

102 學年度四年制二、三年級轉學生招生考試

四技二年級 應用英文系

第一節 英文閱讀與寫作 試題

第一頁 共一頁

注意事項：

1. 本試題共一大題，配分共 100 分。
2. 請標明大題、子題編號作答，不必抄題。
3. 全部答案均須在答案卷之答案欄內作答，否則不予計分。

Directions: Read the following editorial from the New York Times, "What? Send Women to War?" Answer the FIVE comprehension questions.

Capt. Linda Bray led an attack in the Panama invasion, apparently the first time that a woman has commanded American forces in battle. But she was acting as a Military Police officer; women are still barred from combat roles in the armed forces. Since women like Captain Bray already serve with distinction in danger zones, isn't it time to allow them into combat too? A careful experiment could clarify a difficult issue.

Very few regular armies have allowed women to serve in combat, so there's little hard evidence to go on. The issue reaches deep into the relations between the sexes and is fraught with politics and prejudice. The debate goes like this:

The purpose of an army is to win wars, not promote equality. History shows that human factors like group cohesion, far more than weapons, determine victory. Women would erode group cohesion because they distract men, who by instinct or culture would seek to protect them, and because they cannot enter into the male bonding process by which the esprit of combat units is built up.

Before President Truman's order of 1948, group cohesion was also used as an argument against integrating black soldiers into white units. Once integration was imposed, the argument was found to be meritless.

Women lack the physical and psychological stamina to endure the stress of prolonged combat. Few women can easily carry the 100 pounds of equipment that infantry soldiers now take into combat.

Modern combat depends far less on brute strength and more on skills like the ability to operate complex weapons. A certain degree of strength is necessary, but there's no more reason to exclude women from combat on this ground than from police and fire departments. Why not let both sexes be judged by the same objective standards?

Women who are taken prisoner are likely to be abused and raped. Men are abused and raped too. To date, the arguments against allowing women in combat have prevailed. Almost all the world's regular combat troops are exclusively male. Canada recently opened combat roles to women, but only one woman has qualified. In Israel in 1948, women fought in the Haganah units but they were later prohibited from combat service.

The United States, to fill the ranks of the all-volunteer army, now has a force that is 11 percent female, but women are barred from combat roles. Women officers in particular are keen to lift the ban because it impairs their chances of promotion. But most older officers and those experienced in combat probably oppose the idea of letting women into combat. So far, Congress does too.

Military institutions differ designedly from civilian ones. The past discrimination against black soldiers was based on nothing more than white prejudice. The case against putting women in combat has some objective validity. That's all the more reason to put the question to an honest test, as in the four-year trial program suggested by Representative Pat Schroeder of Colorado.

An army should reflect the values of its society as much as possible, and when it comes to the role of women in this society, those values are changing by the day.

Comprehension Questions: Answer the following questions briefly with 200-400 words for each. Your writings will be scored holistically on the basis of writing elements and language use. 100%

- 1) What topic is the author discussing? What point(s) does the author make in regard to the topic? (20%)
- 2) Which of the reasons presented are arguments and counterarguments respectively? (20%)
- 3) What is your interpretation of "objective validity" in the underlined sentence? Do you agree with such a notion? (20%)
- 4) What particular values / judgments do you think the author is referring to in the last paragraph? (20%)
- 5) Do you agree with what the debate about women going to war in the italicized part? Why or why not? (20%)