

科目：英文測驗

系所組：跨文化研究所翻譯學碩士班  
中英組

## I. Précis (60%)

Instructions: For each of the following two articles: (1) Write a short title for each. (2) Summarize each article in no more than 200 words. Use your own words to express the main idea and relevant details, and keep the general writing style of the original. Avoid using the same language and sentence structure. Do not list points; your summary should read like a coherent short article.

### Article 1:

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, feeding humanity in 2050 – when the world’s population is expected to be 9.1 billion – will require a 70 percent increase in global food production, partly because of population growth but also because of rising incomes.

The organization hopes that this increase can be brought about by greater productivity on current agricultural acreage and by greening parts of the world that aren’t now arable. It is also “cautiously optimistic” that, even with climate change, there will be enough land and probably enough water to do so. It’s important to look at this projection in light of another United Nations goal – preserving biodiversity – and ask whether the two are compatible.

In 2003, 123 nations committed themselves to “a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss” by 2010. According to scientists at a recent United Nations-sponsored biodiversity conference, that target was not met. Biodiversity loss keeps accelerating, and extinctions are occurring at a rate that’s 100 times what it was before humans dominated the earth. Species are going out like candles in the dark.

The “cautiously optimistic” authors of the United Nations food report believe that humanity will somehow be able to produce more food while still honoring the value of other species by protecting their habitat. And it’s true that this is not a zero-sum game. A 70 percent increase in food production doesn’t necessarily mean a 70 percent reduction in habitat.

But the Food and Agriculture Organization also warns that agricultural acreage will have to grow by some 297 million acres, a little less than three times the size of California. Add to this the ongoing rate of habitat destruction — including deforestation, often for fuel but usually for producing more food — and other threats like the growing production of biofuels, and it is hard to argue that there isn’t a profound conflict between what our species will need to survive by 2050 and the needs of nearly every other species on this planet.

The question isn’t whether we can feed 9.1 billion people in 2050 – they must be fed – or whether we can find the energy they will surely need. The question is whether we can find a way

to make food and energy production sustainable in the broadest possible sense – and whether we can act on the principle that our interest includes that of every other species on the planet.

The only way to do that is to think about the habitat of all other species as the frame of our activities. Unless habitat is part of the equation, we're simply not talking realistically about the character, much less the future, of our planet. We have no idea what the "right" amount of biodiversity on this planet should be (although we seem at times to be running an ill-judged experiment to see how little we need). And we struggle to find reasons why other species and ecosystems are important, searching mostly for utilitarian arguments (their value as medicines, for instance) that specify their usefulness to us.

My own answer is less utilitarian: They have the value of their own existence. I adhere to a conclusion reached long ago – by James Madison in 1818, who said, simply, that it cannot be right for all of Earth's resources to "be made subservient to the use of man."

We need to act on that principle.

That will mean more than simply roping off habitat. It will mean among other things, a new and far more modest idea of food prosperity, more limited and almost certainly less meat-driven than the present American model.

It will mean a new idea of food equity, a fairer and far more balanced way of sharing and distributing food to reduce the devastating imbalance between the gluttony of some nations and the famine of others. It will mean that we all have to do what we can – wherever we live – to localize and intensify food production. Above all, it will mean restraint, in order to protect, and perhaps one day increase, the remaining biodiversity.

(Source: *The New York Times*)

## Article 2:

Let's take a little quiz. Which piece of home technology do you think uses the most electricity?

- A. Refrigerator
- B. Laptop
- C. DVR/set-top box
- D. HD television

If you answered set-top box (C), you're right. That little box near your TV -- the one that plays and records cable television -- uses more electricity than a modern refrigerator, and it probably sucks down more power than TV it's attached to, according to a recent report from the Natural Resources Defense Council.

Surprised? You should be. In this day and age, we've come to expect that technology will help us save electricity, not to waste it. But when it comes to electronics, there are glaring

exceptions to the rule that more technology makes our lives more efficient.

It seems technology has become simultaneously the hero and villain of the energy-efficiency movement. In the long term, research shows, tech will help us build energy-saving homes and will aid in our quest to get electricity from renewable sources.

But, right now, our growing appetite for consumer electronics seems to be creating overlooked electricity waste and is offsetting gains made in other sectors.

In recent weeks, environmental groups have made set-top boxes public enemy No. 1.

"This is a huge energy consumer that nobody knows about," Noah Horowitz, a senior scientist with the Natural Resources Defense Council, said of set-top boxes. "The secret is out that these products waste \$2 billion a year in energy ... when consumers aren't using them. And we really the industry to move forward and do a better job here."

Why is that the case? There are several problems, Horowitz said, with this piece of technology.

Here are a few: You can't turn most set-top boxes off or put them in "sleep" mode. If you hit the power button, all that happens is the clock gets a little dimmer; virtually no energy is actually saved by "powering down."

Set-top boxes are everywhere; the Natural Resources Defense Council estimates there are 160 million set-top boxes in U.S. homes, about one for every two people in the country.

Cable companies usually own the set-top box, so consumers don't have much choice in whether it's energy efficient (The council suggests that consumers call their cable companies and request a more efficient model that has a sleep mode).

In aggregate, Americans spend \$3 billion per year powering these devices, the group says.

New data about how much energy these never-off set-top boxes really use have caused a sort of sea change in the energy efficiency world.

Regulators are now, for the first time, considering energy efficiency regulations caps for set-top boxes and wireless routers, according to John Cymbalsky, supervisor of the appliance standards program at the U.S. Department of Energy.

It's unclear whether standards will be put in place, he said, but they could be adopted without reducing the devices' performance.

The proliferation of consumer technology is also a driver of the concern.

This year, the average American home has 24 pieces of consumer electronics, according to a survey from the Consumer Electronics Association. Twenty years ago, a standard home only had 9.7 electronics; in 1980, it was only 2.8 per household. (The survey includes computers, gaming systems, TVs, GPS, DVD players and audio systems in its list of products).

Beyond those, It seems everything these days needs to be plugged in.

"Who would have thought 20 years ago that we would need electronic books or toothbrushes or coffee grinders?" said Owen Comstock, a research analyst at the U.S. Energy Information Administration. "There's hardly a thing you could point to that isn't already plugged in -- and it certainly has implications for electricity use."

These devices are also getting bigger.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates that there are 275 million TVs in use in the United States today -- almost one for every person. Of those, 20 million have screens that are 40 inches or larger, said Katharine Kaplan, EPA team lead for Energy Star product development.

All of this adds up to a new reality for home energy use: Electronics are a larger part of our energy diets than ever before. Along with appliances, electronics made up 17% percent of an average household's energy use in 1978; in 2005, that jumped to 31%.

Other home energy wasters -- like light bulbs, air conditioners and water heaters -- are subject to regulations that aim to curb energy use without degrading quality, Kaplan said. The same may happen for electronics, she said.

In 2009, California became the first state to pass energy efficiency requirements for TVs. The state estimated at the time that consumers would save a total of \$1 billion per year in electricity because of the standards.

Overall, consumers shouldn't blame technology for energy waste, Kaplan said. If anything, new tech may be what helps get us out of this mess.

Take smartphones, she said. Those Swiss army knife gadgets replace GPS devices, mobile phones and, to a certain extent, portable computers. That saves energy.

Tech is also being used to make energy systems and individual appliances more efficient. And technology is being used to try to coerce people into using less power voluntarily. One company called OPOWER, for example, uses smart grid technology to tell people how much electricity they use compared with their neighbors, in hopes this will guilt them into using less power.

The better technology gets, and the more widely it's adopted, the more energy we save, according to recent projections from the U.S. Energy Information Administration.

If people develop and adopt lots of new technology, our per-person energy use will drop 34% by 2035, estimates show. If we keep using the same old stuff we were using in 2010, per person energy use will drop much less significantly: only about 10%, the report says.

So, in the end, maybe tech isn't the villain after all.

(Source: CNN)

## II. Cloze Test (40%)

Instruction: Supply the missing word or string of words. Make sure that they make sense, are grammatically correct, relevant, and conform to proper collocation. There are twenty items.

Excerpt from Obama's Inaugural Address

Source:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/01/21/inaugural-address-president-barack-obama>

But we have always understood that when times change, so must we; that fidelity to our founding principles requires new responses to new challenges; that preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires collective action. For the American people can no more meet the demands of today's world by acting alone than American soldiers could have met the forces of fascism or communism with muskets and militias. No single person can train all the math and science teachers we'll need to equip our children for the future, or build the roads and networks and research labs that will bring new jobs and businesses to our shores. Now, more than ever, we must do these things together, as one nation and one people.

This generation of Americans has (1) by crises that steeled our resolve and proved our resilience. A decade of war is now ending. An economic (2) has begun. America's possibilities are limitless, for we possess (3) that this world without boundaries demands: youth and drive; diversity and openness; an endless capacity for risk and a gift for reinvention. My fellow Americans, we are made for this moment, and we will seize it -- so long as we seize it together.

For we, the people, understand that our country cannot (4) when a shrinking few do very well and a growing many barely make it. We believe that America's prosperity must (5) the broad shoulders of a rising middle class. We know that America thrives when every person can find independence and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor (6) families from the brink of hardship. We are true to our creed when a little girl born into the bleakest poverty knows that she has (7) to succeed as anybody else, because she is an American; she is free, and she is equal, not just (8) but also in our own.

We understand that outworn programs are inadequate to the needs of our time. So we must harness new ideas and technology to remake our government, revamp our tax code, (9) our schools, and empower our citizens with the skills they need to work harder, learn more, reach higher. But while (10) will change, our purpose endures: a nation that rewards the effort and determination of every single American. That is what this moment requires. That is what will give real meaning to our creed.

We, the people, still believe that every citizen deserves a basic measure of security and dignity. We must make the hard choices to reduce (11) of health care and the size of our deficit. But (12) the belief that America must choose between caring for the generation that built this country and investing in the generation that will build its future. For we remember the lessons of our past, when twilight years were spent in poverty and parents of (13) a disability had nowhere to turn.

We (14) believe that in this country freedom is reserved for the lucky, or happiness for the few. We recognize that no matter (15) responsibly we live our lives, any one of us at any time may face a job loss, or (16), or a home swept away in a terrible storm. The commitments we make to each other through Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, these things do not sap our initiative, they (17) us. They do not make us a nation of takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great.

We, the people, still believe that our obligations as Americans are not just to ourselves, but to all posterity. We will respond to the threat of climate change, knowing that the failure to do so would betray our children and future generations. Some may still deny the overwhelming judgment of science, but (18) can avoid the devastating impact of raging fires and crippling drought and more powerful storms.

The path towards sustainable energy sources will be long and sometimes difficult. But America cannot resist this transition, we must lead it. We cannot cede to other nations the technology that will power new jobs and new industries, we must claim its promise. That's how we will maintain our economic vitality and our national treasure -- our forests and waterways, our crop lands and snow-capped (19). That is how we will preserve our planet, commanded to our care by God. That's what will lend meaning to the creed (20) once declared.

We, the people, still believe that enduring security and lasting peace do not require perpetual war. Our brave men and women in uniform, tempered by the flames of battle, are unmatched in skill and courage. Our citizens, seared by the memory of those we have lost, know too well the price that is paid for liberty. The knowledge of their sacrifice will keep us forever vigilant against those who would do us harm. But we are also heirs to those who won the peace and not just the war; who turned sworn enemies into the surest of friends -- and we must carry those lessons into this time as well.

(END)

- ※ 注意：1. 考生須在「彌封答案卷」上作答。  
2. 本試題紙空白部份可當稿紙使用。  
3. 考生於作答時可否使用計算機、法典、字典或其他資料或工具，以簡章之規定為準。