Passage 19

Pre-reading

Answer the following questions.

1. What do you mean by "environment"?

_____

2. How does it influence people?

_____

3. What have you done to the environment?

_____

4. Do you feel connected to the environment?

_____

5. How is the environment today?

_____

6. How can you help keep the environment clean?

_____

ENVIRONMENTALISM MATTERS*

(by John Shepardson)

About a half-million years ago (Dott & Batten, 1988,p.610), conditions in the ecosystem permitted humans to establish themselves as a species. There was a niche we could exploit and we did. Unfortunately for much of earth's life, as our numbers grew, so did our arrogance. Our unique communication skills allowed the sharing of knowledge in a synergistic process that expanded the ability to exploit our niche into the ability to exploit the entire ecosystem.

Early humans, the hunter-gatherers and the first agrarian societies, were intimately connected to the earth's natural processes. They understood on a gut level the importance of sun and rain, for example. Without them, these people died of thirst and starvation. For them, the link was clear and immediate. We have, in the last few thousand years, progressed to the point where this link to nature is totally invisible to much of our population. Water comes from faucets, food from stores.

This disconnection from our ecosystem is reinforced for many people by their belief, learned early in life, that "man" is the supreme life form and that everything else was put on earth for our use. This fits well with another belief that humans are at the top of the food chain, that we have no natural enemies.

---

* Jan M. Youga, Mark H. Withrow and Janis Flint-Ferguson, *Readings Are Writings* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1996), pp. 380-383.

Once there were predators that humans feared. They were the big carnivores—tigers, lions, and bears. We overcame them with our brains which enabled us to invent weapons. Now, we are supreme. Or are we? What about the tiniest creatures, the viruses and bacteria that kill us every day? We are not really supreme. We are part of the system of life on this planet and we must live within the constraints of that system if we are to survive.

We have much to learn about these constraints, but we already know some important things. One is that species of plants and animals appear and disappear over geologic time, depending on how well suited to the existing environmental conditions they are. When conditions change and a species cannot tolerate the new ones, it becomes extinct. Many species are threatened with extinction now. Many have already been lost. Some of this would happen naturally, but the large number of threatened species appears to be caused mostly by human activity. Habitat destruction is one of our activities that kills a species. Like us, if they have no shelter or food, they perish.

Many humans, especially in Western society, do not have much understanding of the interdependence of life on this planet. This is a root cause of the continuing assault on the environment. If people understood that their own survival is connected to the species we are driving into extinction, the behavior that is doing the damage would start to change. In a greatly simplified overview, let me list some of the things other forms of life do that allow us to survive.

First, breathing. We take oxygen from the air to fuel our bodily processes. It is in the air because plants release it as a byproduct of their metabolism. If we lose too many plants, we will not have enough oxygen. Plants need soil with nutrients and water to grow. The nutrients are recycled by microorganisms that

break down dead organic matter (Nebel, 1990, p. 165). Many of the chemicals we release into the environment kill the microorganisms. We cannot ordinarily see these creatures, but they are essential to our survival.

Our next most critical need is water. We take it for granted, but most of what we consume is polluted to some degree, and it is getting worse in most places. There are natural processes that clean the water, one of which is the filtration that happens when rainwater slowly works its way through a forest floor and down into the aquifer. On the other end, rivers flow into tidal flats where the water is slowly filtered through plants before going back into the ocean. These both depend on healthy plants to work.

Then there is our food, all of which comes from plants, either directly or indirectly. The bottom line is this, there is no supreme species. All are interdependent . Except perhaps us. Try to think of any species that would miss humans if they were to become extinct besides those we have trained to be dependent on us. We may be the only species the world would be better off without. It we are to thrive, we must understand that bacteria decomposing dead organic matter into nutrients for plants are just as important as we are. The famous Pogo quote, "We have met the enemy, and he is us," sums up the problem.

The damage humans are doing to the environment is a serious problem, made worse because many people do not understand how their actions hurt other life. The lack of understanding is largely due to our disconnection from nature, but this goes back to the line about water comes from faucets and food comes from stores.

There are many ways to eliminate this disconnection, but one that is often suggested is to put a box of dirt in the sun and to grow some of our own food rather than letting large corporations do it for us (Cunningham & Saigo, 1992, p.214). This food both nourishes us and teaches us about how the environment works. We can learn early on that a praying mantis is not an ugly bug to be stepped on but rather a friend who can keep the vegetarian bugs from eating the entire crop. We can enjoy food that is not sprayed with chemical poisons. We can gain a whole new appreciation for rainy days, and the idea of acid rain may not seem so remote. In short, we can re-establish connections to the environment that our ancestors knew well. They depended on that environment for survival. We do, too.

A. Answer the following questions.

1. The writer is likely to be _____.

    A. a political studies student

    B. a historical studies student

    C. an environmental studies student

2. Our ancestors _____.

    A. were close to the environment

    B. damaged the environment

    C. did not recognize the importance of environment

3. Why do people feel disconnected from their environment?

    A. They do not recognize its importance.

    B. They feel too close to the environment.

    C. The link to nature is clearly seen.

4. How does the writer suggest a way to make people feel connected to nature?

    A. By growing their own food

    B. By eating more organic food

    C. By reducing technology

5. The writer wants readers to _____.

    A. be away from nature

    B. feel interdependence with nature

    C. recognize our supreme status

B. Complete the following.

1. Early humans did not destroy their environment because _____

   _____

2. We no longer think about where our water and food come from, so _____

   _____

3. When people feel that "man" is supreme, _____

   _____

4. We should not damage our environment because everything on earth is

   _____

5. The writer discusses breathing, water, and _____ to prove that people and environment are interdependent.

6. The writer says that if _____. we will appreciate it.

Passage 20

Pre-reading

On the line next to each word, write down any word or phrase that comes into your mind related to this word.

1. *ethics* _____

_____

2. *moral* _____

_____

3. *value* _____

_____

4. *obligation* _____

_____

5. *duty* _____

_____

ETHICS*

Let's define **ethics** as *the branch of philosophy that studies what constitutes good and bad human conduct, including related actions and values.* In understanding this definition, it's helpful to view all ethical questions as involving a choice. Suppose, for example, that after not answering your telephone for several hours, you finally take a call. The caller, a friend, expresses frustration at having failed to reach you earlier and asks whether you were home. You were home, of course, but simply didn't feel like answering the phone. Naturally you could tell the person the unvarnished truth. But since such behavior is uncharacteristic of you, the person will likely expect an explanation or feel slighted. In short, saying that you weren't home seems less complicated than telling the truth. What should you do?

Invariably all ethical questions involve a decision about what one should do in a specific instance. Notice the word *should.* Ethical questions are not concerned with what one *would* do (an essentially psychological concern) but what one *ought to* do. Judgments about such decisions are generally expressed with words like *right* and *wrong*, *should* and *ought*, or *obligation* and *duty*. For instance, "I *ought* to tell the caller I was home" or "Telling the caller I wasn't

---

*Vincent Barry, " Ethics," in Philosophy: A Text with Readings (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1980), reprinted in Anne Dye Phillips and Peter Elias Sotirion, *Steps to Reading Proficiency*, 2nd ed. (California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 118-120, 124.

home is the *right* thing to do." A good portion of ethics is devoted to the philosophical problems concerning the right thing to do or what we should do, that is, to questions of obligation.

But at the same time, implied any choice is a value or value judgment. If you decide to tell the caller you were home, your action betrays a commitment to some value, perhaps to truth. If you choose to lie, again your action reflects a value, perhaps your own pleasure. In effect, every choice involves an assessment of worth. We feel obliged to behave a certain way because we seek a specific value or good. These values, just as the actions themselves, can be described with words such as *good*, *bad*, *evil*, *desirable*, *undesirable*, *beneficial*, *harmful*, and so on. In addition to dealing with questions of obligation, there fore, ethics deals with questions of value. *Taken together, questions of obligation and value form the heart of ethics.*

Occasionally the term *ethics* is used interchangeably with *morals*. Business or medical ethics, for example, is generally synonymous with morals. Although this is acceptable, a precise usage would apply the terms *morals* and *moral* to the conduct itself, while the terms *ethics* and *ethical* would refer to the study of moral conduct or to the code that one follows. Thus, the specific act of telling the caller you were home could be described as moral of immoral. But what makes any act moral or immoral, right or wrong, would fall within the province of ethics. When we speak of moral problems, then, we generally refer to specific problems, such as "Is lying ever right?" or "Is stealing always wrong?" In contrast, we can look at ethical problems as being more general and theoretical. Thus, "What makes any act, such as lying or stealing, right or wrong?" and "What makes any entity good?" are ethical problems. In short, morality refers to

the degree to which an action conforms to a standard or norm of human conduct. Ethics refers to the philosophical study of values and of what constitutes good and bad human conduct.

Sometimes the term *nonmoral* arises in the study of ethics. This term refers to what lies outside the sphere of moral concern. Thus, whether I choose to answer my telephone and whether a manufacturer packages a product in a vertical or horizontal container are essentially nonmoral questions. However, nonmoral questions can quickly take on moral overtones. For example, telling a friend to call me at a certain hour and then refusing to answer the call could raise a moral question. Likewise, if the shape of a container could mislead the consumer about the quantity of its contents, then it could constitute a moral question.

In dealing with human conduct from the perspective of obligation and value, ethics investigates a variety of related concerns. Among them are whether a standard of morality exists that applies to all people at all times everywhere, the precise nature of moral responsibility, the conditions under which one is held morally accountable or responsible, and the proper end of the law. In the limited space available we can't attend to all ethical concerns adequately. So we'll focus on questions of obligation and value, that is, on what makes an act right or wrong and what makes an entity good or bad.

We will order the discussion by approaching it from the view of normative ethics, as opposed to what's termed *metaethics*. **Normative ethics** is *that branch of ethics that makes judgments about obligation and value.* It attempts to establish standards or norms about how we ought to behave and what we should pursue. Metaethics, on the other hand, does not make judgments about what is

right and wrong. **Metaethics** *explains theprecise meaning of the ethical words and statements used in judgements of normative ethics and determines what reasons support or contradict such judgments.* Thus, "Am I right in lying to the caller?" is essentially a normative question because it assumes the existence of some norm of rightness to be accepted and subsequently applied to this act of lying. In contrast, questions like "What does the term *right* mean?' "What evidence is there for assuming the existence of any ethical norm or of any specific one?" and "What basis is there, if any, for insisting that a moral judgment is correct?" are essentially metaethical concerns because they are epistemological inquiries about normative judgments, that is, they address the foundations of our moral knowledge. Although the study of metaethics is vital to effective normative thinking, our introduction to ethics will concentrate on normative ethics because most readers at this point are primarily interested in establishing some standards or norms for personal conduct.

Choose the best answer.

1. According to the passage, ethics is concerned with _____.
   a. races and their beliefs
   b. questions of right and wrong, of duty and obligation, and of moral responsibility
   c. our thoughts, feelings, actions and perceptions
   d. the history of philosophy

2. The definition "*the branch of philosophy that studies what constitutes good and bad human conduct, including related actions and values*" refers to what term?

a. normative ethics
b. ethics
c. metaethics
d. all of the above

3. The term "ethics" is sometimes used interchangeably with _____.

a. philosophy
b. value
c. morals
d. obligations

4. Which one is true of ethical considerations?

a. They are specific acts.
b. They deal with the study of moral conduct.
c. They deal with the conduct itself.
d. They are practical, not theoretical.

5. According to the passage, morality refers to _____.

a. the philosophical study of values and of what constitutes good and bad human conduct
b. what lies outside the sphere of moral concern
c. the study of ethical theories
d. the degree to which an action conforms to a standard of human conduct

6. An example of a nonmoral action would be _____.

a. buying a dress
b. refusing to answer a question
c. selling a product to a customer before he or she is completely satisfied
d. moving out of your parents' home

7. A student lies to a teacher. According to the author, this action would be correctly described as a(n) _____ action.

a. ethical
b. unethical
c. moral
d. immoral

8. Which branch of ethics analyzes the terms used in an ethical argument?

a. normative ethics
b. metaethics
c. bioethics
d. Western ethics

9. The word "it" (line 65) refers to _____.

a. metaethics
b. normative ethics
c. obligation
d. value

10. The word "they" (line 76) refers to _____.

a. concerns
b. statements
c. questions
d. reasons

Passage 21

Pre-reading

Take a few minutes to scan the passage to find the answers to the following questions.

1. When was Hugo Grotius born?

_____

2. What did he do?

_____

3. What special event did the United Nation initiate in1974?

_____

4. 12 nautical miles is equal to _____ kilometers.

Since European exploration and colonization of the newly discovered continents in the sixteenth century, the ocean has been largely free to all nations. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) formulated the legal basis in the doctrine of *mare liberum* in 1635. For more than 300 years the ocean, outside of a narrow territorial sea extending 3 nautical miles (5 kilometers) from the shore, was freely used by all nations.

National interest in the potential of immense quantities of petroleum on the continental margins and metal-rich manganese nodules from the deep-ocean floor challenged this concept. Uncertainties about the legal status of these deposits greatly inhibited the investments necessary to exploit them.

In 1974 the United Nations convened a Conference on the Law of the Sea. The nations of the world negotiated their many conflicting needs in order to develop a consensus, often fuzzy, to divide the ocean among them. The treaty was completed in 1981. Its implementation markedly changed the legal status of the ocean.

First, the territorial sea was extended to 12 nautical miles (22 kilometers) from the shore. Within this zone the coastal state has rights and responsibilities equal to those it has over the land. Consequently, some major straits through which ships must pass in going from one ocean to another came within the territories of coastal states. Negotiations were necessary to ensure the right of ships to navigate these areas.

More dramatic was the recognition of a 200-nautical mile (370 kilometers) Exclusive Economic Zone. In this zone the coastal state regulates fisheries and resource exploration and exploitation. About one-third of the ocean falls in this Exclusive Economic Zone of some coastal state. And many important seas—North Sea, Mediterranean, Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean—are totally divided among the coastal states.

Enormous areas of ocean thus come under national jurisdictions. The United States, for instance, assumed responsibility for an ocean approximately 80% of land area. New programs were required to regulate the fisheries on a much larger scale than ever tried before. A new—largely unknown—mineral resources were

opened for future exploitation as their legal status was clarified, thus encouraging investment.*

Answer the following questions:

1. What is the subject matter of paragraph 1?

   _____

2. What is the main idea of paragraph 2?

   _____

3. What does the third paragraph mainly discuss?

   _____

4. What made it possible for many seas to be divided among many coastal states?

   _____

5. What is the last paragraph about?

   _____

*M. Grant Gross, "Oceanography," in *Comprehending College Textbook: Step to Understanding and Reading What You Read* eds. Joe Cortina, Janet Elder and Katherine Gonnet (New York: McGrow-Hill, 1989), pp. 346-347.

Passage 22

1 Summerhill began as an experimental school. It is no longer such; it is now a demonstration school, for it demonstrates that freedom works.

2 When my first wife and I began the school, we had one main idea: *to make the school fit the child*—instead of making the child fit the school.

3 I had taught in ordinary schools for many years. I knew the other way well. I knew it was all wrong. It was wrong because it was based on an adult conception of what a child should be and of how a child should learn. The other way dated from the days when psychology was still an unknown science.

4 Well, we set out to make a school in which we should allow children freedom to be themselves. In order to do this, we had to renounce all discipline, all direction, all suggestion, all moral training, all religious instruction. We have been called brave, but it did not require courage. All it required was what we had—a complete belief in the child as a good, not an evil, being. For almost forty years, this belief in the goodness of the child has never wavered; it rather has become a final faith.

5 My view is that a child is innately wise and realistic. If left to himself without adult suggestion of any kind, he will develop as far as he is capable of developing.

6 What is Summerhill like? Well, for one thing, lessons are optional. Children can go to them or stay away from them—for years if they want to. There *is* a timetable—but only for the teachers.

7 The children have classes usually according to their age, but sometimes according to their interests. We have no new methods of teaching, because we do not consider that teaching in itself matters very much. Whether a school has or has not a special method for teaching long division is of no significance, for long division is of no importance except to those who *want* to learn it. And the child who *wants* to learn long division *will* learn it no matter how taught.

8 Children who come to Summerhill as kindergarteners attend lessons from the beginning of their stay; but pupils from other schools vow that they will never attend any beastly lessons again at any time. They play and cycle and get in people's way, but they fight shy of lessons. This sometimes goes on for months. The recovery time is proportionate to the hatred their last school gave them. Our record case was a girl from a convent. She loafed for three years. The average period of recovery from lesson aversion is three months.

9 A few years ago someone at a General School Meeting (at which all school rules are voted by the entire school, each pupil and each staff member having one vote) proposed that a certain culprit should be punished by being banished from lessons for a week. The other children protested on the grounds that the punishment was too severe.

10 My staff and I have a hearty hatred of all examinations. To us, the university exams are anathema. But we cannot refuse to teach children the required subjects. Obviously, as long as the exams are in existence, they are our master. Hence, the Summerhill staff is always qualified to teach to the set standard.

11 Not that many children want to take these exams; only those going to university do so. And such children do not seem to find it especially hard to tackle these exams. They generally begin to work for them seriously at the age of fourteen, and they do the work in about three years. Of course, they don't always pass at the first try. The more important fact is that they try again.

12 Summerhill is possibly the happiest school in the world. We have no truants and seldom a case of homesickness. We very rarely have fights—quarrels, of course, but seldom have I seen a stand-up fight like the ones we used to have as boys. I seldom hear a child cry, because children when free have much less hate to express than children who are downtrodden. Hate breeds hate, and love breeds love. Love means approving of children, and that is essential in any school. You can't be on the side of children if you punish them and storm at them. Summerhill is a school in which the child knows that he is approved of.*

Answer the following questions:

1. What is the distinction Neill makes between 'an experimental school' and 'a demonstration school'?

---

2. Why is *'is'* in italics? (paragraph 6)

---

*A.S. Neill, "Summerhill—A Radical Approach to Education," in Carole Robinson, *Themes for Proficiency* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, n.d.), pp. 117-119, 250.

3. What is the school's policy on teaching methods?

---

4. What is more important than methods?

---

5. Explain the meaning of 'loafed'. (paragraph 8)

---

6. What is a general school meeting?

---

7. What is the attitude of Summerhill staff to public exams?

---

8. What is more important than the fact that some pupils don't pass exams the first time they take them?

---

9. What is the distinction Neill makes between 'fights' and 'quarrels'? (paragraph 12)

---

10. What does 'downtroden' mean? (paragraph 12)

---

11. What is the underlying belief which makes Summerhill 'the happiest school in the world'? With what evidence does Neill support his claim?

---

12. Name 3 ways in which Summerhill is experimental.

Passage 23

Pre-reading

Answer the following questions.

1. Why is the article on "Deforestation" contemporary even it was written almost two decades ago?

_____

2. Does deforestation occur in Thailand? If yes, what are the results? How can we solve the problem?

_____

3. Does deforestation in one country affect another? How?

_____

DEFORESTATION*

Deforestation has only recently been recognized as a global problem. Even today governments and individuals believe that only countries using up their forests will be affected by it. However, scientists are convinced that the world's forests must be preserved. They base their conviction on scientific data that prove the importance of forests to all people everywhere.

Deforestation is occurring most rapidly in tropical regions of the world. Most forests in other climatic areas have already been affected by human beings. They have been destroyed or preserved or systematically cut and replanted. There are two reasons why jungles are now in danger. One is the mechanization of the logging industry. The second is the world's hunger for forest products. These jungles are the world's largest and last reserved of timber. Because the world needs the wood that these forests supply, they will probably be cut. Scientists, however, want to convince countries with large stands of tropical trees to manage their forests so that they will continue to produce.

Tropical forests seem to have perfect conditions for producing life. The number and variety of plants give the illusion of endless fertility. In most cases, however, this fertility is dependent on a very delicate natural balance, an ecosystem. Most of the soil nutrients that are necessary to support plant life come from decaying plants and animals. Keeping the soil rich and productive is

---

* Jean Zukowski/Faust, Susan S. Johnson and Clark S. Atkinson, *Between the Lines* (New York: CBS College Publishing, 1983), pp.196-200.

the first reason for saving the world's tropical forests. Soil fertility is quickly exhausted when the cycle of death and decay is interfered with. This is a lesson that has been learned through experience in many parts of the world. In Brazil, for example, an area of the Amazon forest was cleared for agricultural use around 1900. By the 1940s the soil in this area, called Bragantina, had been exhausted. Without enrichment from decaying plant and animal matter, the soil had lost its fertility; without the protective covering of trees, the soil had been baked into a hard, unproductive surface. Furthermore, the cost of adding nutrients to the soil in order to make it productive again was prohibitively high. The fertilizers cost so much that no crop could be profitable. Therefore, Bragantina was officially abandoned; its settlers were moved to another place. Bragantina could have served the world as a valuable source of forest products, which in turn could have provided Brazil with a source of income. As it is, Bragantina is a wasteland, a reminder of the fragile balance within the tropical forest.

A second reason to preserve tropical forests is the abundance of plant and animal life that they support. Much of this plant and animal life has never been scientifically categorized. Furthermore, most scientists are convinced that tropical forest life forms have not been adequately studied. Scientists, therefore, view the loss of these forests as a loss of knowledge. To most scientists, the preservation of a source of information is a sufficient reason to preserve the forests. Even scientists with a more practical outlook believe that it is important to explore and study the forests further to determine their usefulness before they are destroyed. For example, tropical forests produce the raw material from which important drugs are manufactured. Both quinine, which is used in the treatment of malaria and other sicknesses, and Dioscorea, which supplies an essential

ingredient in birth-control pills, are tropical forest products. Scientists are convinced that further study would uncover forest plants that repel insects and other herbivores, plant-eating animals. These substances might provide a harmless substitute for the chemical pesticides that are widely used in agriculture and are harmful to all living beings. Robert Allen of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources emphasized the potential of tropical forest products. He said," Tropical trees, thanks to their constant battle with her bivores, are source books of chemical invention of which man has scarcely turned the pages."

A third argument for conserving tropical forests concerns their effect on worldwide climate patterns. All plants give off water vapor that becomes part of the atmosphere. The dense plant life in a tropical forest transpires large quantities of water vapor. This vapor condenses and falls as rain. If the tropical forests disappear, there will be less water in the air. It is, therefore, highly probable that destruction of the rain forests will mean widespread drought.

The probability of drought is increased by the fact that tropical forests also provide the atmosphere with large quantities of oxygen. Like all forms of vegetation, forests take in carbon dioxide and give off oxygen during daylight. If the forests, or even a large portion of them, are destroyed, the percentage of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will increase. Because carbon dioxide forms a protective blanket of warm air around the Earth, an increase in the gas could cause a worldwide rise in temperature. A hotter Earth with less rainfall would mean, among other things, more desert and less agricultural land and, therefore, less food to feed the people of the world.

In spite of the compelling reasons to save the tropical forests, they are

disappearing with frightening speed. An article on deforestation in News Week, November 24, 1980, began with the statement, "In the time it takes to read this sentence, 8 acres of forest will disappear." Unfortunately, this trend toward destruction is not likely to be reversed in the near future. Still, steps can be taken to move in a different direction and save the forests.

The logging industry could contribute much toward saving tropical forests from destruction by applying the principles of good forest management. Forests are a renewable resource. If the industry had to reforest areas where trees are cut, then there would always be new sources for forest products and income from them. Reforestation projects have been very successful in countries like Korea, Australia, New Zealand, and Turkey. In these countries, reforestation has begun to solve the problems caused by deforestation. Reforestation is the first step toward satisfying both the demand for forest products and the need for forests.

Governments of countries with tropical forests must, of course, play an important part in reforestation projects. However, governments could take another important step toward the conservation of tropical forests by setting aside forest reserves. These areas of forest, where trees could not be cut, would preserve the natural environment and the abundance and variety of life that it supports. This step is particularly important in view of the fact that many varieties of tropical trees take several hundred years to reach maturity.

Just reforesting and setting aside forest reserves will not, however, stop deforestation. The reason is another important cause of deforestation, human poverty. People who need fuel and land on which to grow food cut a large percentage of the trees. The problem of poverty is extremely complex. However, the introduction of better agricultural practices and tree culture would

increase the food and fuel supply, and steps are being taken to accomplish both of these goals.

Still, the most important step toward the solution of the problem of deforestation must be taken by all people everywhere. Everyone must recognize deforestation as a global problem with global importance. Everyone will be affected if the forests are not preserved, not just countries in which they are found. Therefore, a global commitment to solving the problem is necessary.

A. Answer the following questions.

1. What are the two reasons that deforestation is occurring most rapidly in tropical regions?

_____

2. Where is Bragantina? _____

   When did settlers first go there? _____

3. Why do scientists think that tropical forests are a source of knowledge?

_____

4. What effect does carbon dioxide have on the earth?

_____

5. What is a forest reserve?

_____

6. Why do poor people cut trees?

_____

B. Complete the following.

1. Although deforestation is considered a global problem, _____ _____ .
2. The reasons why jungles are in danger are: 1. _____ and 2. _____
3. Most forests have already been affected by human being, and the most seriously affected forests are in _____ .
4. To keep the soil rich and productive, _____ .
5. To preserve tropical forests means to preserve _____ .
6. ____ reasons of conserving tropical forests are mentioned in the passage.
7. The reasons to save the tropical forests are recognized, but _____ _____.
8. A way to preserve tropical forests mentioned in the 8th paragraph is _____.
9. A way to preserve tropical forests mentioned in the 9th paragraph is _____.
10. A cause of deforestation mentioned in the 10th paragraph is _____.