

I

Read the following passage and answer the questions which follow.

What challenge does environmental ethics pose for international relations? International relations is usually understood as the realm of power politics, a world in which military strength and the need to survive dominate. In this world, moral concern for other human beings, much less nature, is limited or entirely lacking. Environmental ethics — a set of principles to guide human interaction with the earth — asks us to extend moral consideration beyond humans to other living things and to natural “wholes” such as bioregions and ecosystems. Is it possible to introduce environmental ethics’ far-reaching moral claims into the competitive, militarized, economically unequal world political system?

Although explorations in environmental ethics now have a long history, the dialogue over the human debt to the natural environment has proceeded largely without reference to international politics, to international relations theory, or even to the literature on international ethics. Practical politics is thus often removed from consideration. And scholars of international relations have barely considered the relationship between their studies and environmental ethics.

Bringing the two fields into the same conversation is possible. International political theory has profound implications for understanding how humans should relate to the environment. Realism and liberal institutionalism (the mainstream of international relations theory), by suggesting what political, economic, and social goals are desirable, also imply what environmental values should prevail. They indicate what kind of world humans should or can create and thus tell us how we should relate to the environment. The question then is not whether environmental ethics should matter in world politics, but in which way: which environmental ethic does in fact matter,

which should, and what obstacles prevent needed changes in political practices from being made?

Environmental ethics can be anthropocentric, biocentric, or ecocentric. Anthropocentric ethics is about what humans owe each other. It evaluates (3) environmental policies with regard to how they affect human well-being. For example, the misuse of natural resources such as minerals can destroy forests on which native peoples depend. Moral evaluation of the environmental destruction proceeds in terms of the rights, happiness, or fair treatment of all human groups, including the displaced tribes and the consumers who benefit from the minerals. Anthropocentric environmental ethics generally calls for more environmental protection than we now undertake; current unsustainable resource-use patterns and conversion of land to agricultural or urban uses mean that existing practices do more harm to humans than good, especially (4) when future generations are considered. Still, many observers find anthropocentric environmental ethics unsatisfactory because it appears not to recognize other creatures' natural right to share the planet and considers only their value to human beings.

Biocentric environmental ethics seeks to correct this deficiency by giving moral status to non-human creatures. Humans have moral worth but only as one species among many living things that also have moral status. The grizzly bear's right to sufficient territory for sustaining life and reproduction has as much moral value (if not more) as a tree-cutting company's desire to make a profit in that territory. Even if maintaining the grizzly bear's habitat means some humans must live in somewhat less spacious homes, the loss of human convenience by no means cancels the animal's moral claim to the forest. In short, animals have rights. Which animals have moral status, and whether plants do as well remain matters of dispute among biocentric theorists. Nonetheless, biocentric theory expands the moral realm beyond humans and (5) hence implies greater moral obligations than anthropocentric ethics.

Ecocentric theory tackles a problem at the heart of biocentric theory. In reality, ecosystems work on the principle of eat and be eaten. We may give the grizzly “rights” but the bear survives by consuming salmon, small animals, and so forth, thus violating other living creatures’ right to life. Humans are simply part of a complex food chain or web of life. Given this, ecocentric theory asserts that moral status should attach to ecological wholes, from bioregions to the planetary ecosystem (sometimes called Gaia). Ecocentric theorists are not concerned about particular animals or even species, but with the entire evolutionary process. Evolution involves the “land” broadly understood to include all its organic and nonorganic components. To disrupt or destroy the evolutionary process, reducing the diversity of life and the stability and beauty of the natural system, is unethical. As Aldo Leopold, the environmental philosopher who first developed the land ethic, put in his 1949 book, *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*, “A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.” The emphasis here is on the word “community.”

Each of these approaches suggests the need for change in the practice of international politics. Anthropocentric environmental ethics implies the least extensive reform, although these still could be far-reaching, especially with regard to current economic arrangements. Developed industrial economies rely heavily on global natural resources, such as areas to dispose of pollutants. For example, reliance on fossil fuels leads to increases in CO₂ in the atmosphere, and in turn to global warming. Developing countries undergoing industrialization will draw on the atmosphere’s capacity to absorb greenhouse gases. The added load, along with already high levels of emissions from developed countries, could push the environment beyond a critical level, setting off disastrous climate changes because of global warming. These climate problems could lead to crop failures and destructive storms damaging coastal

cities. What is fair under these circumstances? Should developed countries make radical changes — such as decentralizing and deindustrializing — in their economic arrangements? Should they refrain from adding the potentially disastrous increase of greenhouse gases that will push the climate over the level of disaster? If yes, then anthropocentric environmental ethics calls for far-reaching social and economic change.

Biocentric environmental ethics also implies considerable economic change. If animals have moral status, then killing them or destroying their habitat for human benefit is unacceptable. In particular, the massive species loss resulting from deforestation is a moral failure even if humans profit. Likewise, agricultural practices that rely on pesticides and fertilizers that harm nonhuman species should be reduced. Warfare's effects on nonhuman living things would also need to be evaluated. Just-war theory generally evaluates unintended damage's significance in the context of citizens killed or injured due to military actions. Yet unintended damage also kills and injures animals that have even less interest and less say in the conflict than citizens. Should their right to life be considered? Biocentric ethics would say yes. If so, virtually the entire practice of modern war might be held as fundamentally immoral.⁽⁶⁾

Ecocentric ethics implies the strongest criticism of current practices. Disrupting the ecological cycle or the evolutionary process is morally unacceptable. Most current economic or military practices would not be acceptable. Indeed, in its strong form, ecocentric ethics would require a major reduction in the human population, since the 7.5 billion people now on earth are already disrupting the evolutionary process and will continue to do so as the world population grows to 10 billion or more. Political institutions must be replaced, either with one-world government capable of implementing ecocentric environmental policy, or with ecologically based bioregional political units (ecocentric theorists hold differing views on whether authoritarian government or more democracy is needed to make ecocentrism effective in practice).

If bioregionalism were adopted, world trade would come to an end since each
(7) bioregion would be self-sustaining. Wasteful resource use would be reduced. Long-term sustainability in harmony with the needs of other living things would be the desired end. For some ecocentric thinkers, the model is a hunter-gatherer society or a peasant agriculture society.

Environmental ethics in each form carries important implications for the practice of international politics. Yet the environmental ethics literature usually pays little attention to obvious features of the international system. This is not to say that environmental ethics bears no relationship to political realities. If realism (the theory of power politics) and liberal institutionalism (the theory emphasizing interdependence and the possibilities for cooperation) both contain implicit environmental ethics, then environmental ethics contains implicit political theory. Yet without explicit attention to international political theory, environmental ethics lacks the basis to determine which of its recommendations is feasible, and which utopian.

(Adapted from: "Why Environmental Ethics Matters to International Relations", by John Barkdull. Annual Editions: *Global Issues* 04/05, Robert M. Jackson, Editor. McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.)

QUESTIONS

Underlined 1: Explain the meaning of the underlined part specifically by clarifying what "much less nature" means in comparison with human beings. Write your answer in Japanese.

Underlined 2: What does the phrase "two fields" refer to? Write your answer in English.

Underlined 3: What does anthropocentric ethics recognize as the most important living thing? Write your answer in English.

Underlined 4: Explain the meaning of the underlined part specifically by clarifying what “existing practices” means. Write your answer in Japanese.

Underlined 5: Why does the author say this? Explain the reason(s) from the passage. Write your answer in Japanese.

Underlined 6: Using the author’s logic, explain why he states the underlined part. Write your answer in Japanese.

Underlined 7: Why does the author say this? Explain the reason(s) from the passage. Write your answer in Japanese.

II

Read the following passage and answer the questions which follow.

For months, Charlotte Graves had tried to avoid looking at the new place. And yet how could anyone's eyes not snare on the large size of it? It had been ⁽¹⁾ designed to draw attention.

As she and the dogs came down the drive the following morning, it came into view once again: a massive, white figure of a building with three full floors in the middle. A columned entrance framed the enormous front door. Either side of this, along the front of the house, were small trees set in beds of newly delivered wood chips. It looked like a recently opened country club. The landscaping of the yard and its perfectly crosscut lawn running to the river's edge reminded one of the artificial layout of a golf course. In line at the drugstore, Charlotte had overheard a real estate agent describing it as a Greek Revival château.

This was what had replaced the woods that Charlotte's grandfather had given to the town for preservation.

Over the last year, as it was being built, she had often reminded herself that the house was merely the furthest and most annoying advance of the much larger intrusion, the one that had begun decades ago, first at a distance, a sighting here or there, a fancy baby buggy in the library, a concern for the number of calories heard at the butcher. More recently had come the giant cars with children glaring from the backseat. For years the news had made so much of bombings in the Middle East, and of course in dear old New York now as well, and of the fighter jets we released in revenge, but they never ⁽²⁾ mentioned how wealthy young people seemed to have violence hidden in their eyes. She had seen it at school, the way her students had grown critical, turned into speakers for their parents. As soon as she began speaking of such ⁽³⁾ things openly ⁽⁴⁾ the principal had gone to the retirement board and they forced her into early retirement. Nearly forty years of teaching history to the children of this town and they had hurried her out for speaking the truth.

With the Bennetts on one side of her and the woods on the other, Charlotte had always thought she would be safe from the worst of the intrusion. Her house, the old family place, was similar to a castle. After all this time living in it, its memories were for her neither a comfort nor troubling. They were simply the traces of individuals with whom she shared the place. Time by herself had done that to Charlotte, slowly worn away the hard barrier of the self that had fought against loneliness for so many years at the beginning but in the end lacked a source of power. Because Charlotte was not exposed to the difficulties of others, her social fear tended to decline. The barrier between herself and the world had begun to open. And while this gentle acceptance had put to rest the anxiety she'd endured in the earlier years, it had increasingly opened her to a deeper terror. For instance, trying not to think about — but having an undesirable awareness of — every soul at risk on the planet hour to hour. A thing not to be endured for more than a minute without destroying the integrity of her individual mind.

Before the mansion had been built, there had been the chainsaws and diggers, trees dragged like dead bodies to the road. She had stayed indoors, unable to watch. They removed so much earth, the angle of the land itself had changed. The maple trees they left along the top of the hill, from where she could now see all the way down to the river, did a poor job of hiding the new house even with the leaves out, and as fall had come round again the naked wood frame of the unfinished house had shown clearly through the bare branches.

As a teacher all these years, seeing for herself the small-mindedness of those who ran the town of Finden, Charlotte should have known it would come, that the town would betray the trust her grandfather had placed in it. Her father might have done something about it. A man with a strong faith in the law, he had prosecuted crimes to the last. He would have found a way to stop these terrible people. But not her younger brother, Henry. No. After a few

brief discussions with the lawyer, Cott Jr., Henry had suggested that if Charlotte found it too much to bear, perhaps the time had come to sell the house and move somewhere, as he put it, more practical.

Thus it had been left to her to fight the battle. Naïvely, she had begun with an attempt to persuade, writing letters to the local politicians and the newspaper. When that produced nothing but a few polite replies, she'd begun gathering signatures outside the supermarket, informing people of the town's plans. Just a few years earlier, most people would have at least stopped and said hello. She had been their teacher, after all, or their children's teacher, or both. But now they looked upon her with pity.

Budgets were budgets, the town said. They regretted deeply the necessity of putting a section of land up for sale. But the vote for the school budget had failed at the election and they had to use their land and property. Never mind the break of trust. Never mind the careless short-termism of it all, as if a one-time payout of money could ever fund the yearly expense of schooling. What had government become these days but the poorly announced quick sale of things good for the community?

(Adapted from: *Union Atlantic*, by Adam Haslett, 2009, Nan A. Talese/
Doubleday)

QUESTIONS

Underlined 1: Which of the following has the closest meaning to the word “snare”? Write the LETTER of your answer.

- A. check
- B. depend
- C. focus
- D. move
- E. rely

Underlined 2: What does “they” refer to here? Write your answer in English.

Underlined 3: Which of the following has the closest meaning to the underlined part? Write the LETTER of your answer.

- A. The children asked to go home to see their parents.
- B. The children repeated their parents’ opinions.
- C. The children told stories about their parents.
- D. The children turned the sound on for their parents.
- E. The children wanted to hear Charlotte’s opinion about their parents.

Underlined 4: Which of the following best describes the “things” mentioned in the underlined part? Write the LETTER of your answer.

- A. Amendments of school rules.
- B. Changes in young people.
- C. Different teaching styles.
- D. Teachers’ violence to the students.
- E. Recent news events.

Underlined 5: Which of the following has the closest meaning to the underlined part? Write the LETTER of your answer.

- A. feel secure from feeling lonely.
- B. feel secure from feeling pity.
- C. feel secure from her retirement.
- D. feel secure from something not desirable.
- E. feel secure from the dangers of the forest.

Underlined 6: Why do you think the author uses “dead bodies” to describe the fallen trees? Write the reason(s) in English.

Underlined 7: Why can Charlotte see the new house especially in the fall season? Write the reason(s) in English.

Underlined 8: What does "it" refer to here? Write your answer in English.

Underlined 9: What is the reason the town stated for selling the land? Write your answer in English.

10. According to the passage we can reasonably infer that:

- A. Charlotte believes her brother is supporting her efforts.
- B. Charlotte is impressed by the beauty of the newly built home.
- C. Charlotte prefers to keep the town from changing or modernizing.
- D. Charlotte respects the town's decision to sell the land.

Write the LETTER of your answer.

11. According to the passage we can also reasonably infer that:

- A. Charlotte believes the town's plan for selling the land is reasonable.
- B. Charlotte dislikes all the townspeople because they do not support her efforts.
- C. Charlotte is supported by the townspeople in her efforts.
- D. Charlotte knows many of the townspeople personally.

Write the LETTER of your answer.

III

Read the following passage and answer the questions which follow.

Obesity affects 40 percent of adults and 19 percent of children in the United States and accounts for more than \$168 billion in healthcare spending each year. Sugary beverages are thought to be one of the major drivers of the obesity epidemic. These drinks (e.g. soda and sports drinks) are the largest single source of added sugars for Americans and contribute, on average, 145 added calories per day to their diets. For these reasons, reducing sugary beverage consumption has been a significant focus of public health intervention. Most efforts have focused on soda.

But fruit juice has been relatively neglected. Juice, for some reason, gets a pass, and it is not clear why so many believe it is healthy.

Americans drink a lot of juice. The average adult drinks 25 liters per year. More than half of preschool-age children (ages 2 to 5) drink juice regularly, a proportion that, unlike that for soda, has not changed in recent decades. These children consume on average 375 milliliters per day, more than twice the amount recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics.

Parents tend to associate juice with healthfulness, are unaware of its relationship to weight gain and are reluctant to restrict it in their child's diet. After all, 100 percent fruit juice — sold in handy individual servings — has been marketed as a natural source of vitamins and calcium. The U.S. Department of Agriculture guidelines state that up to half of fruit servings can be provided in the form of 100 percent juice and recommend drinking orange juice with added nutrients such as vitamin D. Some brands of juice are even marketed to infants.

Government programs designed to provide healthy food for children, such as the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, offer juice for kids. Researchers have found that children in the program are more likely to exceed the recommended daily fruit juice limit than those who are similarly poor but not enrolled in the program.

Despite all the marketing and government support, fruit juice contains limited nutrients and is highly sugary. In fact, one 375-ml glass of orange juice contains 10 teaspoons of sugar, which is roughly what is in a can of Coke.

Drinking fruit juice is not the same as eating whole fruit. While eating certain types of fruit like apples and grapes is associated with a reduced risk of diabetes, drinking fruit juice is associated with the opposite. Juice contains more concentrated sugar and calories. It also has less fiber. Fiber makes people feel full. Because juice can be consumed quickly, it is more likely than whole fruit to contribute to excessive carbohydrate intake. For example, research has found that adults who drank apple juice before a meal felt hungrier and ate more calories than those who started with an apple instead. Children who drink juice instead of eating fruit may similarly feel less full and may be more likely to snack throughout the day.

Juice may also be a “gateway beverage” — one-year-olds who drank more juice also drank more sugary beverages, including more soda, in their school-age years. Children’s excessive consumption of juice has been linked to an increased risk of weight gain, shorter height, and bad teeth. Even in the absence of weight gain, sugar consumption worsens blood pressure and increases cholesterol.

It is tempting to minimize the negative contributions of juice to our diets because it is “natural” or because it contains “vitamins.” Studies that support this view exist, but many are biased and have been questioned.

And we doubt you would take a multivitamin if it contained 10 teaspoons of sugar.

There is no evidence that juice improves health. It should be treated like other sugary beverages, which are fine to have periodically if you want them, but not because you need them. Parents should instead serve water and focus on trying to increase children’s intake of whole fruit. Juice should no longer be served regularly in day care centers and schools. Public health efforts should

challenge government guidelines that equate fruit juice with whole fruit, because these guidelines most likely fuel the false perception that drinking fruit juice is good for health.

It is much easier to prevent obesity than it is to reverse it. We need to teach kids how to eat healthier when they are young so that they develop good habits to carry on for the rest of their lives. In the past decade or so, we have succeeded in recognizing the harms of sugary beverages like soda. We cannot keep pretending that juice is different.

(Adapted from: “The fruit juice delusion”. In *The New York Times* International Edition. Tuesday, July 10th, 2018. Opinion.)

QUESTIONS

According to the content of the passage, write T for True, F for False or N for Not mentioned in the text for each statement. Answer a question with “N” only if the statement is either not present in the text or cannot be inferred from the information in the text.

1. Fruit juice, soda, and sports drinks are collectively thought of as “sugary” drinks by the authors.
2. The consumption of juice among adult Americans has declined, but not enough to lower the relatively unchanged obesity levels of 40% of the population.
3. The consumption of juice among preschool-age children has been declining recently, but it remains in excess of that recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics.

4. A number of government agencies, presumably dedicated to the promotion of children's health in the United States, are promoting the consumption of fruit juice among children despite its high concentration of sugar and high number of calories.
5. Unlike whole fruit such as apples and grapes, fruit juice contains sugar.
6. Like sports drinks and soda, fruit juice does provide a quick surge of energy that may be of benefit to children from poorer families, as advocated by the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children.
7. There is opposition to regulating the consumption of juice from new parents who fear losing the obvious advantages of giving juice to their children.
8. Except for the excessive amount of sugar, there are more health benefits in fruit juice than in whole fruit.

IV Read the following and write an essay in English in about 200 words.

Gender discrimination is a major area of difficulty in Japanese society. Give two examples of gender inequality in Japan, and then discuss possible measures that could be taken to deal with each of your examples of gender inequality.