

2012 年上海外国语大学英语基础考研试题（回忆版）

本试题由 kaoyan.com 网友暖暖_Cindy 提供

一、完形填空，略。

二、阅读理解

NOW WE ARE 70 BILLIONS

IN 1980 Julian Simon, an economist, and Paul Ehrlich, a biologist, made a bet. Mr Ehrlich, author of a bestselling book, called “The Population Bomb”, picked five metals—copper, chromium, nickel, tin and tungsten—and said their prices would rise in real terms over the following ten years. Mr Simon bet that prices would fall. The wager symbolised the dispute between Malthusians who thought a rising population would create an age of scarcity (and high prices) and those “Cornucopians”, such as Mr Simon, who thought markets would ensure plenty.

1980 年经济学家朱利安·西蒙 (Julian Simon) 和生物学家保罗·埃尔利希 (Paul Ehrlich) 打了个赌。畅销书《人口炸弹》作者埃尔利希，选择了五种金属——铜、铬、镍、锡和钨，并称按实际价值计算，在未来十年中这些金属的价格将上涨。西蒙则打赌说它们的价格会下降。他们的打赌代表了马尔萨斯人口论者 (Malthusians) 和“物博论者”

(Cornucopians) 之间的争论，前者认为人口增长将创造一个物质缺乏 (物价高涨) 的时代，后者，比如西蒙，则认为市场能够保证充足的供应。

Mr Simon won easily. Prices of all five metals fell in real terms. As the world economy boomed and population growth began to ebb in the 1990s, Malthusian pessimism retreated.

西蒙赢得轻而易举。按实际价值计算，这五种金属的价格都降低了。二十世纪九十年代，随着世界经济繁荣发展，人口增长开始变慢，马尔萨斯式的悲观情绪有所回落。

It is returning. On October 31st the UN will dub a newborn the world's 7 billionth living person. The 6 billionth, Adnan Nevic, born in October 1999, will be only two weeks past his 12th birthday. If Messrs Simon and Ehrlich had ended their bet today, instead of in 1990, Mr Ehrlich would have won. What with high food prices, environmental degradation and faltering green policies, people are again worrying that the world is overcrowded. Some want restrictions to cut population growth and forestall ecological catastrophe. Are they right?

现在这种情绪又滋长起来。10 月 31 日联合国将指定世界上第 70 亿个新生儿。第 60 亿个人阿德南·纳维克 (Adnan Nevic)，生于 1999 年 10 月，到今年 10 月底他才 12 岁零两周大。如果西蒙和埃尔利希不是赌到 1990 年，而赌到现在，埃尔利希就会赢。由于高昂的粮食价格、环境恶化以及推行不力的环保政策，人们又开始担心这个世界过度拥挤。有些人想限制人口增长，阻止生态浩劫。他们对吗？

Lower fertility can be good for economic growth and society (see article). When the number of children a woman can expect to bear in her lifetime falls from high levels of three or more to a stable rate of two, a demographic change surges through the country for at least a generation. Children are scarcer, the elderly are not yet numerous, and the country has a bulge of working-age adults: the “demographic

dividend". If a country grabs this one-off chance for productivity gains and investment, economic growth can jump by as much as a third.

生育率下降可能有利于经济增长和社会发展。当一个妇女一生生育的子女数目有望从3个或3个以上降至稳定的2个,至少经过一代人这个国家就能感受到人口统计上的变化。孩子越来越少,老人的数量还不算众多,这个国家则拥有大量的出于工作年龄的成年人,即“人口红利”。如果一个国家能抓住这个生产力增长和投资的一次性机会,其经济增长将可能猛增三分之一。

Less is more

此消彼长

However, the fall in fertility is already advanced in most of the world. Over 80% of humanity lives in countries where the fertility rate is either below three and falling, or already two or less. This is thanks not to government limits but to modernisation and individuals' desire for small families. Whenever the state has pushed fertility down, the result has been a blight. China's one-child policy is a violation of rights and a demographic disaster, upsetting the balance between the sexes and between generations. China has a bulge of working adults now, but will bear a heavy burden of retired people after 2050. It is a lurid example of the dangers of coercion.

然而,世界上大多数地区的生育率都进一步降低了。超过80%的人类居住的地区,生育率要么低于3并且正在下降,要么已经低于2或者更少。这不仅归因于政府的限制,还得益于现代化进程和人们想要小家庭的愿望。不论何时,政府促使生育率下降,其结果总有不利影响。中国的计划生育政策不仅违反人权而且造成了一场人口统计学上的灾难,破坏了性别平衡与世代间的平衡。中国现在拥有大量工作中的成年人,但是2050年后,中国就将承受退休人口的重负。这个可怕的例子充分体现了高压政治带来的危险。

Enthusiasts for population control say they do not want coercion. They think milder policies would help to save the environment and feed the world. As the World Bank points out, global food production will have to rise by about 70% between now and 2050 to feed 9 billion. But if the population stays flat, food production would have to rise by only a quarter.

人口控制的支持者说他们不想要高压政策。他们认为温和的政策有助于拯救环境,喂饱世界。世界银行指出,从现在到2050年,全球粮食生产必须提高70%才能喂饱90亿人口。但是,如果人口保持稳定,粮食生产则只需增长四分之一。

When Mr Simon won his bet he was able to say that rising population was not a problem: increased demand attracts investment, producing more. But this process only applies to things with a price; not if they are free, as are some of the most important global goods—a healthy atmosphere, fresh water, non-acidic oceans, furry wild animals. Perhaps, then, slower population growth would reduce the pressure on fragile environments and conserve unpriced resources?

西蒙赢了打赌的时候，他可以说人口增长不是一个难题：需求增长吸引投资，产品因此增多。但是这种方法只适用于有价格的事物，而不适用于那些免费的东西，比如一些最重要的全球性的物品——卫生的空气，清洁的水，无酸的海洋，有毛皮的野生动物。或许，人口增长变缓将减少对脆弱的环境造成的压力，保护未定价的资源？

That idea is especially attractive when other forms of rationing—a carbon tax, water pricing—are struggling. Yet the populations that are rising fastest contribute very little to climate change. The poorest half of the world produces 7% of carbon emissions. The richest 7% produces half the carbon. So the problem lies in countries like China, America and Europe, which all have stable populations. Moderating fertility in Africa might boost the economy or help stressed local environments. But it would not solve global problems.

当其他形式的控制措施正在奋力推行，比如征收碳税、制定水价，这个想法就显得尤为诱人。然而正以最快速度增长的人口对于环境变化的贡献少之又少。世界人口中最穷的一半排放了 7% 的碳，而占世界人口 7% 的最富有的人群则排放了一半的碳。因此，问题留给了中国这样的国家以及欧美各国。降低非洲的生育率可能促进经济发展或者有助于人们重视当地的环境，但不能解决全球性问题。

There remains one last reason for supporting family planning: on some estimates, 200m women round the world—including a quarter of African women—want contraceptives and cannot get them. A quarter of pregnancies are unplanned. In our view, parents ought to decide how many children to bring into the world and when—not the state, or a church, or pushy grandparents. Note, though, that this is not an argument about the global environment but individual well-being. Moreover, family planning appears to do little directly to control the size of families: some studies have shown no impact at all; others only a modest extra one. Encouraging smaller families in the highest-fertility places would still be worth doing. It might boost the economy and reduce the pressure of population in some fragile places. But the benefits would probably be modest. And they would be no substitute for other sensible environmental policies, such as a carbon tax.

仅有一个理由支持计划生育：根据一些估计，全球有 2 亿妇女——包括四分之一的非洲女性想要避孕用品而不能得到。四分之一的怀孕为意外怀孕。在我们看来，应该由父母决定要几个孩子，什么时候生孩子——而不能由政府或者教堂或者心急的祖父母决定。尽管如此，要注意，这不是一个关于全球环境问题的争论而是对于个人幸福的争辩。此外，计划生育似乎没有直接影响家庭大小的控制：一些调查显示计划生育对家庭大小的控制完全没有效果；其他调查仅仅揭示了计划生育略显多余的作用。在生育率最高的地方鼓励缩小家庭可能还是值得一做的。这样可能促进经济增长，并减小一些脆弱地区的人口压力，但其利益或许不大。而且这些利益不能替代其他明智的环境政策，比如征收碳税。

ilahm 注：

1. 马尔萨斯人口论的基本思想是：

- a) 如没有限制，人口是呈等比数列（即：2，4，8，16，32，64，128 等）增长。
- b) 而食物供应呈现等差数列（即：1，2，3，4，5，6，7 等）增长。

c) 食物为人类生存的最重要之条件。

d) 只有自然原因(事故和衰老), 灾难(战争, 瘟疫, 及各类饥荒), 道德限制和罪恶(马尔萨斯所指包括杀婴, 谋杀, 节育和同性恋)能够限制人口的过度增长。

人口论的论点为粮食增加仅会呈等差数列, 而人口的增加却会呈现等比数列。所以马尔萨斯觉得人类必须顾虑食物的缺乏, 而减少结婚的预防限制, 以及受现实穷困的折磨、对已生人口所加压迫积极限制。。

2. “物博论者”是根据”Cornucopians”的自创词。

3. 指定第 70 亿个人: 联合国人口司根据各国递交的人口统计数据, 按照人口增长率, 用数学方法计算出世界人口将在 2011 年 10 月的某一天达到 70 亿人。之后联合国将选择最可能在那一天零点出生的宝宝作为世界上的第 70 亿个人。也就是说, 第 70 亿个人是一个象征性的指定。联合国就是以这种方式指定了世界的第 50 亿个人和第 60 亿个人。

4. 所谓“人口红利”, 是指一个国家的劳动年龄人口占总人口比重较大, 抚养率比较低, 为经济发展创造了有利的人口条件, 整个国家的经济成高储蓄、高投资和高增长的局面。

5. 碳税: 对燃烧矿物燃料排出碳的征税。

三、大作文

是关于阅读理解后半部分提到的计划生育 family planning 的

以上试题来自 kaoyan.com 网友的回忆, 仅供参考, 纠错请发邮件至 suggest@kaoyan.com。