

100 學年度四年制二、三年級轉學生招生考試

四技三年級 應用英文系

第三節 專業科目(二) 英文閱讀與寫作 試題

第一頁 共二頁

注意事項：

1. 本試題共三部分，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。

Reading Comprehension and Essay Writing

For this test, which contains three parts, you need to write three short essays in English and read four reading passages. Write each English essay based on the related reading passage(s) and instructions. Be sure to use your own words in summarizing the topic, explaining main ideas, and discussing viewpoints. The first essay weighs 30%, the second essay, 30%, and the third essay, 40%.

- I. Read the following passage and write a short essay in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the opinion stated below and support your position with reasons and/or examples. (30%)

Passage ONE

Environmental protection and the protection of biodiversity are very much a luxury of developed nations. Many biodiversity and environmental protection policies are beyond the financial means of developing nations, and implementing them would stunt economic growth and disenfranchise their citizens. It is hypocritical for developed nations to criticize the lack of environmental protection in the developing world, considering that the First World got to its current position through an Industrial Revolution that paid no heed to biodiversity, pollution, and other such concerns.

(from *The Debatabase Book* by the editors of IDEA)

- II. Read the following two passages concerning abortion and write a short essay in answer to the following questions:

- (1) What are the arguments presented in the two passages? 15%
- (2) Which argument is closer to your opinion? Why? 15%

Passage II-A: Advances in medical technology have enabled us to determine during pregnancy whether the child will be disabled. In cases of severe disability, in which the child would have a very painful and tragic life, it is surely right to allow parents to choose a termination. This avoids both the suffering of the parents and of the child.

Passage II-B: What right does anyone have to deprive another of life on the grounds that he or she deems that life not worth living? This presumption is impossible to justify, given that many people with disabilities lead fulfilling lives. What disabilities would be regarded as the watershed between life and termination? All civilized countries strongly condemn the practice of eugenics.

(from *The Debatabase Book* by the editors of IDEA)

- III. Read the following article and write a short essay in which you summarize the article, discuss your viewpoint about human cloning in comparison with the author's view, indicating whether you agree with the author's main point or not, and give reasons and/or examples to support your position. (40%)

Passage THREE

Human cloning should be banned because it would radically alter our very definition of ourselves by producing the world's first human with a single genetic parent. This manufacture of a person made to order undermines human dignity and individuality, and encourages us to treat children like commodities. . . .

In vitro fertilization is no precedent for cloning; the child is still conceived by the union of the egg and sperm from two separate persons, and the child is genetically unique. Cloning is replication, not reproduction, and represents a difference in kind, not in degree, in the way humans continue the species. . . .

Rather than look deeply into ethics and world literature, supporters of human cloning have tried to come up with extreme and improbable hypotheticals to sell this technique to the public. But these hypotheticals only demonstrate that the risks of dehumanization and commodification are real. . . .

注意：背面尚有試題

The most popular suggestion is that parents of a dying child should be able to clone the child for a replacement. But when a child is cloned, it is not the parents who are replicated, but the child. No one should have such dominion over a child as to be allowed to use its genes to create the child's child.

Ethical human reproduction requires the voluntary participation of the genetic parents, and this is impossible for the young child. Nor, of course, should one have an "extra" child for organs or other spare parts. . . .

Humans have a basic right not to reproduce, and human dignity requires that human reproduction not be equated with that of farm animals or even pets. We could only discover whether cloning is even feasible in humans by unethically subjecting the planned child to the risk of serious genetic and physical injury. Congress and states should take a stand at this boundary.

(from *American Bar Association Journal*, 83)