

Written by LIS KOREA Editorial Staff and Copy-Edited by Duane Vorhees

Topic-Discussion Textbook

I

WHAT DO YOU THINK

**30 Controversial Issues Today for
Very-Advanced
Classes**

vk.com/englishlibrary

LIS KOREA

머리말

학교에서 또는 학원에서 중고급 영어회화를 가르치면서 가장 안타까운 것은 학생들이 마음놓고 토론을 할 수 있도록 배려된 길이 없고 체계적인 영어 교재가 없다는 것이다. 영어 토론 시간이 되면 즉흥적인 토론 제목을 받는 것은 물론이고, 그 토론 제목에 대한 배경 지식과 참고할 만한 다양한 의견들이 없어 자기 의견을 정리하는 데 많은 어려움을 겪는다. 가르치는 선생님들도 토론 제목을 선정하는 데 어려움을 겪기는 마찬가지여서 결국 일행이 없는 토론이 되기 십상이다. 또한 선정된 주제들도 토론의 주제라 되기에 부적합한 - 난해하거나 분명한 의견 대립이 없는 - 것들이 많아 토론의 흥미를 반감시키는 경우가 많다. 결국 중고급으로 올라가는 학생들이 점점 흥미를 잃게 되어 고급 영어를 공부할 기회를 놓치는 경우가 허다하다.

이번에 리스 코리아에서 출판하는 **WHAT DO YOU THINK? 1, 2**권 시리즈는 **Let's talk (1) (2)**를 끝마친 학생들과 선생님들이 시사적이며 좀더 깊이 있는 주제들에 대해 토론을 할 수 있도록 다음과 같은 형에 유의해서 만들었다.

첫째, 여기에 선정된 주제들은 현대인들에게 특히 시사적이며 매우 논란의 여지가 큰 주제들로서 많은 찬반 의견과 다양한 의견들이 논의 될 수 있어 수업의 흥미를 한껏 높일 수 있을 것으로 확신한다.

둘째, 토론 영어의 기초 단계인 영어로 설명하는 힘을 길러 주기 위해 **What Does It Mean?** 난을 삼립했다. 여기에서 학생들은 특정한 영어 표현을 영어로 설명하는 훈련 과정을 거쳐 토론 영어의 기초를 다질 수 있도록 했다.

셋째, **Comprehension Check-Up** 난에서는 주제에 대한 다양한 질문을 제공하여 주어진 주제에 대한 깊이 있는 토론에 대비하는 힘을 길러 주고자 했다.

넷째, **What Do You Think?** 난에서는 주어진 주제에 대한 토론 포인트는 물론이고 그것과 연관된 다양한 주제들에 대한 토론을 할 수 있도록 많은 토론 주제들을 제공하였다.

다섯째, **Opinion Samples** 난에서는 학생들이 주어진 주제에 대해 토론을 준비 하는 데 도움을 주기 위해, 많은 찬반 의견과 참고 의견들을 제시했다. 따라서 토론 영어에 익숙하지 않은 학습자들로 하여금 의견을 정리하는 데 도움이 되도록 했다.

여섯째, 본문 또는 **Opinion Samples** 난에 있는 어려운 표현이나 **Idiomatic Expressions**에 관해서 각주에서 충분한 영어 설명이 있어 학생들로 하여금 이해를 쉽게 하게 했다.

아무췌록 본 교재가 영어회화 학습에서, 수준 높은 토론 영어가 정착되는 데 이니의 디딤돌이 되었으면 한다.

Recommendation

What Do You Think? is a unique addition to the English-learning field in Korea. Most such books are intended for introductory classes; a few are good for intermediate-level usage. But **What Do You Think?** is the only one that I know of that is designed for advanced-level discussion groups.

The topics are timely, lively, often humorous, perhaps even controversial, and are sure to provoke comment among the participants. Classes using this book will certainly NOT be boring!

Each chapter also provides extensive introductions and practice for a wide variety of idioms and up-to-date contemporary English. Furthermore, the entire contents have been carefully proofread, and extensively revised, by native-speaking professionals, so the book is accurate as well as interesting.

Any practiced speaker of English as a second-language will find **What Do You Think?** a useful, thought-provoking tool in furthering his linguistic competence. It will also help keep him informed about current social and moral issues in the modern world, and encourage him to speak out about these issues and their consequences.

So if you want to expand your world as well as your language ability, what do you think?

Duane Vorhees

Contents

- (1) The Right to Know / 9
- (2) Truth or White Lie / 13
- (3) Surrogate Mother / 15
- (4) Public Breast-Feeding / 19
- (5) Punishment for Shoplifting / 21
- (6) Proper Etiquette / 25
- (7) Right to Have Sex / 29
- (8) Betrayed by Betty / 31
- (9) Scientists Disobedient to Mother Nature / 35
- (10) Free Cigarettes for Soldiers / 39
- (11) Sending Women into Combat / 43
- (12) Whose Responsibility? / 45
- (13) Hunting: Sport or Atrocity / 49
- (14) Publishing Names / 53
- (15) Jail, A Lovely Place to Be? / 57
- (16) Human Growth Hormone / 61
- (17) Rape / 65
- (18) Euthanasia / 73
- (19) Suicide / 79
- (20) The Rights of The Dead / 85
- (21) Death-Bed Confessions / 89
- (22) A Life for A Life / 93
- (23) State Matchmaking / 97
- (24) Self-Awarded Gifts / 99
- (25) A Deposition / 101
- (26) Gun Control / 103
- (27) Environmental Holocaust / 109
- (28) What Is Everything in Life? / 113
- (29) Preventing Drunk Driving / 117
- (30) Zoo / 119

ISSUE 1

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

There is always an argument concerning whether or not to tell a **terminally ill patient** the truth about his condition. Many people say that patients with an incurable disease have the right to know the truth. **I feel qualified to comment** because three days ago we had a memorial service for my husband.

He was given six to 12 months to live - that was less than two months ago. After the initial shock **we made what time he had left count**. My husband was only 45 years old and he had never been sick, so getting such news was hard to take.

Seven of his longtime friends from five states came to visit us. I cannot describe how much that meant to my husband. He accepted his **impending death** and helped me plan the service. At 42, I wasn't prepared to cope with it, but he gave strength to me and our children, 16 and 21. We did it together.

I am all for total honesty. I say, tell your loved one the truth. **The chances are that he knows it already. He can read it in the eyes of those he loves and who are caring for him.**

What Does It Mean?

- (1) terminally ill patient
- (2) I feel qualified to comment
- (3) we made what time he had left count
- (4) impending death
- (5) I am all for total honesty
- (6) The chances are that he or she knows it already.

- (7) He can read it in the eyes of those he loves and who are caring for him.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Why does she think she is qualified to comment on this subject?
- (2) Why was the news so hard to take for his family?
- (3) Was she prepared to cope with this tragedy? How did she cope with it?
- (4) Do people usually know the truth about their illness? How?

What Do You Think?

- (1) If one of your family members had a terminal illness, would you tell him or her the truth?
- (2) Do you think it is always better to tell the patient the truth?
- (3) If you had just six months to live, what would you do?

Opinion Samples

- (1) We should always tell a patient the truth about his illness. If he had a terminal disease and his days were numbered, we should let him prepare for his final day. Otherwise the other people around him will regret having made such a great mistake.
- (2) Even if someone had a fatal disease, he shouldn't be told the truth. Unless he has given up hope, there might be a miracle. Sometimes mental strength can overcome physical disease.

- (3) If I were diagnosed as terminally ill, I would want to know. I may want to travel, visit friends and relatives, revise my will, and enjoy my remaining time to the fullest.

This is his second marriage.
He's been unlucky in both -
his first wife left him and this one won't.

ISSUE 2

TRUTH OR WHITE LIE

Do you believe that a child who is 6 1/2 years old should be told the truth, regardless of what it is?

Here is the situation: Dad is in jail for one year. Please understand, my husband didn't steal anything, nor did he commit a **violent crime**. However, he was found guilty of drunk driving - it was his third offense. If you think our son should be told the truth, how do you feel about my taking him to visit his father in jail? Or do you think it would be better to tell him that **Daddy is away "on business"** and he may be gone for quite a long time?

I can't describe the humiliation our family has endured. It was reported in the newspaper, but this is a large city and not everyone is aware of it.

What does it mean?

- (1) white lie
- (2) violent crime
- (3) Daddy is away on business

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) How long has Daddy been in jail?
- (2) Did he commit any violent crime?
- (3) How does he happen to be in jail?
- (4) Is it his first offense?
- (5) What is the excuse she thought of for daddy's being away?

- (6) Why isn't everyone aware of daddy's offense, even though his case was reported in the newspaper?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think her son should be told the truth or should she make some excuse?
- (2) How would you handle the situation if your husband or your wife were found guilty of drunk driving and sent to jail?

Opinion Samples

- (1) I think she should tell her son that Daddy did something wrong and is being locked up for a while, and tell him now, before someone else does. I also believe that she should take the boy to visit - for his sake as well as his father's - and say, "Dad will be back soon, and we will be a family again." These are troubled times for her family. But it is not the end of the world. And this too shall pass.
- (2) What good would be accomplished about her son's knowing about daddy's criminal record? The truth is important, I know. But truth doesn't mean everything. In this case lying is better than telling the truth. If the boy were told the truth he would show a total disregard for his father. But if she lies about it the child will grow up and eventually understand the situation and mom's good will

ISSUE 3

SURROGATE MOTHER

I'm in a dilemma. My husband and I have been happily married for 10 years. I am 30 and my husband is 38, and we have three beautiful, healthy children. I've agreed to become a **surrogate mother** for a married woman who has unsuccessfully tried to have a baby for 10 years. I have discussed this with my husband, and he is agreeable. (The egg and sperm will be the other couple's - they are just using my body as an incubator.) I will be paid \$5,000 when my pregnancy is confirmed, and \$5,000 after the baby is born. **All my pregnancies and deliveries have been relatively easy.** When I told my mother about this, she said, "**Have you lost your mind? If you go through with this, I don't want to see you in that condition.**" I told her she could live her own life, and she should let me live mine.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) surrogate mother
- (2) All my pregnancies and deliveries have been relatively easy
- (3) Have you lost your mind?
- (4) "If you go through with this, I don't want to see you in that condition."

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) How long have the couple been married?
- (2) How many children do they have?
- (3) What has she recently agreed to do?
- (4) Did her husband respect her decision?
- (5) When and how much will she be paid?
- (6) When she told this to her mom, how did her mother feel about it?
- (7) What did she tell her mom when her mom said she is against her decision?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think she made the right decision?
- (2) Do you think \$10,000 is enough for a surrogate mother?
- (3) Would you be willing to be a surrogate mother if you were well paid?
- (4) What would you say if your wife were willing to be a surrogate mother?
- (5) Do you think it natural for her mom to be angry, or is it none of her business?
- (6) Who do you think has more right to the baby if the surrogate doesn't give up the child, the surrogate mother or the natural parents?
- (7) Who do you think is most responsible if the child is less than perfect?

Opinion Samples

- (1) I think the advice she gave her mother - to live her own life and let her live hers - was sensible and to the point. Surrogate motherhood is not about renting one's womb; it's

about helping a woman fulfill a dream of motherhood.

- (2) However helpful it may be to *sterile*¹ couples and how well I might be paid, I would be scared to be a surrogate mother. The entire matter is a very controversial, ethical, and legal issue.
- (3) Some people refer to the surrogate process as a gift that enables a barren woman to have a child, but the would-be surrogate mother will be paid \$5,000 at the time of conception and \$5,000 upon the delivery of a healthy, normal child. In other words, it is not a gift; it is a fee for services rendered.
- (4) If the surrogate mother is doing this out of the kindness of her heart she should accept only reimbursement for medical expenses, but a wealthy woman seldom donates the use of her body to a woman in financial straits.
- (5) Except in true donation situations where the surrogate is, for example, the mother or sister of the adopting mother, the surrogate expects to be paid. This is not to say that she finds the procedure distasteful; she merely regards it as an easy way to make some extra money.
- (6) Finally, carrying and bearing a child for another woman is an emotionally complicated way to make money. It is difficult enough to bear one's own child, and situations often arise where surrogates do not want to give up the child; or children who are less-than-perfect may be rejected; or

¹ incapable of producing offspring

marriages break down, leaving the child in *limbo*.² In our society, often the only ones who really benefit are the lawyers who pick up the pieces.

² a state of oblivion

ISSUE 4

PUBLIC BREAST-FEEDING

Many people suggest that mothers who nurse their babies in public places do it discreetly.

Have you been to the beach lately? If not, you ought to go. You will see women covered by no more than a narrow strip in front and with their entire bottoms in full view. Their breasts are completely exposed except for dime-size fabric pasties.

Turn on the TV and you can watch men and women in bed together, under the sheets, kissing passionately ... need I go on?

And yet some **loony people** think a mother nursing her baby in a restaurant is offensive. Good grief!

What Does It Mean?

- (1) loony people

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What does the writer think about nursing a baby in public places? Why?
- (2) What does the writer think about people who feel offended by mothers' breast-feeding in public?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Would you breast-feed your baby in public if he is crying for milk?
- (2) Would you accept your wife's breast-feeding in public?

- (3) When you see other women breast-feeding their babies, how do you feel?
- (4) Do you want your child to be breast-fed or just milk-fed?

Opinion Samples

- (1) I think there is nothing obscene about nursing a baby in a restaurant if there isn't a lounge or other private place where the young mother could go. We have no right to deprive a baby of the right to being fed at the right time regardless of place or other people's presence. Once a mother starts to feed the child the breast is no longer regarded as a sex symbol but as a good source of baby food.
- (2) In my opinion, the woman's behavior (breast-feeding in the presence of others) is obscene, inappropriate, and disrespectful. Many people are disgusted and angry at such behavior. If there is no private place available she should not breast-feed her baby.
- (3) I think breast-feeding is a completely natural act, and if people feel that it is something that should not be made public we need to accommodate nursing women by providing facilities for them. The bathroom is no place to breast-feed our children.

ISSUE 5

PUNISHMENT FOR SHOPLIFTING

My daughter got picked up for **shoplifting** \$30 worth of merchandise in a store. After she was caught she offered to pay for the items she took, but the owners refused to accept her money. (It was the first time she had ever been picked up for shoplifting.) Instead, they put a restraining order on her, denying her the privilege of shopping in any of their stores for the rest of her life! (They are part of a large national chain.)

My poor daughter is a **wreck**. She's manic-depressive and has been under the care of a psychiatrist for the last four years.

I could understand them fining her maybe \$100 and barring her from shopping in that store for six months or a year, but for them to bar her from shopping at any their stores for life seems terribly harsh to me.

There are video cameras all over the store so customers can be observed while they shop. I think there should be signs posted advising the customers that they are being videotaped.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) shoplifting
- (2) wreck

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What did the writer's daughter do?
- (2) When she got picked up, what did she do?
- (3) What did the chain store do to her?
- (4) Is the daughter mentally OK?

- (5) What does the writer think about the punishment from the chain store?
- (6) What did the chain store install to observe customers?
- (7) Were there any signs warning customers against shoplifting?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think the signs which say customers are being observed should be posted?
- (2) Do you think the signs would discourage shoplifting?
- (3) Do you think the chain's denying the daughter the right to shop there is fair? Or is it too harsh?
- (4) Do you think there should be a difference in punishment between first-timers and ex-convicts?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Shoplifters cost retail merchants millions of dollars annually, so I can't fault them for dealing firmly with those they catch. However, for a first-time offender, especially one who has been under the care of a psychiatrist for the last four years, I would say that she received very harsh punishment. I also believe that there should be signs posted all over the store advising shoppers of the video cameras. This alone should discourage shoplifting.
- (2) People acknowledge that retail merchants lose millions annually because of shoplifting, but some of them fail to recognize that the consumer must pay this cost in the form of increased prices. The girl was a common thief. I do mind subsidizing these criminals by paying higher prices for products!
The "poor, first-time offenders" are well aware of the crime

they are committing. Rarely is a shoplifter caught on the first attempt at shoplifting. They are usually so accustomed to getting away with it they become careless and are finally observed by store employees or security devices. Then they offer to pay for the stolen items to keep from being arrested.

All levels of crime, not just violent or serious ones, must be dealt with by setting examples of punishment that will deter others from committing such acts.

A man consulted a psychiatrist because he was worried about his wife.

"She's got this terrible fear of having her clothes stolen," he told the doctor.

"How can you tell?"

"Only the other day I got home early and found she had hired a man to stand in the closet to guard them."

ISSUE 6

PROPER ETIQUETTE

What is the proper etiquette for smokers and non-smokers dining out together?

Recently, eight of us decided to eat out. It was one's birthday, and the others were treating him to a party. The restaurant did not take **reservations**.

As we entered the restaurant we were asked if we wanted to sit in the smoking or non-smoking section. I said, "Non-smoking," **but was quickly and loudly corrected by one of the smokers**. There were three smokers and five non-smokers in our party. The three smokers chain-smoked during the entire meal.

Since the meal took about two hours, **I don't think it would have been unreasonable for the smokers to have abstained for that short period of time** - or they could have excused themselves for a few minutes if they wanted a cigarette. Also, since **the non-smokers were in the majority**, I think our party should have been seated in the non-smoking section.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) reservations
- (2) but was quickly and loudly corrected by one of the smokers,
- (3) I don't think it would have been unreasonable for the smokers to have abstained for that short period of time
- (4) the non-smokers were in the majority,

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Why did they decide to eat out?
- (2) Did the restaurant take reservations?
- (3) What was the first question they were asked as they entered the restaurant?
- (4) Did the three chain smokers stop smoking during the meal?
- (5) How long did the meal last?
- (6) Who was in the majority?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Whose right do you think is more important, smokers' or non-smokers'?
- (2) When their rights conflict, what is the best way to solve the problem?

Opinion Samples

- (1) In recent years non-smokers have become so militant about having their space polluted with cigarette smoke that smokers have been made to feel like king-sized **outcasts**.³ With three smokers in his party so desperate for a cigarette that they chain-smoked through the entire meal, his party did not belong in the non-smoking section. However, I would have based the actual decision on whether or not the guest of honor was a smoker and accommodated that person.
- (2) All the people know that second-hand smoke is as bad as first-hand smoke. Smokers have a right to enjoy smoking, but only if they make sure that they do not deprive a non-

³ persons who are rejected, as from home or society

smoker's right to breathe unpolluted air. Even if the non-smokers are in the minority, their rights must be considered as having priority.

My mother-in-law was kidnapped last week.
The kidnappers said
if we didn't send \$25,000 quick
we would have to take my mother-in-law back.

ISSUE 7

RIGHT TO HAVE SEX

What do you think about a man who, **out of the blue**, says to his wife of 11 years, "We aren't going to have any more sex." When is it the right of either party to make a **unilateral decision** that there will be no more sex in the relationship?

I'm a young person, fairly good-looking, in love with my husband, and very much alive sexually. My husband refuses to see a doctor or a therapist because he insists there is nothing wrong.

What am I supposed to do? Live the rest of my life **celibate**? Or is an affair the answer? I'm tired of crying, begging, and fighting about what I consider a nightmarish turn of events. It has made me a nervous wreck, trying to pretend to our family and friends that everything is OK.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) out of the blue
- (2) unilateral decision
- (3) celibate

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) How long have this couple been married?
- (2) What did writer's husband say?
- (3) Why does her husband refuse to see a doctor or therapist?
- (4) What does she pretend to her family and friends?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think the wife has a right to a legal separation?
- (2) Which do you think is more important between a couple, the right to have sex or the right not to have sex?
- (3) Do you think either spouse has a right to have sex outside the marriage if there is no sex life between them?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Marriage is an agreement bound by love. Love never includes "forced sex" against one's will. Sex would be OK when both spouses are in the mood. When one spouse declares "no more sex," it should be respected as his or her right. The fact that many couples are happy without sex proves sex is not everything in marriage. However, we all know that sex is an important part of marriage, so the other spouse should have a right to a legal separation if unsatisfied with the situation.
- (2) Sex is the most important thing in marriage. If one spouse is reluctant to have sex anyway, it means more than sex itself. In other words, he or she is no longer interested in the other spouse. The other spouse is lonely and feels sexually deprived. Divorce is the best solution.

ISSUE 8

BETRAYED BY BETTY

Ten years ago my wife and I separated after 25 happy years of marriage. She found out I was having an affair with a young employee and asked me to move out. My wife is a beautiful and charming woman who gave me five terrific children.

Everyone was hoping we would reconcile but because of pure selfishness I refused to end the affair with Betty, even after my wife and children begged me to. Eventually that poor decision led to a painful divorce.

My affair with Betty has been very convenient. She is self-supporting and hasn't cost me anything. Betty isn't very good looking but she is a hard worker and **is around whenever I ask her to be.** Also, since we are not married, **I have never felt that I had to be loyal to her** - and I haven't been.

I made it clear to Betty that I didn't want any more children and she assured me that **she would take care of that.** Well, you guessed it: Betty is pregnant. I'm 63 years old and **too darned ancient to start with diapers and bottles again.** I also do not want to get married again. **I don't mind supporting the child but I feel a lot of resentment against Betty for having tricked me.** I'm sure that she thought this would be a way to get us married.

What I really want is my old family back, but I've been so rotten that I don't believe I have the right to ask for forgiveness. And then too, **a part of me says I owe Betty something for all our years together. I also believe I owe that unborn child my name.**

What Does It Mean?

- (1) My affair with Betty has been very convenient.
- (2) She is around whenever I ask her to be.
- (3) I have never felt that I had to be loyal to her
- (4) I made it clear to Betty
- (5) she would take care of that.
- (6) too darned ancient to start with diapers and bottles again
- (7) I don't mind supporting the child
- (8) I feel a lot of resentment against Betty for having tricked me.
- (9) a part of me
- (10) I owe Betty something for all our years together.
- (11) I also believe I owe that unborn child my name.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) When did the writer and his wife separate?
- (2) How long had they been married?
- (3) What caused them to separate?
- (4) What made him refuse to reconcile with his wife?
- (5) Has he been loyal to Betty?
- (6) Did he want more children?
- (7) How does he feel about Betty's pregnancy?
- (8) Is he ready to have a child at his age?
- (9) Is he reluctant to support Betty's baby?
- (10) What does he really want to do?
- (11) What does he think about Betty and the baby?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Would you have any children if you were in a second or third marriage?
- (2) Betty is pregnant in spite of his clear-cut intention against

having another child. Do you think he has any responsibility to support the child? Or should Betty handle everything, including full financial responsibility?

Opinion Samples

- (1) If I had any children from my first marriage, I wouldn't have any from a later marriage. Why? The reason for the second marriage would be to have very "selfish" happiness without the responsibility of child breeding.
- (2) If my girlfriend had a baby against my will I wouldn't support her and the baby, emotionally or financially. These days there are a lot of ways to prevent women from being pregnant. So pregnancy would be a deliberate trap for me to be put under legal obligation of support. But a problem would arise if she were convinced that it was an honest mistake. In that case, I would support the baby, but I would never see her again.

I'm in love with a beautiful girl, but she's poor.
And there's a homely girl with plenty of money in love with
me. Would you marry the rich girl or the poor girl?
I'd marry the rich girl and be good to the poor.

ISSUE 9

SCIENTISTS DISOBEDIENT TO MOTHER NATURE

A while back researchers in the labs were working overtime on ways to extend **life expectancy** well past 100. If they were successful it would not be considered unusual for a person to reach his or her 170th birthday. When I read that, all I could think of was buying Christmas gifts for children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, great-great-grandchildren, and great-great-great grandchildren. **Have mercy!**

And now I read about yet another remarkable effort. Scientists have now made it possible for women who have gone through menopause to become pregnant through the implantation of donated eggs. According to the New England Journal of Medicine, four out of seven post-menopausal women who use this method become pregnant and give birth to healthy babies.

Cut it out, you folks in the nation's research centers. There is still a long list of diseases that we have no cure for. Please work on these and don't "help" women in their late 40s and 50s have babies. The best break Mother Nature gives us is menopause and the freedom from pregnancy. Please, geniuses, **keep your cotton-picking hands off this God-given blessing**.

What Does It Mean?

(1) life expectancy

- (2) Have mercy.
- (3) Cut it out
- (4) keep your cotton-picking hands off this God-given blessing.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What did the writer think when she read the story of scientific efforts to prolong life expectancy?
- (2) How have scientists allowed women in menopause to become pregnant?
- (3) What are the chances of menopausal women becoming pregnant through this scientific miracle?
- (4) Does the writer think it's good to go ahead with medical research into prolonging the child-bearing ability?
- (5) What does the writer think is more important than this medical research?
- (6) What does the writer think about menopause?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think this scientific research - extending life expectancy - is worth continuing?
- (2) Do you think the research of prolonging child-bearing age is against God's will?
- (3) What do you think are the most important areas of research in modern medicine?
- (4) Talk about some diseases medicine has no cure for.

Opinion Samples

- (1) I can appreciate a scientific *breakthrough*⁴ as much as the next person, but *enough is enough*!⁵ I'm not sure all women share my views, but I'll bet if we took a poll my team would win by *a landslide*.⁶
- (2) What is the strongest desire among human beings? Long life, without exception. So what's wrong with research which extends life expectancy? How do we know it is against God's will? If we think it is against God's will, then why do we save people with serious diseases? Isn't that against God's will too? If so, we would have to give up all medical progress in the name of God.
And the second strongest desire is to want a baby. I think if we are able to help sterile women have babies, medical progress must be God's will too.

⁴ important development or discovery, esp in scientific knowledge

⁵ that's enough, let's not have any more

⁶ overwhelming majority of votes for one side in an election

Judge to defendant:

"I note that in addition to stealing money,
you took watches, rings and pearls."

"Yes, your honor," he replied.

I was taught money alone doesn't bring happiness."

ISSUE 10

FREE CIGARETTES FOR SOLDIERS

My father, who is now 71, never smoked as a youngster. All through junior high and high school, **when peer pressure to smoke was heaviest**, he never touched a cigarette. During his four years of college he resisted the temptation.

Dad was 26 when he went to Germany as a civilian employee of the United States army. It was there that he began picking up the free cigarettes that were issued to the military. That's how he started a lifelong addiction to smoking. He has regretted it ever since, but he's hooked and can't stop.

The cigarette companies know a good thing when they see it. They are now supplying free cigarettes to the men and women stationed in the Persian Gulf. What **a terrific opportunity to zero in on a potential market** of over 230,000 future smokers. You can be sure they are making the most of it.

What burns me up is that the cigarette companies are trying to look patriotic. They say they want to "make a contribution" to our **men and women in uniform**. If this is so, why don't they send playing cards, board games, or **paperback books**? I'll tell you why. Because they know that nicotine is highly addictive. Some researchers say it's harder to stop smoking than to get off heroin or cocaine. Cigarette companies figure that if they can hook even half of these soldiers they will have at least 115,000 new customers.

War itself is plenty dangerous. Why should we allow a company that sells a habit-forming, cancer-causing product to give it to our soldiers? Does this make any sense?

Somebody with high visibility and clout should make some noise about this. The tobacco companies should not be permitted to seduce our troops, **who are putting their lives on the line in combat** and should not have to continue to risk their lives after the war.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) when peer pressure to smoke was heaviest
- (2) a terrific opportunity to zero in on a potential market
- (3) What burns me up
- (4) men and women in uniform
- (5) paperback books
- (6) Somebody with high visibility and clout should make some noise about this.
- (7) who are putting their lives on the line in combat

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) When did the father start smoking?
- (2) Did smoking give him satisfaction?
- (3) Why hasn't he quit smoking?
- (4) Why do cigarette companies supply free cigarettes to the military?
- (5) What makes the writer furious?

What Do You Think?

- (1) What do you think about cigarette companies supplying free cigarettes to people in uniform? Is it morally OK?

- (2) Describe how people start smoking.
- (3) Talk about your first cigarette and how you felt at the time.
- (5) Have you ever tried to quit smoking?
- (6) What do you think is the best way to quit?
- (7) Why do you continue to smoke?

Opinion Samples

- (1) We are very concerned and upset. What's behind the cigarette companies' charity? Do they really give free cigarettes without expecting any return? This is a well-designed marketing strategy to hold current smokers and cultivate potential ones as well. Whether they are currently smoking or not men are easily tempted by free cigarettes. The strategy is to get people hooked on cigarettes, so they will have no choice but to hang on, even though smoking costs a lot, financially as well as physically. The government should ban distributing free cigarettes to the army.
- (2) I admit that free cigarettes might tempt some potential smokers to adopt a lifetime smoking habit. But we don't have any right to condemn cigarette companies for giving them away. We are all adults and responsible for our actions, whatever they may be. The companies do not force non-smokers to smoke, and free cigarettes are only gifts for smokers.

Joe is the man for me,"
said a starry-eyed young woman to her mother.
"He's nice.
He's handsome.
He's smart.
He's hard-working.
He's funny.
He's strong.
He's kind. "
"He's married," interrupted her mother.
"So, nobody's perfect!"

ISSUE 11

SENDING WOMEN INTO COMBAT

How do you feel about sending women into combat? I'm a woman who will be going through Army basic training in a few months. I think it would be foolish of me to say that I want to go into battle, but I think it's totally unfair to exclude women from combat duty when they can handle it as well as men. Women should be expected to do the same work as men in the military and in wartime.

When are the people going to realize that women are a **viable source** of our national defense? Canadian law has been revised, and now women are allowed to serve in all military positions - except on submarines - in the Canadian armed forces.

There are plenty of men out there who would gladly give up their combat positions to women, and plenty of women who would **jump at the chance** to prove themselves in battle.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) a viable source
- (2) jump at the chance

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Is the writer eager to go into combat?
- (2) What does she think about keeping women out of battle?
- (3) Do people realize women are important to their defense?
- (4) Can Canadian women serve in all military positions?

What Do You Think?

- (1) What do you think of sending women into combat?
- (2) If you were a woman soldier, would you be willing to go into combat?
- (3) Should the government force women to serve in combat?
- (4) If your wife insisted on going into battlefield duty, what would you do?
- (5) Do you think female casualties would affect army morale differently than male losses?

Opinion Samples

- (1) My first impulse is to say, "Women do not belong alongside men in combat." But, on second thought, perhaps a woman's place is where she wants to be. Perhaps when 18-year-old girls start coming home in wheelchairs and body bags we will begin to wonder why we think it's acceptable for 18-year-old boys to come home that way.
- (2) Society has made some giant steps in liberating the present generation from gender slots. Let us not take a step backward. Although I would not choose a combat role for myself, I would fight for my daughter's right to have it if that is what she wants.
- (3) Nobody ***drafted***⁷ me. I volunteered. I've been trained on the M-16 and have achieved an excellent rating. If the law doesn't allow me to go into combat, it means that I don't have the right to fight and die for the country I love.

⁷ conscripted

ISSUE 12

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

We recently took my son and eight of his friends to a baseball game for his 10th birthday. We parked on the left side of a **one-way street**. One of the young passengers opened the front door without looking. An oncoming car hit the door which was half open. The boy's leg was caught in the door and got bruised so badly that for a few minutes we thought it was broken.

My wife, who is a nurse, concluded that the leg was not broken and so, though offered the option of going home, the child chose to go to the game. He spent the night at our house. The next morning he was walking normally, and no medical bills resulted from this accident.

Our insurance company paid \$1,300 in claims for damage to both vehicles. Because of this accident we will have to pay out-of-pocket a \$250 deductible and a surcharge of \$1,200 in **added premiums** over the next three years.

As the driver **I feel some responsibility for not issuing a warning to our young passengers**, but I also believe **it is not unreasonable to expect a 10-year-old to exercise some caution on his own**.

After discussing this incident with several friends, all agreed that the parents of the child should share in at least some of the cost. Most felt that a 50/50 split would be fair. The child's father, however, indicated that his friends unanimously concluded that since the child was in my custody the total responsibility should be mine and he should not be expected to pay anything. To us **the issue is one of fairness, not legal liability**.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) one-way street
- (2) added premiums
- (3) I feel some responsibility for not issuing a warning to our young passengers
- (4) it is not unreasonable to expect a 10-year-old to exercise some caution on his own.
- (5) the issue is one of fairness, not legal liability.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What did the man do when his son had his 10th birthday?
- (2) What happened after they had parked?
- (3) What is his wife's job?
- (4) After the accident, did the boy go home?
- (5) Was the boy limping the next morning?
- (6) How much was the boy's medical bill?
- (7) How much did the insurance company pay for the damage to the two cars?
- (8) How much is the man going to pay in the wake of the accident?
- (9) Why does he feel some responsibility?
- (10) Does he think a 10-year-old is too young to exercise some caution on his own?
- (11) What do he and his friends think about cost sharing?
- (12) Why does the child's father think he doesn't have to share the cost?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think the writer should cover all the costs of the accident, or should the child's parents share?
- (2) If you were the child's parents, would you volunteer to share

the cost?

- (3) If you were the driver, would you ask for the cost to be shared?

Opinion Samples

- (1) I think the parents of the child should pitch in for the cost of the accident. We all know that the children were *in his custody*⁸ but that doesn't necessarily mean he ought to *foot the bill*⁹ alone. He was celebrating the 10th birthday of his son with the son's friends, which means he was entertaining all the children at his own expense. Parents should always remain somewhat responsible for their own children's behavior.
- (2) The fact that the children were under his care shows that the driver has no right to ask for any financial help. But financial help would be appreciated. Human relationship means more than legal responsibility in social life.

⁸ his responsibility

⁹ be responsible for paying the cost of something

He has a problem.

If he doesn't pay his psychiatrists' bills,
they'll let him go crazy,

and if he pays their bills he'll certainly go crazy.

ISSUE 13

HUNTING: SPORT OR ATROCITY

With all the ranting and raving about animal rights these days, it is time somebody spoke out about a so-called sport that is really nothing but an atrocity. Let me start at the beginning.

I'm a Nebraska farmer. Last year some very pleasant neighbors invited me to go deer hunting. I applied for and received a permit. Since I had never been hunting I was totally unprepared for the events of that day. I discovered that animals have no rights, or for that matter even a sporting chance.

Truckloads of hunters jammed the roads, armed with binoculars, CBs and dogs, not to mention the planes scouting from the skies. This, of course, is illegal but it goes on just the same. I was there and I saw it.

After three hours, three bucks and two does had been shot by the men in our party. Only one doe and one buck were bagged.

The other three animals got away, which means they suffered and died in some shelter belt or ditch.

To me this is a sick way of having a good time. I will never go hunting again. To see those beautiful, graceful animals shot down for the fun of it was horrible.

I know a lot of so-called sportsmen will be angry with me for writing this, but to my way of thinking, deer hunting is something animal rights organizations should investigate.

These poor defenseless animals need help. Certainly someone can figure out a more humane way to control their population. I want my children to see deer as the beautiful animals as they are, not as targets in a **sick contest** between man and beast.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) the ranting and raving about animal rights
- (2) it is time somebody spoke out
- (3) Truckloads of hunters jammed the roads
- (4) The other three animals got away,
- (5) a sick contest

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What does the writer think of hunting?
- (2) Had he ever gone hunting before?
- (3) What were the hunters armed with?
- (4) Will he go hunting again?
- (5) Is hunting the best way to control animal populations?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think hunting can be a kind of sport or is just a atrocity?
- (2) Will you shoot down animals for fun in the name of sport?
- (3) What do you say to making all kinds of hunting illegal?

Opinion Samples

- (1) This sure **raises the hackles**¹⁰ of a great many hunters. We can't justify the cruelty in hunting if we kill animals just for fun. We can only be justified when we kill animals for food. And the fact that this vulgar activity is going on in the name of sport should be shameful to us as rational animals. In addition, there is no good reason to wear fur coats, no

¹⁰ arouses the anger

matter how beautiful, because there are so many synthetics available.

- (2) I'm not saying I support overhunting, which reduces the number of animals to near extinction. But if there is a need to reduce the number of animals because of overpopulation we have to take appropriate action. If not, we are faced with unbalancing the animal society, which is by no means good for the animals themselves.

He doesn't carry life insurance, just the fire insurance -
he knows where he's going.

ISSUE 14

PUBLISHING NAMES

I'm frustrated by the retired school teacher who advocated publishing the names of the parents of **juvenile lawbreakers**.

A few years ago, when my son was 16 **he took up smoking**. I repeatedly warned him that he could not afford the habit and sooner or later **he would be tempted to steal** a pack of cigarettes.

Well, on his 17th birthday **he was caught shoplifting**. He went to court, did 12 hours of community service, and **made restitution**. Since then he has never been in any kind of trouble.

So what would be gained by putting our names in the paper as being irresponsible parents? And what about families with more than one son or daughter? Wouldn't the siblings suffer unnecessarily?

What Does It Mean?

- (1) juvenile lawbreakers.
- (2) he took up smoking
- (3) he would be tempted to steal
- (4) he was caught shoplifting
- (5) made restitution.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What is the writer upset about?
- (2) When did the writer's son start smoking?

- (3) What did the writer warn his son?
- (4) What happened on the son's 17th birthday?
- (5) Has the son been in any trouble since he made restitution?
- (6) What would happen to other family members if the names of wrong-doers' parents were published?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Are you for or against publishing the names of juvenile lawbreakers or of their parents?
- (2) Does publishing names encourage or discourage juvenile lawbreaking?
- (3) What do you think about publishing the names of the following?
 - (a) real estate speculators
 - (b) tax evader
 - (c) companies causing pollution
 - (d) drunk drivers

Opinion Samples

- (1) Publishing names in school should always be based on one rule. When a student sets a good example for others, his name is worthy of being published. But when there is a possibility of a student being hurt, no publishing of names should be permitted.
- (2) Name publishing is a good idea, whether for good cause or not. When model cases need praising, name publishing will help others follow suit. And publishing the names of lawbreakers will contribute to discouraging others from doing something wrong. I know there are some side effects in both cases, but I'm sure there are more positive

effects than negative ones.

He may talk like a fool and act like a fool.
But don't get the wrong idea about him -
he *is* a fool.

ISSUE 15

JAIL, A LOVELY PLACE TO BE?

I'm so angry right now **I could chew nails. I am busting my buns to support three kids**, I can't afford medical or dental insurance, and we're eating macaroni without cheese. Meanwhile, my **rotten ex-husband** is sitting in jail with full medical and dental benefits, **eating three squares a day, and without an ounce of remorse for anything he has done.** In America we call this justice. What a joke.

When is this nonsense going to end? When are we going to stop rewarding **these lazy good-for-nothings** with every comfort and benefit imaginable, and start trying to help those who help themselves? It makes me sick to my stomach to think of the money we spend to house, feed, clothe, entertain and provide medical and dental services for this **pond scum**, not to mention what we **dish out** for legal fees, while millions of children and senior citizens go without the **bare essentials**.

In jail, prisoners live like middle-class citizens. On the outside they can't feed themselves, at least not by honest means. It is no wonder we don't have enough prisons to hold them all. They're not being punished. **They're being pampered.** That's why so many keep going back.

I wish my kids could go to prison for a while - at least long enough to get their teeth fixed and to get some eyeglasses. My daughter could even have the surgery she needs. If my mother could go with them, she wouldn't have to wear two sweaters in the house to keep warm in the winter and she wouldn't be eating macaroni seven days a week.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) I could chew nails.
- (2) I am busting my buns to support three kids,
- (3) rotten ex-husband
- (4) eating three squares a day, and without an ounce of remorse for anything he has done
- (5) these lazy good-for-nothings
- (6) pond scum
- (7) dish out
- (8) bare essentials
- (9) They're being pampered.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Why is the writer angry?
- (2) How do prisoners live?
- (3) If the prisoners are out of jail, what happens to them?
- (4) Are prisoners really punished in jail?
- (5) Why do criminals go back to prison after being released?
- (6) Why does she wish her children could go to prison for a while?
- (7) What does her mother wear in winter?

What Do You Think?

- (1) If you are homeless, jobless, and on welfare, would you rather go to jail where housing, three meals a day, and medical care are guaranteed?
- (2) Why do you think ex-cons keep going back to prison?
- (3) What are some ways to prevent ex-cons from committing crimes again?
- (4) Are you for a "three strikes out" bill, which means that if a person is convicted of more than two crimes he should be

kept out of society permanently?

Opinion Samples

- (1) The writer makes prison sound like a lovely place, as though every inmate enjoys being behind bars. The loss of personal freedom is the roughest part of the sentence, however.

I agree it's an outrage that criminals are taken better care of than law-abiding citizens. But would you prefer that we treat them the way hostages were treated in the Middle East?

- (2) Ex-convicts should reimburse the government for their living expenses during their imprisonment. Why should innocent citizens have to pay? After they are released, if they can't afford to reimburse the money they owe they can do community service for a certain period.

- (3) My daughter, age 23, was brutally raped and murdered. The death certificate read "Skull crushed by blunt object. Multiple stab wounds on the neck and body." The attorney for the defendant decided it was better for his client to plead guilty and get life in prison rather than risk 10 years of hell on Death Row.

The murder finally confessed, so that animal who raped and killed my daughter is now living rent-free, getting three square meals a day and free dental and medical care, watching cable TV, exercising in a gym and working on a master's degree - thanks to the generosity of us taxpayers - while our family is struggling to deal with our anger and outrage over the murder.

When he's in, she's out;

when she's in, he's out.

They can't find each other to discuss a divorce.

ISSUE 16

HUMAN GROWTH HORMONE

Today many unhappy youngsters and their families **have their hopes pinned on** what is being touted as a medical fix to their problem: injections of a synthetic version of human growth hormone (HGH). **But efforts to test the drug have exploded into a medical and ethical controversy in the U.S.** The chief issue: Can an experiment be justified that gives a healthy child a drug simply to change his looks?

The debate flared anew last week when two organizations - the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine and the Foundation on Economic Trends - filed suit to halt a U.S. National Institute of Health study that would give HGH to 80 boys and girls. The youngsters' pituitary glands produce typical amounts of HGH, and the children are within the normal height range for their ages (9 to 15), but they are shorter than average.

The study had been suspended a year ago after the two groups accused the agency of violating U.S. government regulations governing research with healthy children but was resumed recently following the recommendation of a National Institute of Health (NIH) advisory panel.

Federal rules require that research pose only a minimal potential risk to youngsters and must glean important information about a medical condition. **The study doesn't qualify**, the groups charge. They claim that there is little information about its long-term safety or efficacy, and, furthermore, HGH therapy may increase the chances of developing cancer.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) have their hopes pinned on
- (2) But efforts to test the drug have exploded into a medical and ethical controversy in the U.S.
- (3) The study had been suspended
- (4) The study doesn't qualify

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Why has HGH injection become a controversial issue?
- (2) What do the federal rules require?
- (3) Why is HGH therapy considered unsafe?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think that short children suffer psychological stress because of their height?
- (2) Would you feel OK about HGH therapy if your children were shorter than average?
- (3) Do you think it's OK for the government to permit HGH sales, even though long-term safety is not guaranteed?

Opinion Samples

- (1) There is heightism in our society. Short kids don't have it easy. They are pitied by playmates and picked on by bullies. More worrisome to some parents, short kids often grow up into short adults. It is true that being short is not a medical disorder but it can make some things harder to do and cause psychological problems. So unless serious medical problems result, HGH therapy should be available.

- (2) Shortness is not a medical condition but a social problem. There is no physical risk to being short. The healthiest approach is to take the stigma out of being short. Instead, HGH treatment legitimizes bias by implicitly telling short kids they're not adequate the way they are.

He married a girl for her money, and her dad went bankrupt the following day.

ISSUE 17

RAPE

I'm trying to recover from the worst thing that can happen to a woman: Rape. Because I was totally ignorant about the subject, my new mission in life is to help educate others.

Women keep arguing the **pros and cons** about whether it is best to be passive. Some advocate **letting the rapist have his way**, hoping to avoid a beating or worse. Others believe they should fight back, on the **outside chance** that they will get away. But no matter which course a woman chooses, **she must never lose sight of the fact that being raped is not her fault.**

A traditional source of strength, the church, is viewed by some victims as not being a viable option anymore. This is unfortunate. I didn't want to go near a church after I was raped because, according to my early religious training, there were only three types of women - virgins, wives or whores. **No provision was made for victims of rape.** I thought that was where I stood with God and spent many years punishing myself for having "fallen from grace." **Then one day it dawned on me that those teachings were the work of people, and that God did not blame me for being a victim.**

What Does It Mean?

- (1) pros and cons
- (2) let the rapist have his way
- (3) outside chance

- (4) she must never lose sight of the fact that being raped is not her fault.
- (4) A traditional source of strength, the church, is viewed by some victims as not being a viable option anymore.
- (6) No provision was made for victims of rape.
- (7) Then one day it dawned on me that those teachings were the work of people, and that God did not blame me for being a victim.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Did the writer know much about rape before she was raped?
- (2) What does she think her new mission is?
- (3) What is the reason some women give to be passive when raped?
- (4) What is the most important thing for raped women to understand?
- (5) Why aren't churches helpful to those raped?
- (6) How did she stop punishing herself?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Why do you think men rape women?
- (2) Do you think it is best to be passive when raped?
- (3) Do you think those raped should report the incident to the police?
- (4) Do you think date rape should be punished?
- (5) Do you think marital rape should be punished?
- (6) Why do you think many men don't believe it when women say "no"?
- (7) Do you think a woman's saying "no" without any resistance is enough evidence for a rape charge?

- (8) Do you think women are in part responsible for being raped?
Or do you think men are totally responsible, regardless?
- (9) What do you think is the best way to prevent rape?

Opinion Samples

- (1) If a person (man or woman) is forced to have sex against his or her will - it's rape.
- (2) It's no wonder so many girls and women are raped these days. They go around without bras, wearing halters and skin-tight pants, and some of them even leave their whole midsections naked. They practically ask for it!
I'm not saying we should be easy on the rapists who commit these terrible crimes, but seeing the way some girls dress I can understand how a man can be tempted beyond his ability to control himself.
- (3) The theory that girls "ask for it" by the way they dress is not valid. Rapist are more interested in humiliating and degrading a female than in satisfying themselves sexually. Any female of any age will do.
- (4) A friend of mine was picked up and arrested for raping a 24-year-old woman he had dated twice. He had sex with her the first time he took her out. He said she was *easy*.¹¹ The second time he went out with her she gave him the *high-and-mighty*¹² routine and refused to have sex with him. He got angry, and I guess you could say he overpowered her.

¹¹ not difficult to influence or overcome, esp in a sexual manner

¹² haughty; arrogant

Now he's got a rape charge against him, which I don't think is fair. It seems to me that if she was willing to have sex with him on the first date, there is no way she could be raped by him after that.

- (5) There is no hiding a man's arousal. Usually, the female enjoys bringing it on every bit as much as the man enjoys the experience. It is all part of human nature.

The problem is that with many men there is only one way to end arousal, and that is by ejaculation. Does the female partner think the man is going to excuse himself at the height of ecstasy, go into the bathroom, and take a cold shower? **No way.**¹³ He wants the final release.

My point? I will probably get in trouble for this, but it's because I give women more credit than I give men that I can say this. If the female partner has made up her mind that there is NOT going to be penetration, she should put a stop to the proceedings at the very first sign of male arousal. A female who doesn't want the total sexual experience should still have a healthy respect for the flashing red warning light. If she goes beyond this point she could be in trouble. The notion that a woman has the right to change her mind after two hours of passionate stimulation may be legally sound but it **flies in the face of**¹⁴ the most basic facts of **procreation**¹⁵ and human biological drives.

- (6) Today some of brainless and chauvinist judges do NOT convict a man of rape because, even though the woman kept saying, "No, no," she did not fight back. How on earth

¹³ impossible

¹⁴ acts in defiance of authority, custom, etc.

¹⁵ begetting or generating offspring

could they expect the helpless woman to defend herself against the "dangerous" man? Does a woman have to be beaten to a pulp before a man is convicted of this crime? It's high time we got rid of these sexist judges so justice can be done.

- (7) Rape is not a crime of lust. It is a crime of violence. No person provokes rape by acting or dressing in a particular manner.

The rapist's motive is not sexual gratification. It is to degrade, control, and/or humiliate.

The rapist is not always a stranger. Nearly 75 percent of all rapes are committed by a friend, relative, or acquaintance.

Sex depends on consent between partners. If one doesn't consent, it's rape.

No one has the right to verbally pressure you or physically force you to have sex, even if:

He has spent a lot of money on you.

You are dressed sensually.

You have flirted or led him on.

You are high on alcohol or any other drug.

He says he is turned on and can't stop.

You have had sex with him before.

You have agreed to have sex with him and then changed your mind.

- (8) A rapist recently said the following, and from this we can learn many things about how to keep ourselves from being raped.

"If you are a working woman, I'm looking for you, and you'd better hope I don't find you. I'm a rapist. I'm not going to tell you why I'm a rapist, but I'll say this. I do it because I like it. It's like hunting, but easier.

"As I said, working women are my *game*,¹⁶ and they are usually pretty easy targets. Mostly it's because they travel by themselves, work by themselves and are so dumb about taking care of themselves.

"I live in a big city, but I often hunt in the suburbs. Small offices in big buildings or small businesses are good places to find women alone. That's where you might find me at the end of a day. Most of the time, a simple lock on the door stops me, and I stay away from places where I see people coming and going.

"I've never been caught, never even came close, and that's because I don't *take chances*.¹⁷ I don't break in to get at a woman I want. Most often I can walk right in - or she lets me in.

"The thing is that I look pretty harmless and ordinary. In fact, I try to look like I belong wherever I am. I'm neither big nor small. I'm deliberately clean cut. Nobody who knows me would think I'd do such a thing.

"Darkness is my friend, but I don't always hunt after dark. The end of the workday is my time. Everybody's too interested in getting the hell out to pay much attention to what's going on.

"Shopping centers around closing time are good, too. Many of the women I've raped came my way because they were dumb. They stayed late and parked a long way from the store. They locked their keys in their cars or left their lights on and ran the battery down.

"I pick my women because of their situation, which I've studied before I move. Looks don't mean a lot to me, but my victims are always alone in a place where nobody else

¹⁶ any object of pursuit, attack, abuse, etc.

¹⁷ risk; hazard

will come, or I get her to come to one. You'd be amazed how easy it is.

"Self-defense: Don't make me laugh. I don't go after a woman who looks like she'd be able to **ship**¹⁸ me in a fight.

"The best protection from me that you working women have is company or a locked door you're smart enough not to open when I ask. Other than that, the best protection is for you to remember there are lot of guys like me out there who are looking for you."

¹⁸ send away

At seventeen, her voice started changing -
from no to yes.

ISSUE 18

EUTHANASIA

Yesterday my father died. My immediate reaction was relief that his prolonged illness had at last ended. This poor soul had suffered a few small strokes, had Parkinson's disease and arthritis, and last fall we had to admit him to a nursing home when I could no longer care for him.

He had a tube in his stomach, a catheter from his bladder, and in his last eight months had been **back and forth to the hospital** for blood transfusions, oxygen, urinary infections, etc. The last month he no longer recognized me and was, in my opinion, 95 percent dead.

We wouldn't allow an animal to suffer this way. **If a racehorse or a dog were in pain we would put it to sleep immediately.** Why should a sick man 88 years old endure so much? Could it be so that the nursing home could collect some \$2,400 per month for his care?

He had a **Living Will** - but **this only provided that if his heart stopped there would be no heroic measures to revive him.** Why won't the medical profession let nature take its course? Why insist on prolonging a life that really is not worth living anymore?

I was told I had no choice on the feeding tube, except to decide if it went up his nose or directly into his stomach. "We can't starve a patient," the nursing home spokesperson said.

It was terrible to see Dad suffer, but I visited him every day. It was terrible to see the other patients in this nursing home crying out for help when there was nothing that could be done. Thank God it's finally over for my father. But it was the longest eight months he ever lived. When he was able to communicate

he was distressed for me to see him in this condition. Medicare can only go so far, so his savings were about depleted.

I can't feel much sadness that he's gone, only that he had to suffer so much before his heart finally stopped beating. We can only hope that something in the future will change before the rest of us have to go through the same misery. I'd do anything to prevent my family from seeing me linger that way.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) back and forth to the hospital
- (2) If a racehorse or a dog were in pain, we would put it to sleep immediately.
- (3) Living Will
- (4) this only provided that if his heart stopped there would be no heroic measures to revive him.
- (5) he was distressed for me to see him in this condition.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What was the writer's first reaction when his father died?
- (2) What diseases had his father suffered from?
- (3) Why had Dad been back and forth to the hospital during the last eight months?
- (4) How much did daddy's nursing home collect from each patient a month?
- (5) When could his living will be valid?
- (6) When dad was able to communicate, how did he feel?
- (7) Did the writer feel very sad when dad was gone?
- (8) What did the writer feel sad about?

What Do You Think?

- (1) If you had an incurable disease, would you go ahead with euthanasia?
- (2) If your child suffered from a terminal illness and he wished for euthanasia, would you accept that?
- (3) Do you think it is OK to legalize euthanasia?
- (4) What do you think God's will is, euthanasia or supporting life as long as possible?

Opinion Samples

- (1) In nursing homes we see friends and relatives in various stages of deterioration, and dread the day when we may be in a similar condition. The thought of imposing on family members or having strangers take care of us is not a pleasant one.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if there were a *hospice*¹⁹ where a person could go when all hope of independent living was gone? A place where one could voluntarily end his or her life?

I envision a place staffed with people whose duty is to talk things over with those who come and make certain those individuals fully comprehend what they are about to do. The staff would then assist them in taking the final steps. The place I envision would allow us to exit this life in a dignified, painless, and peaceful manner.

- (2) I think euthanasia is a sane, sensible, civilized alternative to existing in a nursing home, draining family resources, and hoping against hope that the end will come soon. It's too

¹⁹ hospital for dying people

bad it's against the law. One who assists in this sort of thing could be charged with murder. In fact, the doctor in Michigan who has assisted in 18 suicides has been arrested. One day, hopefully in the not-too-distant future, a person who no longer wants to go on living will be permitted to exit with grace and dignity. This would sure beat the needles, jars, tubes, and **respirators**²⁰ - to say nothing of the colossal bills - while agonized family members stand vigil at the bedside.

- (3) Is it morally defensible to deny people the opportunity to select the method and time of their own death? We have to accept doctor-assisted suicide, since it is morally wrong to force people with incurable diseases to undergo prolonged suffering.
- (4) Our present-day attitude supports "life at any cost" even if that means paying thousands of dollars a day to keep a brain-deficient premature baby alive in a hospital. We "modern" people look back on previous eras as "barbaric" because of such practices as leaving unwanted babies in the mountains to die of exposure. But was that barbaric or simply realistic? The common argument against assisted suicide is that those who help others die are **playing God**.²¹ But those who deny death to the severely ill are also playing God, a fact that does not seem to bother people as much. People who challenge contemporary thinking are often treated as being mad or dangerous. Euthanasia is a sane attitude toward human life, an alternative to the extremism of our present practices.

²⁰ apparatuses for giving artificial respiration over a long period

²¹ contending against God

- (5) The views supporting *euthanasia*²² are simply *bizarre*.²³ The first rule of medicine is "Do No Harm." What greater harm can be done by a physician than to kill his patient?

²² a gentle and painless death for a person suffering from a painful incurable disease, extreme old age, etc.

²³ strange in appearance or effect

Father, I want to get married.

No, my boy, you're not wise enough.

When will I be wise enough?

When you get rid of the idea that you want to get married.

ISSUE 19

SUICIDE

I have been planning to commit suicide for a long time. Although I haven't yet actually attempted it I have come close enough so that I no longer fear death. When the time comes I have every intention of doing it right.

When I hear of someone who has taken his or her life, I silently applaud the decision. When I hear of homeless people living in boxes under bridges, of people **who are trapped in dysfunctional bodies**, and of those who are dying a slow death and are racked with pain, I wonder why they feel that life is so precious that they want to continue to live.

Experts tell people who are **harboring suicidal thoughts** to seek professional help, but they never tell them why. **When it comes right down to it, no one is indispensable. We will all die eventually, so if life is lousy, why stick around?**

I have found that **life's trials and tribulations are not temporary. When an agonizing situation ends a new one pops up to take its place.** I no longer believe that God does not give us more trouble than we can endure or a heavier load than we can carry. Often people who are crushed by life's cruel blows opt for **sleeping pills, a rope, or a bullet in the brain.** I see nothing wrong with that. The only reason I am still alive is because I am waiting for my elderly mother to die. She is the only person in my life I care enough about not to hurt. When she goes, I go.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) who are trapped in dysfunctional bodies
- (2) harboring suicidal thoughts
- (3) When it comes right down to it, no one is indispensable.
- (4) We will all die eventually, so if life is lousy, why stick around?
- (5) life's trials and tribulations are not temporary.
- (6) When an agonizing situation ends a new one pops up to take its place.
- (7) sleeping pills
- (8) a rope
- (9) a bullet in the brain.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What does the writer think when she hears about other people's suicides?
- (2) What does she think when she sees people in trouble?
- (3) What do experts advise people with suicidal thoughts to do?
- (4) Does the writer believe the troubles in life are temporary?
- (5) Why is the writer still alive?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Talk about why adults commit suicide.
- (2) Talk about why children commit suicide.
- (3) If you knew a man who really wanted to attempt suicide, would you say, "Go ahead?" How could you persuade him not to attempt it?
- (4) If you saw someone trying to commit suicide, what would you do?
- (6) What do you think makes people hesitate to kill themselves even though they're having suicidal thoughts?

Opinion Samples

- (1) The fact that people live in boxes under bridges and suffer terminal diseases is the best evidence that even under the worst conditions life is precious. Otherwise, why would they want to go on? Even though life may be painful and depressing, hope springs eternally that things will get better. Many people who were *hell-bent*²⁴ on killing themselves have changed their minds and decided to give life one more shot, and are thankful that they did.
- (2) Suicide is a permanent solution to what may be a temporary problem. Once you cross that great abyss there is no coming back. Even those who suffer from terrible illness, such as cancer or AIDS, say they want to die with dignity. They want to thank family members and friends who stood by them and offered unconditional love and emotional support. How much more compassionate (and classy) that is than blowing your brains out and leaving the carnage to be discovered by a spouse or a dear friend.
- (3) I understand some of the reasons people want to commit suicide. For example, they are suffering from depression and have problems that seem overwhelming. But many of them who really attempt suicide fail to end their lives and then have emotional and physical scars they have to live with for the rest of their lives. Remember there is always a rainbow after the storm. And a rainbow is God's promise that there will be many beautiful days ahead.

²⁴ stubbornly or recklessly determined

- (4) Suicide has never solved any problem. It only creates others. Granted, there are times when you feel so worthless that you don't want to be a burden to others. But don't run off and be alone. Run to a phone and get some help. The line that is repeated most often is this: "If he had only known what his death would do to us, he never would have done it."
- (5) The pressure to succeed academically is really heavy. Teens are forced to strive to gain acceptance by top-class universities. It's especially tough if their fathers or mothers went to these schools. Life in an affluent suburb is often lonely. The parents are involved in demanding careers. They travel a lot and almost never do things together with the family. The fact that many more teen-age suicides occur in *well-to-do*²⁵ areas than lower-middle-class neighborhoods proves that most rich kids are more seriously troubled than poor ones.
- (6) Some authorities believe that a person who is bent on destroying himself will do so and no amount of loving or caring can prevent it. They say suicidal personalities have a fragile link in the psychic chain that cannot be reached or repaired. Often there is no hint, no signal that they need help. The person who swallows a handful of pills, just enough to punish an indifferent spouse or an unfaithful lover, doesn't really want to die. He's signaling for help. But the one who takes 100 pills, uses a revolver, or jumps off a bridge unseen, is another story.

²⁵ prosperous; wealthy

- (7) Ten years ago, everything hit me from all sides. I became depressed and suicidal and started to plan my own death. I attempted to kill myself in March, but a motel attendant saved me.

I came out of the hospital still determined to end my life. I began saving prescription pills. When I went to church in search of answers, I would look around to see if there was a way I might hang myself from the ceiling. In June, I headed for a small town where I thought I would not be found and took 300 prescription pills with me.

A friend traced me to the motel. Three other friends flew up and talked me into going to the hospital. I walked into that hospital with the 300 prescription pills, determined to kill myself there.

While seated in the lobby with other patients, I picked up a Reader's Digest and opened it without looking at the index. The article I saw was entitled "Before You Kill Yourself." It gave several reasons to choose life over suicide. God, friends and that article in Reader's Digest saved me.

He's still single.

Every time he was ready to get married, the price of rice went up.

ISSUE 20

THE RIGHTS OF THE DEAD

How much indignity should human remains be allowed to suffer - even **for the cause of science**? That ancient debate was renewed last week by the disclosure that Germany's Heidelberg University had, for the past two decades, wired electronic sensors to more than 200 human corpses (including the bodies of eight children), strapped them into cars, and hurled them at speeds of 48 km/h into walls, barriers, and other vehicles.

Society has always been reluctant to tolerate research on corpses, **allowing it only when it serves to illuminate the unknown and improve medical science**. But what if the purpose of desecrating the dead is to learn how to make a better Volkswagen?

Germans are not alone in testing corpses in car crashes. During the past 20 years, the French carmaker Renault said about 450 corpses had been used in accident simulations in France. And since the 1940s, cadavers have been crash-tested in the U.S.

Statistics, at least, seem to justify the use of cadavers. Despite a nearly 75% increase in the number of cars on the road during the past 20 years, the **vehicle fatality rate** in the U.S. has decreased more than half. Much of that improvement is due to the introduction of such devices as seat belts, air bags, safer windshields, and stronger doors - all of which were developed with the aid of crash dummies. "My research with children's corpses helps to save lives," Heidelberg researcher Dimitrios Kallieris told the German newspaper Bild. **"Anyone who has seen smashed children in an accident will understand what is at stake."**

What Does It Mean?

- (1) for the cause of science
- (2) allowing it only when it serves to illuminate the unknown and improve medical science
- (3) vehicle fatality rate
- (4) Anyone who has seen smashed children in an accident will understand what is at stake.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Which countries have done such experiments?
- (2) What kinds of experiment have they done with corpses?
- (3) When does society usually allow research on corpses?
- (4) How do statistics show that the research on corpses is valuable in making safer cars?
- (5) How do researchers justify their experiments?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think it is ethically right to use corpses to make better cars?
- (2) For medical purposes, doctors perform dissections. What's the difference between medical-purpose dissections and industrial-purpose experiments on corpses?
- (3) Which is more important, the rights of the dead or the safety of living people?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Experiments with children's bodies are ethically unacceptable. They are repugnant to the conscience and have no moral justification under any circumstances.

- (2) Whether or not the dead have rights is not the issue. Using corpses in any experiment is not the thing human beings should do. Nothing can justify these experiments.
- (3) Nobody can deny these experiments have helped make cars safer. Without them, we could not have improved car manufacturing technology. We must be pragmatic.

Wife: Mother says she nearly died laughing over those stories you told her.

Husband: Where is she? I'll tell her some funnier ones.

ISSUE 21

DEATH-BED CONFESSIONS

My husband and I have been married for 61 years. We had a good marriage - not without problems, but **it was solid**, and there were more good times than bad.

Two months ago John suffered a massive heart attack. For several days **he hovered between life and death**. **The priest was called in to give the last rites**. That same night John said he had something he wanted to tell me. He confessed an affair he had during World War II. He was 23 years old at the time, and we had been married only 15 months. Although he saw the girl only twice, hearing about it broke my heart.

John made a miraculous recovery and is gardening as I write this. Whenever I look at him I think of his unfaithfulness, and it makes me sad. Perhaps people should not make death-bed confessions.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) death-bed confessions
- (2) The priest was called in to give the last rites.
- (3) it was solid,
- (4) he hovered between life and death.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) How long have they been married?
- (2) How was the marriage?
- (3) What happened two months ago?

- (4) What did he confess when he was on the brink of death?
- (5) How is he now?
- (6) How does she feel when she sees her husband?
- (7) What does she think about death-bed confessions?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Would you confess any affairs to your spouse if you were dying?
- (2) Could you forgive your spouse at the death-bed if you heard about an affair?
- (3) Dying people may get some therapeutic effect by confessing some secret episodes, but the survivors are often hurt. Which effect is more important?
- (4) Talk about why people should be honest if they are dying?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Such confessions (even made in good health) may be **therapeutic**²⁶ for the confessor, but they seldom help the one who has to listen. Confessions of **marital infidelity**²⁷ are **ill-advised**,²⁸ and are neither wise nor productive. The people who want to clear their consciences should tell their clergyman, not their loved one.

²⁶ pertaining to the treating or curing of disease

²⁷ marital disloyalty; adultery

²⁸ done without due consideration; imprudent

- (2) Dying people tend to be honest and they usually confess what they feel guilty about. The survivors should respect their last wish to be honest and let them confess anything which has been bothering them.

She doesn't have the figure for a bikini - just the nerve.

ISSUE 22

A LIFE FOR A LIFE

Protesters outside the university of Pittsburgh Medical Center carried signs reading **ANIMALS ARE NOT EXPENDABLE**. But for the 35-year-old man recovering inside, the choice had been between life and death. In an 11-hour operation, the **unidentified patient** received a new liver to replace his own, ravaged by hepatitis B. Since the virus would also have destroyed a replacement human liver, doctors transplanted the new organ from a baboon.

It was hardly the first time a human had received an animal transplant; kidneys and hearts have been shifted from chimpanzees, baboons and monkeys into people for decades, though never successfully. What may make the difference this time is a new, experimental antirejection drug known as FK-506; doctors hope **it will keep the recipient's immune system from attacking the new liver as a foreign object**. Though the patient had symptoms of a mild rejection reaction by week's end, it wasn't considered serious. Otherwise, said a hospital spokeswoman, "He's doing really well. It's almost scary."

If this works, it may lead to a more widespread use of animal organs. Dr. Thomas Starzl, who pioneered animal-human transplants and who supervised this operation, acknowledged the concerns of animal-rights activists but said, "Our passion and our commitment are to human beings."

What Does It Mean?

- (1) ANIMALS ARE NOT EXPENDABLE.
- (2) unidentified patient
- (3) it will keep the recipient's immune system from attacking the new liver as a foreign object.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What did the protesters' sign say?
- (2) What was wrong with the patient?
- (3) Why have all animal transplants failed?
- (4) What is the difference this time?
- (5) What is expected to happen if this case proves successful?
- (6) What do the concerned doctors worry about?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Is it justified to kill an animal such as baboon to save a man?
- (2) Some people are against killing animals for medical purposes. Do you think their opinion would remain unchanged if one of their close family members were in critical condition but could be saved with a new organ from a baboon?
- (3) What's the difference between killing animals for food and killing them for medical purposes?
- (4) What do you think about killing and eating plants?
- (5) Do you think animals can feel pain and other emotions?
- (6) Do you think plants can?

Opinion Samples

- (1) One wonders if any of the demonstrators who carried the poster and decried the transplant of a baboon liver to save the life of a 35-year-old man would still hold such a poster if the patient were their own five-year-old child. I'm glad they are not my parents.
- (2) The killing of an innocent baboon in order to conduct an experiment in saving a human being is the epitome of exploitation and greed. Because animals cannot speak up and are helpless to protect themselves, they are somehow considered less important than humans. As cohabitants of this planet, we have a moral obligation to question science and recognize that there should be limits to the harm man can inflict on nature. There is a desperate need to reform the health-care industry and educate the public about preventive medicine and organ donation.
- (3) Today's advanced technologies have brought viable alternatives to using animals for research. Science has shown that much animal experimentation is not only duplicative and unproductive, but is also old-fashioned and should be phased out because up-to-date, sophisticated methods of biomedical research are available for use right now.
Computer and mathematical and mechanical models can be used to simulate many physiological systems. In-vitro research utilize cell tissue and organ cultures, bacteria and other micro-organisms. Chemical and physical systems such as enzymes, artificial membranes and robots serve as alternatives. Even plants make useful and inexpensive research tools.

These are the procedures that will give the most benefits to both people and animals because they are more accurate and reliable than animal experimentation, and eliminate needless cruelty. They also can save the taxpayers a bundle.

ISSUE 23

STATE MATCHMAKING

In its effort at social engineering to build the perfect society, Singapore has, among other things, banned chewing gum, run campaigns encouraging people to smile, and passed edicts to stop children from climbing trees. Since 1984 the Social Development Unit, a government agency, has even attempted to create smarter Singaporeans. The forum was launched to redress a vexing imbalance: too few bright Singaporean men and women seemed interested in marrying each other, preferring either to wed intellectual inferiors or not to marry at all. Fearing the trend pointed inexorably in the direction of dullardism, **the government decided to play Cupid** by organizing dances for eligible college graduates. The SDU, though, quickly earned a reputation among critics as the port of last resort for the "Single, Desperate and Ugly." But the **state matchmakers are catching on**: more than half of Singapore's graduate men now marry graduate women - an increase of nearly 25% since 1984.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) the government decided to play Cupid
- (2) state matchmakers are catching on:

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Why did the Singapore government start state matchmaking?
- (2) What reputation has the government earned by getting involved in dating?

- (3) What has been the result of state matchmaking so far?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think matchmaking is something that a government should engage in?
(2) Discuss the immediate side effects of state matchmaking.

Opinion Samples

- (1) I don't think it's a good idea for government to intervene in private life, even though it may bring some good results. If the government promotes elite matchmaking, the other so-called "inferior" people feel resentful about it, and the policy might *backfire*.²⁹
- (2) What is the purpose of the state? It puts its top *priority*³⁰ on development. State matchmaking is well designed to help promote national, cultural and economical power as well as individual well-being. So it is an excellent example of governmental power. There is no reason to be against it.

²⁹ produce an unexpected and unwanted result esp for the people responsible for the action

³⁰ importance according to rank; that which is regarded as more important than others

ISSUE 24

SELF-AWARDED GIFTS

I recently heard of a woman who bought herself a pair of expensive diamond earrings for Mother's Day because the previous year her husband gave her nothing.

What's the idea of awarding oneself a "gift"? To me, **this is about on a par with certain foreign dictators who cover their chests with medals and decorations. Assuming she did it to make a point**, wouldn't a card and flowers have made it without **breaking the budget**?

I was married for 14 years to a woman who never gave me a chance to buy her anything. She'd buy herself gifts (usually jewelry) on credit, using my name and credit references, as much as two months before the date to be celebrated. I would never have forgotten her birthday or our anniversary, but **she took no chances. I am far from being a cheapskate**, but because she always selected her own gifts **I was cheated out of the pleasure I would have had, had I been allowed to do the buying and giving myself.**

What Does It Mean?

- (1) this is about on a par with certain foreign dictators who cover their chests with medals and decorations.
- (2) Assuming she did it to make a point,
- (3) breaking the budget
- (4) she took no chances.
- (5) I am far from being a cheapskate,
- (6) I was cheated out of the pleasure I would have had, had I been allowed to do the buying and giving myself.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) Why did the woman buy herself expensive diamond earrings?
- (2) What does the writer think about the self-awarded gift?
- (3) What did the writer's wife do for special days?
- (4) Did he ever forget her birthday or anniversary?

What Do You Think?

- (1) What do you think about self-awarded gifts?
- (2) If your husband forgot to buy you something on special days, would you get yourself a gift?
- (3) What kind of gift do you like to receive on your birthday or wedding anniversary?
- (4) On wedding anniversaries men usually buy something for wives, so do you think it is fair that women do not buy anything for men?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Some men do not like to shop and appreciate being relieved of the chore. But a wife should not take over the chore of buying her own gift unless her husband tells her to.
- (2) If a husband forgets to buy a gift for his wife, self-awarding is a good idea. Then a wife can get what she wants without causing her husband any difficulty in gift selection.

ISSUE 25

A DEPOSITION

My employer is being sued for **sexual harassment**. I, and at least a dozen other employees, must give a **deposition** very soon. We have discussed whether or not to tell what we have seen but fear losing our jobs. Many of us would like to see the company atmosphere improve, but **we are afraid to come forward**.

The executives, from the top on down (including the head of personnel), have harassed some women and created a hostile environment here. **The woman who is suing was terminated** for refusing to have sexual relations with some top male executives.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) sexual harassment
- (2) deposition
- (3) we are afraid to come forward.
- (4) The woman who is suing was terminated

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What are the employees expected to do?
- (2) What did they discuss?
- (3) Are they willing to tell the truth?
- (4) What are they afraid of?
- (5) What did the company executives do to some women?
- (6) Why was the woman terminated?

What Do You Think?

- (1) If you were fired for not having sex with a company executive, would you go to court?
- (2) Would you tell the truth about the fired fellow worker in court, even though you were liable to be fired?
- (3) If a person lied in court for fear of losing his job, should we criticize him for lying?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Lying is the last thing for me to do. I'd rather be honest than retain my job by lying in court. Because I know from experience that if I lied against my conscience I would feel distressed for a long time, perhaps throughout my life. And the pain would be stronger than any satisfaction I obtained from lying.
- (2) We all know that honesty is a good thing. But we have no right to criticize people who lied to keep their jobs. The job and family support might be more important to them than the truth.
- (3) I think lying is bad even if one's job were threatened by high-ranking officials. Truth comes before a job. How can we lie for the people in trouble? If I lost my job because I told the truth in court I wouldn't care because I wouldn't feel guilty at least, and I would be able to get another job anyway.

ISSUE 26

GUN CONTROL

Two young boys - no older than 14 - came into our shop yesterday. One pointed a gun at us. The gun did not look real, but **who wants to take a chance?** We had only \$35 and some change in the cash register. Had it not been for the gun, **Susan and I would have been a match for them.** One of the boys dangled two shoelaces and wanted to tie our hands. I figured it would take about two minutes to break the laces, and nobody would get hurt - if the gun were not real.

Well, **Susan got real steamed and was ready to crown them,** but I told her to relax. They tied our hands behind our backs and told us to wait five minutes. Our mouths were taped and we were bound hand-and-foot, then dragged into a dressing room. It was two hours before a customer came and released us.

Susan is furious with me. She says we allowed a couple of punks to humiliate us; we never should have let them tie our hands in the first place, etc. I didn't enjoy being tied up either, but I think my judgment was sound.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) who wants to take a chance?
- (2) Susan and I would have been a match for them.
- (3) Susan got real steamed and was ready to crown them

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What happened yesterday?
- (2) Was the robber's gun real?
- (3) If the robbers had not had a gun, what would have happened?
- (4) Did the robbers bind the hands of Susan and the writer very tightly?
- (5) How long were Susan and the writer left bound hand-and-foot?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think Susan is right?
- (2) Do you think having a gun is an effective way of defending yourself?
- (3) Do you think a pro-gun policy encourages crime or discourages it?
- (4) Even if the government stopped selling guns, criminals would be able to get guns anyway and only the ordinary people would have no access to any weapons. Do you think that's fair?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Susan and the writer only lost \$35 and suffered the indignity of being trussed like a couple of chickens. But if they had challenged the boy holding the gun (regardless of his tender age), they could have been casualties. The writer's having insisted on complying with the youthful robbers' demand may have saved Susan's life - as well as the writer's

- (2) Allowing people to buy guns to protect themselves is like washing off blood with blood. Although total disarmament seems to be the only intelligent solution, how is this possible when the "bad guys" will always find a way to get a gun?
- (3) It is not easy to persuade people to give up ownership of guns. Education could be used to solve this problem, although it will take time. High levels of government should focus on the supply and demand of handguns. Gun control has to be backed up by legislation and enforcement. Of course, gun lovers may believe they have a right to protect themselves with handguns, but they must know they don't have a right to abuse freedom.
- (4) The total ban on firearms is always observed only by law-abiding citizens: the bad guys will always own and use guns anyway. Laws do not work to prevent nut cases. There will always be idiots. Foolproof laws do not exist. We need a weapon for self-defense.
- (5) Americans are the only people who support the right to own a gun rather than the right to walk safely along the street or to feel secure in their home. It seems that human life no longer has any value. However, anyone who violates another person's basic right to life should suffer the death penalty. Prevention begins with education, classes on handling life stresses and humane solutions for problems. Guns serve only two purposes - to kill and maim. Weapons belong in the hands of law enforcers or those who are responsible enough to have a license. Guns should be limited to those who know how to use them properly - and not on each other.

(6) I demand the right to protect myself and my family with the best means available - a gun. The state has no right to remove an object from an individual just because someone somewhere may misuse it. Those who believe that the government has this right and who are really intent on saving lives should mount a campaign to force young people under the age of 25 to give up their cars.

(7) A delusion persists that a gun is an effective method of self-defense. The fact is that a gun is often useless.

Guns are the weapons of choice for criminals because there is no effective defense against a gun. The criminal combines distance and surprise, and bang, you're dead before you can reach that gun you kept handy for self-defense.

Some people's fantasy is that if someone threatens to harm them, they will grab their gun and shoot him. Sorry, it almost never happens that way. The reason it makes the news when an intruder does get killed is because it occurs so rarely.

If the possession of guns by law-abiding citizens prevented crimes, we would be a crime-free country. So many law-abiding citizens have guns that a criminal should be afraid to enter a home or a business for fear of being shot. So why are they not afraid? Criminals know your gun is no threat. Remember, distance and surprise. Bang you're dead. You never had a chance to reach that gun.

Another fantasy is, if only someone had a gun when that gunman shot those people in the train, or the school, or the food place! Wrong again. He got his shot off before anyone could react. Remember - distance and surprise. I guarantee that someone close did have a gun. But the gunman fired and was gone before that person could get it.

out of **the pocket, the** purse, the glove compartment, or the drawer.

All pro-gun **people who** insist there should be no restrictions on the **sale, possession,** or ownership of guns and bullets are guilty of **enabling** criminals to arm themselves. They've put so **many guns into** the hands of criminals already that the only **solution is to stop** the sale of guns and bullets altogether.

Does your wife object to your smoking in the house?

She objects to my smoking anywhere.

She says it's too expensive having both of us do it.

ISSUE 27

ENVIRONMENTAL HOLOCAUST

The alarming rate of ozone destruction presents a man-made environmental holocaust. **Within a short time span** industrialized societies have rapidly progressed with a **reckless disregard for the damage** they have caused to the **vulnerable ecosystem**. Just as history will remember the folly of our generation for spending massive amounts out of limited resources to stockpile weapons of destruction instead of solving problems such as poverty, hunger, and homelessness, so will this generation be remembered for leaving a huge hole at each end of the globe as its **legacy** to future generations. What angers me is the **nonchalant attitude** among the leading industrialized governments instead of taking **draconian measures** to halt ozone destruction. Do we have to wait for the holes to be so large that the leaders can see them from their homes?

It is only natural for developed nations to pursue material comfort, but the price of an elevated standard of living is the sacrifice of a clean and habitable environment. Industrialization has turned us into careless children. We fill our air and water with poison. We destroy our forests and oceans, and instead of saving our valuable resources for future generations we scatter them to the winds. Many birds and animals are threatened with **extinction** because of pollution and **residual pesticide contamination**. It is impossible to overemphasize how important the environment is to our existence. The only choice is to lower our living standard and recover the clean environment that we used to enjoy.

With overpopulation off the agenda, the Earth

Summit was a hollow shell. The meddling of conservative religious factions in this matter is a travesty. Five hundred million women in the developing world want access to family planning but are denied this basic human right. There are other forces opposing population stabilization - corporations and developers who encourage rampant growth, and leaders who wish to obtain short-term gains from unsustainable growth.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) Within a short time span
- (2) reckless disregard for the damage
- (3) vulnerable ecosystem
- (4) legacy
- (5) nonchalant attitude
- (6) draconian measures
- (7) extinction
- (8) With overpopulation off the agenda, the Earth Summit was a hollow shell.
- (9) The meddling of conservative religious factions in this matter is a travesty.
- (10) Five hundred million women in the developing world want access to family planning but are denied this basic human right.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) On what has mankind spent massive resources?
- (2) Are industrialized nations interested in halting ozone

depletion?

- (3) What is the price of the material comforts that developed nations have pursued?
- (4) What is pushing birds and animals toward extinction?
- (5) What is the only choice to make our environment clean enough to enjoy?
- (6) Was the overpopulation issue included in the Earth Summit?
- (7) What are two problems in curbing overpopulation?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Would you accept a tax increase to clean up the earth?
- (2) What do you think is the first step toward a clean environment?
- (3) Talk about some ways to reduce pollution.
- (4) Would you accept lowering your living standard in return for a clean environment?
- (5) Talk about ways to control overpopulation.
- (6) Why are corporations and political leaders opposed to population stabilization?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Overpopulation is the ultimate source of all pollution. Pollution begins with the struggle for existence or a better life. If we reduce overall population, we can limit the activities which naturally lead to pollution. Therefore, we should legalize abortion for the welfare of mothers as well as children. If unwanted babies are born, they will share the filthy environment equally with the rest of us.
- (2) We pollute the air and the water to make a few dollars' profit. In figuring manufacturing costs we tend not to consider the

expenses caused by pollution clean-up. If we made the genuine long-term-effect calculations on pollution-causing products, the current production cost formula would be rewritten.

- (3) I worry about the way we are killing our planet and destroying the environment.

What is going to save us?

The answer is clear: We must change a great many things about our everyday lives in order to save ourselves.

Do you know that **disposable**³¹ diapers contribute heavily to our country's landfills? Disposable diapers containing polypropylene and wood pulp fiber can take as long as 500 years to decompose.

My family and I are committed to change. We take every aluminum can and glass bottle in sight and all newspapers and cardboard to our neighborhood recycling center. I let the car sit in the garage and take public transportation to work at least twice a week. We will have two children and no more, although we always wanted a large family. I know if enough people care we can save our planet.

³¹ designed to be thrown away after a single use

ISSUE 28

WHAT IS EVERYTHING IN LIFE?

My husband is probably one of the guys people admire. We have moved six times in 10 years, always for a better paying, more **prestigious job**. But each move requires establishing new friendships and becoming part of the community. I dream of staying in one place long enough for my children to develop ongoing relationships, but I know this will never happen.

We drive a **BMW**, which some people admire as a **status symbol**. Actually, we have two of them. My husband seems satisfied with his job, his salary, and the city we live in, and is lucky that I am committed to keeping our family life strong and loving. **But some days I feel like throwing in the towel.**

What Does It Mean?

- (1) prestigious job
- (2) BMW
- (3) status symbol.
- (4) But some days I feel like throwing the towel.

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What kind of person is her husband?
- (2) How many times have they moved in the last 10 years?
- (3) Why have they moved so often?
- (4) What does each move require of them?
- (5) What does she dream of?

- (6) What kind of car do they drive?
- (7) Does her husband seem satisfied with his job?
- (8) What does she think about her current life?
- (9) Why does she say her husband is lucky?
- (10) Does she think she can continue her present life style?

What Do You Think?

- (1) What do you think is the most important thing in life?
- (2) Do you think money can guarantee happiness in life?
- (3) Do you want to live in the city, in the suburbs, or in the country?
- (4) What kind of car do you want to drive?
- (5) What are your priorities in choosing a car?
(design / color / price / fuel-efficiency / make)
- (6) If you were driving for the first time, which would you prefer - a new or used car?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Happiness is the most important thing in my life. Happiness itself can be defined differently by different people. We all know our desire for material things is endless, and people pursuing material things can never be satisfied since they get sick of the material wealth they have just gotten. Suppose you were a billionaire, how much could you spend in a day? Maybe you could go crazy thinking of the ways to spend the money. Imagine you are at a buffet, which means that you have free access to every kind of food and you have the "right" to consume all of it. Could you eat all the dishes on the table? You know you can just consume only limited amounts. The same is true about money.

Real happiness is not bought but is felt. People tend to feel happy when they have new things. But the reality doesn't last for a long time. If you want to have a feeling of happiness, you should find it with the things you have. You should feel happy with your family and friends to talk to, mountains to climb, three meals a day, work to do, etc. If you can't find any happiness in these small things, you can never feel happy with anything.

- (2) I know money doesn't guarantee happiness. Here's my story.

A few years ago I shocked my friends and family when I broke my engagement to a well-educated millionaire business executive to marry a construction worker. Why? Because he's kind, honest and totally lovable.

My high-school dropout can fix plumbing, tune up a car, build a house, and grow enough vegetables to feed an army. He can cook and clean like a pro, and comes home whistling every evening without stopping at a bar.

The stories he tells me about his day at the construction site are far more interesting than my day on Wall Street. This man won't grow soft and flabby sitting behind a desk all day, and he won't get a stress-related illness or have an affair with his secretary. And if we have children, he won't be too busy to spend time with his family.

He never knew what happiness was until he married her -
now it's too late.

ISSUE 29

PREVENTING DRUNK DRIVING

Should a person turn in another person - a friend or spouse - for drunk driving? For example, you know that this person is out getting drunk and plans to drive home. Should you phone the police and tell them where this person is and describe the kind of car he's driving, so he can be followed, pulled over, and arrested?

Or must the drunk driver commit some kind of traffic violation before he can be pulled over, made to walk a straight line, have his breath tested, and all that?

I am just a good citizen who wants to remove someone from the streets temporarily before that person removes someone from the earth permanently.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) Should a person turn in another person - a friend or spouse - for drunk driving?
- (2) made to walk a straight line,

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) When the police stop a suspect for drunk driving, what are some ways of telling whether or not the driver is *inebriated*³²?
- (2) What is the main reason the writer wants to call the police?

³² drunk or intoxicated

What Do You Think?

- (1) Do you think the writer is a good citizen?
- (2) Is calling the police justifiable to prevent someone from driving drunk?
- (3) Would you turn in your friends or family members if they were driving drunk?
- (4) If someone you knew well reported you to the police because you were driving drunk, would you be angry or thankful?
- (5) Did you ever drive drunk?
- (6) Talk about the penalties drunk drivers deserve.
- (7) How can we possibly discourage people from driving drunk?

Opinion Samples

- (1) Calling the police when someone is driving drunk should not only be morally acceptable but is also the best way to prevent a serious accident. The likely fatal result dwarfs the one-time punishment for drunk driving, and the punishment may serve to discourage further incident.
- (2) Call the police if your friend is driving drunk? That's nonsense. I don't mean to say drunk driving is OK. But by calling the police you betray your friend. If your friend is drunk, you can drive him instead of letting him drive. That is simpler and safer than involving the cops.
- (3) The penalty for drunk drivers is too minimal to discourage them. If anyone is caught for driving drunk, he must be permanently deprived of his right to drive. If faced with harsh penalties, no one would dare to think of driving drunk. We all know drunk driving is a murderous act and that the drunk driver is ready to kill anyone on the road or street.

ISSUE 30

ZOO

Today, many zoo managers are concerned that the zoo, as an institution for research, education and preservation, is becoming as endangered as some of the animals it houses. Financial support has dropped, and costs keep climbing. Rising too is the clamor from critics, who claim that zoos are no better than prisons, designed for the amusement of mindless gawkers. The more militant activists want to shut zoos down altogether.

The globe is losing valuable species day by day; 20% to 50% of the world's **biological diversity** may be gone before the end of the next century, and the irony is that human beings will have contributed overwhelmingly to that loss. The human population is expected nearly to double within the next few decades. For third world **agrarian economies** especially, the competition for space and resources will grow during this "demographic winter," and the losers will be the wild animals.

What Does It Mean?

- (1) biological diversity
- (2) agrarian economies

Comprehension Check-Up

- (1) What are zoo managers concerned about today?
- (2) What do critics think about zoos?
- (3) How much is the biological diversity expected to become extinct by the next century?

- (4) What is mainly responsible for that loss?

What Do You Think?

- (1) Is it morally justifiable to confine animals just for fun, or for that matter, in the name of research, education, or preservation?
- (2) The zoo animals are well provided with food and don't have to worry about being eaten by other animals. Do you think they feel happy? Or are they continuously under the stress?
- (3) Which do you think is better - to confine animals in a designated area to prevent them from becoming extinct or to leave them in a wild condition whether they become extinct or not?

Opinion Samples

- (1) I believe zoo keepers are guilty of "speciesism," the counterpart to racism. Animals are no different from people and should be treated accordingly. There really is no rational reason for saying a human being has special rights. My credo is "A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy."

This means that incarceration in a penned environment inflicts unacceptable psychological and even physical harm on animals. Such treatment cannot be justified by any beneficial service that zoos perform.

Is it really better to confine a few hapless mountain gorillas in a zoo than to permit the species to become extinct? If it is true that we are inevitably moving toward a world in which mountain gorillas can survive only in zoos, then we must ask whether it is really better for them to live in artificial environments of our design than to disappear.

- (2) The **animal-rights** activists are unrealistic and biologically naive. **They are taking** human moral precepts and trying to apply them to animals. That view may have some merit when **focused on domestic** and farm creatures and even on the **plight of laboratory** animals, but it has no place in wildlife conservation. **We are** trying to save animals from extinction. The **best response** to this depletion is controlled breeding in captivity.
- (3) No matter **how humane** a zoo is, captivity is always cruel. **Wild animals belong** in the wild, not in cages. If people want to **learn more** about animals they should watch National Geographic or other wildlife specials on television.
- (4) The **activist position** against the existence of zoos is distressing. Zoos are wonderful sanctuaries and the last safe haven for **precious, endangered** species. It would be disastrous to shut them down.
- (5) The main concern of animal-right activists is that animals be permitted to roam free in their natural habitat instead of being confined in a protected environment. But how free can an animal be, even in its own surroundings, when it is continuously threatened by man? This planet cannot afford the extinction of more species, but exactly that will occur if these animals are set free and left uncared for. It is not a crime to keep animals in wildlife reserves as long as the main objective is to care for them and allow them to live naturally.

WHAT DO YOU THINK?(1)

초판 4쇄 인쇄 : 2004년 7월 5일 인쇄

초판 4쇄 발행 : 2004년 7월 10일 발행

지 은 이 : 리스 코리아 편집부 &

DUANE VORHEES

펴 낸 곳 : 리스 코리아

펴 낸 이 : 최 승 신

등록 : 경기 남양주 제 17호

전화 : (0502) 423-7947

팩스 : (0502) 423-7948

가격 : 9,000원

잘못된 책은 바꿔드립니다.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing of the Publisher.