

name:  
form:

# Textbook



**TEXTBOOK 1**

**H/V 4**



# **TEXT SHEET 1**

## **Programmed to bully**

- 1 New research claims that 'Four-year-old children who watch more television than average are more likely to become bullies'. The research team, led by Dr Frederick Zimmerman, has added bullying to the list of potential negative consequences of excessive television viewing along with obesity, inattention and other types of  
5 aggression.
- 2 What the news reports have failed to mention, in their rush to blame TV for yet another social problem, is that the effect found was so small as to be barely significant. The researchers note: 'Each hour of television viewed per day at age 4 years was associated with a significant odds ratio of 1.06 for subsequent bullying.' In other words, children  
10 who watched TV for one hour a day more had a six per cent increased risk of being 'a bully'.
- 3 But there are plenty of other problems with this research. All the reporting is done by mothers, so what one mother considers to be bullying behaviour might be another mother's friendly horseplay. In fact, it must be extremely difficult to define what 'a bully'  
15 is for such a report. Does it mean violent behaviour? Would organising classmates to exclude a particular individual constitute bullying? Would someone who exhibits this behaviour at the age of six, but not at the age of eleven, fall into the category of a 'bully' for the purposes of this research?
- 4 Moreover, if there really is a link with bullying here, it has little to do with television as  
20 such. For example, watching television is a very passive activity. While not harmful in itself, it's a poor substitute for the social and intellectual engagement involved in play. Opportunities for free play are becoming increasingly restricted by parental fears. If some children then take longer to learn what is appropriate behaviour and what is not, that is hardly the fault of television but of the wider environment in which they grow up  
25 today.
- 5 That said, this particular research report also suggests a complete lack of historical perspective. Children have been picking on other children since time immemorial -- and certainly a long time before the gogglebox was invented. Whether the amount of bullying going on is on the increase is surely impossible to know. However, we live in an age  
30 where the feeling of being a lonely, picked-upon individual is very fashionable. No wonder there's money to research bullying.
- 6 Television may be the source of innumerable bad programmes, but the evidence that it is responsible for society's ills is thin. Maybe it's time to pull the plug on this kind of research.

# **TEXT SHEET 2**

## Text 1 – The beauty of wind farms

### The beauty of wind farms

David Suzuki

- 1 OFF the coast of British Columbia in Canada is an island called Quadra, where I have a cabin that is as close to my heart as you can imagine. From my porch on a good day you can see clear across the waters of Georgia Strait to the snowy peaks of the rugged Coast Mountains. It is one of the most beautiful views I have seen. And I would gladly share it  
5 with a wind farm.
- 2 However, sometimes it seems like I'm in the minority. All across Europe and North America, environmentalists are locking horns with the wind industry over the location of wind farms. In Alberta, one group is opposing a planned wind farm near Cypress Hills Provincial Park, claiming it would destroy views of the park and disturb some of the last  
10 remaining native prairie in the province. In the UK more than 100 national and local groups, led by some of the country's most prominent environmentalists, have argued that wind power is inefficient, destroys the ambience of the countryside and makes little difference to carbon emissions.
- 3 It is time for some perspective. With the growing urgency of climate change, we  
15 cannot have it both ways. We cannot shout from the rooftops about the dangers of global warming and then turn around and shout even louder about the "dangers" of windmills. Climate change is one of the greatest challenges humanity will face this century. It cannot be solved through good intentions. It will take a radical change in the way we produce and consume energy – another industrial revolution, this time for clean energy,  
20 conservation and efficiency.
- 4 We have undergone such transformations before and we can do it again. But first we must accept that all forms of energy have associated costs. Fossil fuels are limited in quantity and create vast amounts of pollution. Large-scale hydroelectric power floods valleys and destroys animal habitat. Nuclear power is terribly expensive and creates  
25 radioactive waste.
- 5 Wind power also has its downsides. It is highly visible and can kill birds. The fact is, though, that any man-made structure can kill birds – houses, radio towers, skyscrapers. In Toronto alone, it is estimated that 10,000 birds collide with the city's tallest buildings every year. Compared with this, the risk to birds from well-sited wind farms is very low.
- 6 30 Even at Altamont Pass in California, where 7000 turbines were erected on a migratory route, only 0.2 birds per turbine per year have been killed. Indeed, the real risk to birds comes not from windmills but from a changing climate, which threatens the very existence of bird species and their habitats. This is not to say that wind farms should be allowed to spring up anywhere. They should always be subject to  
35 environmental impact assessments. But a "not in my backyard" approach is hypocritical and counterproductive.
- 7 Are windmills ugly? I remember when Mostafa Tolba, executive director of the United Nations Environment Programme from 1976 to 1992, told me how when he was growing up in Egypt, smokestacks belching out smoke were considered signs of progress. Even as  
40 an adult concerned about pollution, it took him a long time to get over the instinctive pride he felt when he saw a tower pouring out clouds of smoke.
- 8 We see beauty through filters shaped by our values and beliefs. Some people think wind turbines are ugly. I think smokestacks, smog, acid rain, coal-fired power plants and climate change are ugly. I think windmills are beautiful.
- 9 45 And if one day I look out from my cabin's porch and see a row of windmills spinning in the distance, I won't curse them. I will praise them. It will mean we are finally getting somewhere.

# **TEXT SHEET 3**

## Text 1 - Do fat people get a fair deal

The first rumblings of a 'fat rights' campaign are being heard in the United States, where several heavy-weights have been suing employers for discriminating against them because of their excess poundage.

In Connecticut, a 24-stone policeman, Richard Chaffee, is preparing a case against the police authority for wages lost when he failed to comply with a weight-loss schedule. In Pittsburgh, 17-stone Belle Luna, who was sacked from her post at the city jail for failing to meet her employers' orders to slim, has won a court order for reinstatement. With the support of the National Association to Aid Fat Americans, Luna is preparing to widen her case into a 'class-action suit' on behalf of other overweight Americans who claim job discrimination. The association's secretary, Lisbeth Fisher, told us from New York: 'There's a lot of medical research now to show that obesity is not always in a person's conscious area of control. So it's a matter of employers and everyone accepting us as we are.'

The slimming organisation Weight Watchers has plenty of evidence from members that fatness can hamper career prospects. In some cases, bodily bulk became a practical hindrance. 'Our members have included a fireman who became too heavy to climb a ladder,' said a Weight Watchers' spokesman, 'professional drivers who couldn't get behind the wheel, and machine-minders too obese to fit the workspace.'

In other cases, the hindrance has been psychological: 'Badly overweight people in office work and a wide range of other jobs tell us that obesity has been such an embarrassing preoccupation that it must have affected their prospects.' They are usually too immersed in miserable guilt to make the most of their chance of promotion.

Among top management, where paunches once betokened importance, the lean, tennis-playing look is nowadays in favour. Dr Hugh Pentney, of the Institute of Directors' health centre and clinic, who examines many candidates for senior board-room positions, says: 'Obesity by itself is not the handicap. The point is that it may indicate unsuitability on other grounds. If a person is more than 10 per cent over the appropriate limit on the weight-and-height scale, then it does raise questions of self-management and balanced outlook.'

'I think much depends on how a person carries the weight,' says A. E. 'Tubby' Pitcher, who carries his 15 stones well enough within his 5ft. 5in. frame to be president of the leading advertising agency Ogilvy, Benson and Mather. Early on, he says, he grasped the secret of feeling comfortable, which is that there is no standard human shape: 'In hiring people we look for talent, whether it comes fat or thin.' He manages a 16-hour working day and occasionally uses the Scarsdale diet to shed a few pounds. 'But it's all a matter of self-acceptance, I think.'

The logo for Weight Watchers, featuring a stylized circular icon to the left of the brand name "WeightWatchers" in a bold, sans-serif font.

# **TEXT SHEET 4**



# Darwin's Revenge

Why are we getting fat?



By Fred Guteri with Anne Underwood

1 Of nature's many weather conditions, winter at the Arctic Circle would have to be one of the harshest. It's hard to imagine that humans would have survived generations of frigid climate without some adaptation giving them a way to cope. Scientists have in fact put forward a theory about a "thrifty genotype" that some humans acquired 30,000 or so years ago during their migration from Asia, across a land bridge at what's now the Bering Strait, to North America. These genes may have given cold warriors an ability to store fat and metabolize it sparingly, a handy trait for the dark, cold months when food is scarce.

2 Now that the land bridge is long gone, the descendants of these first North Americans are stuck with genes optimized for life in the Ice Age. The same traits that allowed their ancestors to thrive in the Arctic wilderness may be making them uniquely vulnerable to the high-fat, high-cholesterol, sedentary American lifestyle. The problem with evolution is that it can't keep pace with the modern world.

3 Asians are thought to possess many of the "thrifty-genome traits", which may explain why the number of obese Chinese doubled between 1992 and 2002 to 60 million, according to China's Health Ministry. Some Mediterraneans and Africans may not have acquired the thrifty genes of Arctic peoples, but their hunting-and-gathering ancestors didn't leave them a whole lot better equipped. Half of Brazil is now overweight, and one in eight is obese. In France and Italy, about one in three is overweight, and the proportion is rising. All told, about 1.2 billion people in the world are fat, and another 350 million are obese. Obesity-related illnesses, such as heart disease and diabetes, are rising.

4 Scientists are beginning to appreciate the variations in how different people respond to diet. For most people, particularly Asians, eating food rich in saturated fats will generally increase the level of "bad" cholesterol and decrease the "good" cholesterol. "When Asians move from their traditional environment to the West" - or when they start eating at their local McDonald's in Tokyo or Beijing - "they immediately get into trouble with obesity and heart disease - more than Caucasians," says Jose Ordovas, director of the Nutrition and Genomics Laboratory at Tufts University. By the same token, Northern Europeans and Celts, and some Mediterranean populations, tend to have the same cholesterol levels no matter what they eat - the work of a gene inherited from Viking ancestors.

5 A person's vulnerability to the diseases associated with obesity depends not just on diet but on his level

of activity as well. And there's some evidence that activity is a product of biology as well as culture. A paper published by Dr. James Levine, a nutritionist and endocrinologist at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota, reports that a genetic predisposition to obesity may turn on how much a person fidgets. People who fidget turned out to expend 350 calories a day more on average than those who don't - the equivalent of a weight gain of 30 or 40 pounds in a year - merely by getting up and moving around more. Studies suggest a neurochemical basis for the natural tendency to fidget. 29, rats injected with the neuropeptide orexin began to "run around their cages like crazy," says Levine. But scientists are

only beginning to get a handle on the problem. There's a possibility that fat in the body slows down the metabolism over the long term. What's certain is that thrifty genes work in more complex ways than scientists appreciate at present. "There's a profound interplay going on between the amount of energy people take in and their level of activity," he says.

6 The question scientists would ultimately like to answer is how to compensate for the obsolete genes we've inherited from our primitive ancestors. Identifying the hundreds of genes involved - let alone figuring out how to 32 their ill effects - won't be easy. Undoing thousands of years of evolution never is.

*Newsweek*

# **TEXT SHEET 5**

## Misstep on video violence

*Today's debate: Minors and video games*

1 In the booming world of video  
games, there are more than a few  
dark corners: Murder and chaos.  
Blood and slaughter. Explicit sex  
5 and abuse of women.

2 Small wonder some parents are  
concerned over what game-crazed  
teens may be up to. And small  
wonder, too, that legislators in  
10 several states are playing to these  
concerns by trying to outlaw the  
sale of violent and sexually explicit  
games to minors.

3 But to what useful end? This is  
15 the latest chapter in a very old  
story. When teenage entertainment  
offends adult sensibilities — think  
Elvis Presley's pulsating hips — the  
first response is to see the new  
20 phenomenon as a threat to social  
order. The second is to attempt to  
ban it. Parents — former teenagers  
all — seem to forget history's  
lesson: The bans never work.

4 And they're probably not  
25 constitutional, anyway. Courts  
have ruled that today's  
sophisticated video games are  
protected as creative expression.

30 \_\_\_\_\_ if communities want to  
limit access, they must show  
overriding evidence that the games  
pose a public threat. That evidence  
does not exist.

5 Lawmakers and activist groups  
35 claim that the thrill of engaging in  
virtual criminal activity will spur  
teens to try the real thing. But the  
violent crime rate has gone down

40 nearly 30% since the first bloody  
shoot-'em-up games debuted in the  
early 1990s. Youth crime rates  
have dropped even more. And a  
Federal Trade Commission survey  
45 found parents already involved in  
83% of video-game purchases and  
rentals for minors.

6 Judges have repeatedly  
rejected the studies that, according  
50 to advocates, show a link between  
fantasy violence and anti-social  
behavior.

7 To the extent there is a threat,  
55 it is mainly to the individual,  
vulnerable teenager, and it can be  
addressed only by parents.  
And they're getting some help. The  
game industry's rating system  
60 classifies games in six categories  
from "early childhood" to "adults  
only". Also, newer models of  
popular games include parental  
controls that can block their use  
for age-inappropriate games. And  
65 major retailers are tightening their  
restrictions on sales to minors.

8 There will always be a market  
for the dark, tasteless, even the  
outrageous, and parents ought to  
70 keep kids away from it. But even  
with the best intentions of  
legislators, the problem is beyond  
their reach.

9 New laws are likely to give  
75 parents only the false impression  
that someone else is solving that  
problem for them.

# **TEXT SHEET 6**

## Text 1 - Prisons

A prison is still a prison, however much fresh primrose paint you slap on its rock-heavy walls. Walking around Wormwood Scrubs, one of Britain's biggest and the one where all life sentences start, it's at first hard to realize, though, that the thousand or so inmates are being held in there by force. For the first impression is cheerful enough: men busy in workshops, prisoners trotting  
5 purposefully through the long corridors on errands. Only the high wire fences, and the dogs and the groups of warders watching the men in their blue denim uniforms walking round and round the windy exercise yard remind you that this is not, in fact, a barracks or a big boarding school.

It is the sheer ordinariness of the prison that forces so insistently the question nobody answers: what is it all supposed to be for? The Victorians, who built the Scrubs as if it were a model  
10 fortress, had no doubts: a prison was for punishment. But that's now considered barbaric and ineffective.

Is it there to reform the men? That was Elizabeth Fry's notion, to be accomplished with Bible readings and useful work; but in practice there's precious little of either. The Scrubs has a small therapeutic unit where those who opt for it get group therapy, five hours a day, remorselessly  
15 for months, but even when it works, that's just for a tiny minority.

Is it there to keep people off the streets, so they can't hurt anyone while they're inside? Not a bad idea - but then, the length of time you're inside ought to depend on how likely you are to do it again. So the persistent petty thief would be in for ever, and the man who had used a once-for-all meat cleaver on his faithless wife would walk free.

Perhaps the real answer is the one given by one of the saner warders: he said simply 'to ease  
20 the conscience of society'; by shutting these men away, people can let themselves off worrying about why the crimes were committed.

Not that the prison people worry, either: the crime's the last thing they think about. This warder said he didn't even know the crimes of three-quarters of the men in his charge: there's  
25 even a sort of prison convention that you don't mention whatever it was the man's in for. This is the thing that is most amazing to the outsider. After the first few days, they all agree, the only thing that counts for the prisoner is making things as tolerable as possible - as it is for the warder, only from the opposite point of view. All enlightened people concerned with prisons take the same line: perhaps they would find it intolerable, in their day-to-day dealings with these  
30 men, if they had to think 'He's the one who bashed up that old lady'. But if the crime's not important, what are they doing there at all?

The men are in prison because of a crime; yet the prison doesn't seem to relate to the crime in any way. It can't punish and reform at the same time; so in practice it doesn't do either. It is simply a parallel society, out of which, in due course, a man will emerge: maybe better, maybe  
35 worse; but probably much the same as before.

Small wonder that concerned people more and more ask what on earth could be tried instead: they'll look at anything that seems to expend the range of the three standard options of fine, probation\* or prison. More money has just been voted for those who, since the 1972 Criminal Justice Act, can do community service; that's something. One or two judges in Germany have  
40 tried punishments that do seem relevant - making motorbike tearaways, for example, go to work in an accident ward; but of course half the time there isn't any such appropriate punishment available.

We buy crime books in their millions, we watch crime series on TV five times a night; we're obsessed with the idea of those who committed a crime being caught and brought to justice. But  
45 when that's all over we seem totally uninterested in what happens next. Put them away, shut them up, hide them; and we can forget all about them - until the next time when we can get indignant all over again.