利	1858—1859	保守党
37	Henry John Temple Palmerston	亨利·约翰·坦普尔·帕麦斯顿	1859—1865	自由党
38	John Russell	约翰·罗素	1865—1866	自由党
39	Edward Smith-Stanley	爱德华·史密斯 - 斯坦利	1866—1868	保守党
40	Benjamin Disraeli	本杰明·迪斯雷利	1868	保守党
41	William Ewart Gladstone	威廉·尤尔特·格莱斯顿	1868—1874	自由党
42	Benjamin Disraeli	本杰明·迪斯雷利	1874—1880	保守党
43	William Ewart Gladstone	威廉·尤尔特·格莱斯顿	1880—1885	自由党
44	Robert Gascoyne-Cecil	罗伯特·盖斯科因 - 塞西尔	1885—1886	保守党

续表

任数	姓名 (英文)	姓名 (中文)	任期	所属党派
45	William Ewart Gladstone	威廉·尤尔特·格莱斯顿	1886	自由党
46	Robert Gascoyne-Cecil	罗伯特·盖斯科因 - 塞西尔	1886—1892	保守党
47	William Ewart Gladstone	威廉·尤尔特·格莱斯顿	1892—1894	自由党
48	Archibald Philip Primrose	阿奇博尔德·菲利普·普里姆罗斯	1894—1895	自由党
49	Robert Gascoyne-Cecil	罗伯特·盖斯科因 - 塞西尔	1895—1902	保守党
50	Arthur James Balfour	阿瑟·詹姆斯·贝尔福	1902—1905	保守党
51	Henry Campbell-Bannerman	亨利·坎贝尔·班纳曼	1905—1908	自由党
52	Herbert Henry Asquith	赫伯特·亨利·阿斯奎斯	1908—1916	自由党
53	David Lloyd George	大卫·劳合·乔治	1916—1922	联合内阁
54	Andrew Bonar Law	安德鲁·博纳·劳	1922—1923	保守党
55	Stanley Baldwin	斯坦利·鲍德温	1923—1924	保守党
56	James Ramsay MacDonald	詹姆斯·拉姆齐·麦克唐纳	1924	工党
57	Stanley Baldwin	斯坦利·鲍德温	1924—1929	保守党
58	James Ramsay MacDonald	詹姆斯·拉姆齐·麦克唐纳	1929—1935	工党 / 国民内阁
59	Stanley Baldwin	斯坦利·鲍德温	1935—1937	保守党 / 国民内阁
60	Arthur Neville Chamberlain	阿瑟·尼维尔·张伯伦	1937—1940	保守党 / 国民内阁
61	Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill	温斯顿·伦纳德·斯宾塞·丘吉尔	1940—1945	保守党 / 联合内阁过渡政府
62	Clement Richard Attlee	克莱门特·理查德·艾德礼	1945—1951	工党
63	Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill	温斯顿·伦纳德·斯宾塞·丘吉尔	1951—1955	保守党
64	Robert Anthony Eden	罗伯特·安东尼·艾登	1955—1957	保守党
65	Harold Macmillan	哈罗德·麦克米伦	1957—1963	保守党
66	Alec Douglas-Home	亚历克·道格拉斯 - 霍姆	1963—1964	保守党
67	Harold Wilson	哈罗德·威尔逊	1964—1970	工党
68	Edward Heath	爱德华·希思	1970—1974	保守党
69	Harold Wilson	哈罗德·威尔逊	1974—1976	工党
70	James Callaghan	詹姆斯·卡拉汉	1976—1979	工党
71	Margaret Hilda Thatcher	玛格丽特·希尔达·撒切尔	1979—1990	保守党
72	John Major	约翰·梅杰	1990—1997	保守党



续表

任数	姓名 (英文)	姓名 (中文)	任期	所属党派
73	Anthony Charles Lynton Blair	安东尼·查尔斯·林顿·布莱尔	1997—2007	工党
74	Gordon Brown	戈登·布朗	2007—2010	工党
75	David William Donald Cameron	戴维·威廉·唐纳德·卡梅伦	2010—2016	保守党 / 联合内阁
76	Theresa Mary May	特雷莎·梅	2016—2019	保守党 / 联合内阁
77	Boris Johnson	鲍里斯·约翰逊	2019—2022	保守党 / 联合内阁
78	Elizabeth Truss	伊丽莎白·特拉斯	2022	保守党 / 联合内阁
79	Rishi Sunak	里希·苏纳克	2022—2024	保守党 / 联合内阁
80	Keir Starmer	基尔·斯塔默	2024—	工党

Text B

导读

在英国脱欧以后，欧盟大国下一阶段将如何发挥作用？《卫报》记者邀请了四位欧盟国家的作家，介绍各自政府将会优先考虑的问题。

文章认为，德国作为欧盟轮值主席国，正在为艰难的谈判做准备。这将会成为默克尔在 2021 年卸任德国总理前面临的最后一次大考。西班牙愿意尽可能广泛地达成协议，但如果英国坚持背离欧盟规则，那它就会承受后果。法国认为英国脱欧对英国和欧洲会带来双输局面，但仍希望多方面与英国保持紧密联系。在未来谈判中，意大利在关注公民权利、安全和国防合作的同时，还希望维持英国的全球第九大贸易伙伴的地位。对英国来说，鲍里斯·约翰逊的谈判团队只剩下 11 个月的时间，谈判结果如何，需拭目以待。

Europe's British question: How will the EU's big powers play the next phase?

*By Stefan Kornelius, Xavier Mas de Xaxàs, Sylvie Kauffmann, Philippe Ricard,
Francesca Sforza, Alberto Simoni and Patrick Wintour*

The UK and EU must now work out their future relationship. We asked writers in four EU capitals what their governments will prioritise.

Berlin: The political class is divided on how harsh to be

The German government is bracing itself for tough negotiations. Berlin sees the UK's decision to put a 31 December time limit on the process as a tactical manoeuvre by Boris Johnson¹, calculated to step up the pressure on the EU towards the end of 2020. Germany holds the EU presidency until the end of December and will have to oversee negotiations on the next EU budget, which will involve juggling increasingly difficult demands. It will also be the last major test for Chancellor Angela Merkel, coming shortly before she leaves office in 2021.

According to officials, a bare-bones EU-UK trade agreement that obviates only the introduction of customs duties and import quotas is fully negotiable within this time. If the agreement touches only on areas the EU has sole responsibility for, it will be quickly ratified. Greater difficulties arise in what are known as “mixed” agreements, where member states themselves also retain power. Here, national or even regional parliaments must agree, and ratification can take at least two years.

The German government no longer expects agreement on the “level playing field” provisions (outlawing competition by undercutting EU standards). London is unlikely to automatically submit to EU rules. Still, Berlin is determined not to allow EU environmental protection standards, social policies or data protection to be undermined.

*Stefan Kornelius writes for Süddeutsche Zeitung*²

Madrid: Looming on the horizon is Gibraltar

Spain knows the road ahead won't be easy. The levels of bilateral economic interdependence, both trading and financial, are intense. Both nations have hundreds of thousands of citizens working and living in each other's territories. Tourism—some 19 million British tourists visit Spain every year, where they spend about €13.3bn—fishing, agriculture and aviation are all big sectors. And of course, looming large is the Rock of Gibraltar³, the British colony that Spain aspires, some day, to recover.

The UK withdrawal agreement seems to have shielded the rights of these people, including their professional qualifications, pensions and health coverage, but many questions remain around labour and mobility rights. “Spain will be very forceful in protecting these rights,” says its foreign affairs ministry. Spain, as a new net contributor to the EU, will have more power to flex its muscles on this point in the coming year.

From now, however, everything depends on how the UK plays its cards. Madrid is willing to



make the agreement as broad as possible, but if London insists on diverging from EU rules—for instance, by making it difficult for people to move back and forth, undercutting regulations and detaching from the internal market—Spain will stand firm with Michel Barnier’s⁴ position. And if that happens, the British will find it very difficult to move, sell their services and do business on the continent.

*Xavier Mas de Xaxàs writes for La Vanguardia*⁵

Paris: Macron⁶ won’t allow anything that helps Le Pen⁷

Far from having any sense of schadenfreude, the French view the UK’s departure from the EU with sadness, convinced, as Michel Barnier says, that this is a lose-lose situation: bad for the UK and bad for the rest of Europe, just when it needs to be strong in an unstable world.

Yet a certain sense of relief is tangible on this side of the Channel⁸: the Brexit saga went on for too long, monopolising the EU’s time for three and a half years when there were so many other urgent matters to deal with. It had to be resolved.

The French would like the future relationship to be as close as possible, while at the same time leaving the UK in no doubt that being a “third” (or non-EU) country is always less advantageous than being a fully paid-up member. In Paris, there are fears that a successful Brexit will be seized on by French Eurosceptics, starting with Marine Le Pen—something that would augur badly for Macron in the presidential election in 2022. This is an argument against rushing the negotiations, even if it means rejecting the timetable that Boris Johnson seeks with his self-imposed deadline of 31 December 2020.

At this point, given the inability of Johnson’s team to provide the rest of Europe with much precision on what he wants the UK to look like once Brexit is “done”, the French can only speculate. Paris will seek to revive bilateral ties not covered by the trade agreement. In defence and security in particular, the French believe they can maintain strong links with the UK. This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Lancaster House defence treaties⁹, and neither side’s military has any desire to part company with the other.

*Sylvie Kauffmann and Philippe Ricard write for Le Monde*¹⁰

Rome: Cutting Britain adrift totally won’t help anyone

The Italian strategy on Brexit has three pillars: the rights of 600,000 Italian citizens living in the UK, protecting trade, and security and defence cooperation. Over the next 11 months of negotiations on the future relationship, Rome doesn’t intend to budge from these priorities.

However, Italy will seek to advance its interests, according to sources in the foreign ministry,

while avoiding “predatory attitudes”. Italy wants to keep things in balance. Peronaci¹¹ emphasizes that cutting London adrift wouldn’t help anybody.

Italy was the UK’s ninth biggest trading partner globally in 2018, a position that Rome plans to defend, if not improve. So doing the least possible to disrupt the current state of affairs is of fundamental interest. “What we want,” diplomats say, “is a balanced agreement: zero dumping, and import and export quotas stripped to the bone.” Business activities and credit facilities, conditions for the roughly 1,000 Italian companies based in the UK, financial channels and Milan stock exchange’s membership of the London Stock Exchange Group must not be interrupted, not now and not after the negotiations—which won’t be easy.

*Francesca Sforza and Alberto Simoni write for La Stampa*¹²

London: It’s frictionless trade versus full political sovereignty

Britain knows it has taken a leap in the dark by ending its 47-year relationship with the EU. The divorce took more than three years, but Boris Johnson has given his negotiating team only 11 months to forge an enduring new settlement.

Johnson has never truly revealed his brand of Euroscepticism. In order to secure the withdrawal agreement, he largely accepted the form of Northern Ireland backstop¹³ first offered by Brussels¹⁴. But that episode only revealed his pragmatic determination to achieve Brexit.

For the first few months of this year, before the talks start in earnest in late spring, Johnson will be able to avoid hard choices. But at some point he will have to acknowledge that frictionless trade and full political sovereignty are incompatible. Downing Street believes its diplomatic cards will produce compromise. Brussels will not want a deregulated behemoth on its doorstep. The collective discipline the EU showed in the first round of talks may be tested. The UK also believes that Germany and France, needing British defence assets, want to cooperate with the UK on defence. On foreign policy the EU 3 group, deployed in policymaking over Iran and Libya, makes Britain a necessary partner for Europe.

(From *The Guardian*, Feb. 5, 2020)

NOTES

1. **Boris Johnson**: 鲍里斯·约翰逊（1964—），出生于美国纽约，英国国会保守党籍议员，保守党领袖。2019年7月24日，鲍里斯·约翰逊正式接任特雷莎·梅，成为英国首相。2022年9月6日，约翰逊辞去首相职务。



2. **Süddeutsche Zeitung**: 《南德意志报》(又译为《南德日报》), 德国的一份全国性报纸, 由南德意志出版社发行, 总部位于慕尼黑。
3. **Rock of Gibraltar**: 直布罗陀巨岩, 磐石山。它是指地处地中海西南端的一处悬崖, 位于西班牙南部直布罗陀港城附近。
4. **Michel Barnier**: 米歇尔·巴尼耶(1951—), 曾任法国环境部长、外交部长等职, 时任欧盟首席谈判代表, 负责与英国就脱欧事宜展开谈判。
5. **La Vanguardia**: 《先锋报》, 西班牙的一份综合性报纸, 成立于1881年, 总部位于巴塞罗那。
6. **Macron**: 埃马纽埃尔·让-米歇尔·弗雷德里克·马克龙(Emmanuel Jean-Michel Frédéric Macron, 1977—), 法国政治家, 曾任法国经济部长, 现任法国总统。马克龙毕业于巴黎第十大学哲学系, 后进入巴黎政治学院、法国国家行政学院学习。2012年任总统府副秘书长, 2014年8月出任法国经济、工业和数字事务部长。2017年5月7日, 马克龙赢得总统选举, 成为法国历史上最年轻的总统。2022年4月27日, 马克龙在法国总统选举中获得连任。
7. **Le Pen**: 玛丽娜·勒庞(Marine Le Pen, 1968—), 法国国民阵线(Front National)主席(2012—2017)。2018年, 国民阵线更名为国民联盟(Rassemblement National)之后, 她担任国民联盟主席(2018—2022)。
8. **the Channel**: 英吉利海峡(the English Channel)的简称。该海峡将英格兰南部和法国北部分隔开, 通过东北端的多佛海峡与北海南部相连。英吉利海峡长约560公里, 宽度在34公里至240公里, 是世界上最繁忙的航运区之一。
9. **Lancaster House defence treaties**: 《兰开斯特宫防卫条约》, 一般称为《兰开斯特宫条约》(Lancaster House Treaties), 是英法两国签订的关于国防和安全合作的两项条约, 由时任英国首相卡梅伦(David Cameron)和时任法国总统萨科齐(Nicolas Sarkozy)于2010年11月2日签署。
10. **Le Monde**: 《世界报》, 创刊于1944年, 目前是法国第二大全国性日报, 也是法国在海外销售量最大的日报。
11. **Peronaci**: 此处指 Marco Peronaci(马可·佩罗纳奇, 1965—), 曾任意大利外交部脱欧特使(2018—2020)。2020年2月起, 佩罗纳奇任意大利驻布鲁塞尔欧盟政治和安全委员会常驻代表。
12. **La Stampa**: 《新闻报》, 创刊于1867年, 面向意大利及其他欧洲国家发行, 总部在意大利都灵。
13. **Northern Ireland backstop**: “北爱尔兰后盾计划”, 是英国政府和欧盟于2017年12月制订并于2018年11月敲定的“脱欧协议草案”的失效附录, 旨在防止英国脱欧后爱尔兰共和国和北爱尔兰之间出现有海关管制的边界。2019年10月, 约翰逊新政府重启谈判, 于2020年12月签署“北爱尔兰议定书”(Northern Ireland Protocol), 取代了“北爱尔兰后盾计划”。在新的协议中, 整个英国作为单一关税区脱离欧盟关税同盟。
14. **Brussels**: 布鲁塞尔, 比利时首都。由于欧盟总部设在布鲁塞尔的贝尔莱蒙大楼(Berlaymont Building), 布鲁塞尔常用于代指欧盟。但需要指出的是, 并非所有欧盟机构都设在布鲁塞尔, 比如欧洲中央银行总部设在德国的法兰克福, 欧洲法院、欧洲统计局、欧洲审计处、欧洲投资银行等重要机构设在卢森堡。



USEFUL WORDS

aviation	[ˌeɪvi'eɪʃn]	<i>n.</i> the designing, building and flying of aircraft 航空制造业; 航空; 飞行
behemoth	[bi'hɪ:məθ]	<i>n.</i> a very big and powerful company or organization 超级公司 (或机构)
deploy	[dɪ'plɔɪ]	<i>v.</i> ~ <i>sb./sth.</i> to move soldiers or weapons into a position where they are ready for military action 部署, 调度 (军队或武器)
diverge	[daɪ'vɜ:dʒ]	<i>v.</i> ~ <i>from sth.</i> to be or become different from what is expected, planned, etc. 偏离; 背离; 违背
dumping	['dʌmpɪŋ]	<i>n.</i> selling goods abroad at a price below that charged in the domestic market (向国外) 倾销
loom	[lu:m]	<i>v.</i> to appear important or threatening and likely to happen soon 显得突出, 逼近
manoeuvre	[mə'nu:və(r)]	<i>n.</i> a clever plan, action or movement that is used to give sb. an advantage 策略, 手段; 花招, 伎俩
monopolise	[mə'nɒpəlaɪz]	<i>v.</i> ~ <i>sth.</i> to have or take control of the largest part of sth. so that other people are prevented from sharing it 独占; 垄断; 包办
obviate	['ɒbviət]	<i>v.</i> ~ <i>sth.</i> to remove a problem or the need for sth. 消除; 排除; 打消
predatory	['predətəri]	<i>adj.</i> (of people) using weaker people for their own financial or sexual advantage (人, 在金钱或性关系上) 欺负弱小的, 压榨他人的
provision	[prə'vɪʒn]	<i>n.</i> a condition or an arrangement in a legal document (法律文件的) 规定, 条款
quota	['kwɒtə]	<i>n.</i> the limited number or amount of people or things that is officially allowed 定额; 限额; 配额
ratify	['ræɪfaɪ]	<i>v.</i> ~ <i>sth.</i> to make an agreement officially valid by voting for or signing it 正式批准; 使正式生效
retain	[ri'teɪn]	<i>v.</i> to continue to have that thing 保留; 保持
saga	['sɑ:gə]	<i>n.</i> a long story, account, or sequence of events 长篇小说, 长篇故事; 一连串事件
schadenfreude	['ʃɑ:dnfrɔɪdə]	<i>n.</i> a feeling of pleasure at the bad things that happen to other people 幸灾乐祸



EXERCISES

I. Vocabulary

Choose among the four alternatives one word or phrase that is closest in meaning to the underlined part in each statement.

1. According to officials, a bare-bones EU-UK trade agreement that obviates only the introduction of customs duties and import quotas is fully negotiable within this time.
A. obligates B. regards C. removes D. obtains
2. The German government no longer expects agreement on the “level playing field” provisions (outlawing competition by undercutting EU standards).
A. permitting; shortcutting B. illegalizing; undermining
C. outrunning; undergoing D. implementing; overcoming
3. The Brexit saga went on for too long, monopolising the EU’s time for three and a half years when there were so many other urgent matters to deal with.
A. long story B. sage C. deep sorrow D. song
4. In Paris, there are fears that a successful Brexit will be seized on by French Eurosceptics, starting with Marine Le Pen—something that would augur badly for Macron in the presidential election in 2022.
A. August B. indicate by signs C. anger D. remove entirely
5. “What we want,” diplomats say, “is a balanced agreement: zero dumping, and import and export quotas stripped to the bone.”
A. removed entirely B. insulting C. stopped D. increased
6. It’s frictionless trade versus full political sovereignty.
A. imperfect B. fictitious C. affectionate D. smooth
7. The divorce took more than three years, but Boris Johnson has given his negotiating team only 11 months to forge an enduring new settlement.
A. force B. make C. fork D. abandon
8. But at some point he will have to acknowledge that frictionless trade and full political sovereignty are incompatible.
A. comparable B. uncompetitive C. ill-sorted D. incomputable
9. Brussels will not want a deregulated behemoth on its doorstep.
A. an animal B. an ugly man C. a giant D. a moth
10. On foreign policy the EU 3 group, deployed in policymaking over Iran and Libya, makes Britain a necessary partner for Europe.
A. deprived B. used C. displayed D. deputed

II. Comprehension

Decide whether the following statements are true (T) or false (F) according to the information given in the press clipping. Mark T or F for each statement.

1. Berlin sees the UK's decision to put a 31 December time limit on the process as a tactical manoeuvre by Boris Johnson, calculated to step up the pressure on the EU towards the end of 2020.
2. To oversee negotiations on the next EU budget is a challenge for German Chancellor Angela Merkel.
3. The Spanish government was optimistic about the prospects of Europe after the Brexit.
4. It seems that Spain is waiting to see the UK's stand.
5. The French consider the UK's departure from the EU with more delight than disappointment.
6. In defence and security matters, the French believe they can still cooperate with the UK.
7. Italy seems to be indifferent to the Brexit, for these two countries are geographically and financially aloof.
8. Italy plans to maintain trading partnership with the UK.
9. In order to secure the withdrawal agreement, Boris Johnson largely accepted the form of Northern Ireland backstop first offered by Brussels.
10. Sometimes Boris Johnson will have to acknowledge that smooth trade and full political sovereignty are incompatible.

III. Topics for Discussion

1. Why did British people decide to depart from the EU? Do you think that the Brexit is advantageous to the economy of the UK?
2. How would you predict the relationship between the UK and the EU? And why?
3. What are the major issues that the German government is considering in confrontation with the Brexit?
4. Is the German government for or against the "level playing field"?
5. Why did Boris Johnson largely accept the form of Northern Ireland backstop first offered by Brussels?



《纽约时报》简介



《纽约时报》（*The New York Times*，有时简称为 *NYT*），创刊于 1851 年 9 月 18 日，是美国三大主流报纸之一，也是美国公认的历史记录性报纸。该报历史悠久，在全世界发行，历来以信息灵通、言论权威著称。截至 2022 年 5 月，该报已荣获 135 项普利策奖（*Pulitzer Prize*）。《纽约时报》初期名为《纽约每日时报》（*The New York Daily Times*），其创始人是亨利·贾维斯·雷蒙德（*Henry Jarvis Raymond*）和乔治·琼斯（*George Jones*）。阿道夫·奥兹（*Adolph Ochs*）家族于 1896 年开始接管经营。

该报的宗旨是“天下新闻，宜而刊之”（*All the News That's Fit to Print*）。《纽约时报》在突发新闻、国际局势与政治报道方面享有盛誉，如对 1912 年豪华客轮“泰坦尼克号”撞上冰山沉没事件的及时报道；对第一次世界大战后签订《凡尔赛和约》（*Treaty of Versailles*）的独家刊载；对飞行家林白（*Charles Augustus Lindbergh*，又译林德伯格）于 1927 年单人驾驶单翼飞机飞越大西洋的报道；对 1945 年美国向日本广岛投掷原子弹的报道；等等。在美国的精英报纸中，《纽约时报》被称为“政治精英的内部刊物”，政府部门、社会团体都视其为重要的信息参考材料。其头版新闻深受美国新闻界的重视，已成为每日重大新闻的标准版本。

多年来，浏览《纽约时报》似乎成为美国民众生活中不可缺少的部分。由于该报风格古典严肃、拘谨保守，版面一片灰色，有时被戏称为“灰衣女士”（*The Gray Lady*）。

《纽约时报》隶属于纽约时报公司（*The New York Times Company*）。该报国际版原名为 *International Herald Tribune*，现称为 *International New York Times*。2012 年 6 月，《纽约时报》开始发行中文版。