

## The Root of Inequality #1

In July 1972, I was walking \_\_\_\_\_ a beach of New Guinea \_\_\_\_\_ a man called Yali. He asked me, “Why you white men have so much cargo, and we New Guineans have so \_\_\_\_\_?” New Guineans use the word “cargo” to \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ goods \_\_\_\_\_ country by Westerners. His question was simply about the roots of inequality around the world. He \_\_\_\_\_ know why some countries are \_\_\_\_\_ than others.

The \_\_\_\_\_ explanations were already clear. Europeans developed guns, \_\_\_\_\_ and steel \_\_\_\_\_ the world did. But that doesn’t fully answer his question. The \_\_\_\_\_ how they developed these \_\_\_\_\_ first place. Why was it Europe that first \_\_\_\_\_ to military power, \_\_\_\_\_ diseases and advanced technologies? I had no idea \_\_\_\_\_. Since then, I \_\_\_\_\_ this question for 25 years and now I think I know the answer.

In July 1972, I was walking along a beach of New Guinea with a man called Yali. He asked me, “Why you white men have so much cargo, and we New Guineans have so little?” New Guineans use the word “cargo” to describe the material goods brought to their country by Westerners. His question was simply about the roots of inequality around the world. He wanted to know why some countries are wealthier than others. The immediate explanations were already clear. Europeans developed guns, germs and steel before other parts of the world did. But that doesn’t fully answer his question. The point is how they developed these advantages in the first place. Why was it Europe that first gained access to military power, lethal diseases and advanced technologies? I had no idea what that answer was. Since then, I have worked on this question for 25 years and now I think I know the answer.

describe	描写する、言い表す	germ	細菌、病原菌
inequality	不平等、不均衡	in the first place	そもそも、まず第一に
wealthy	裕福な	lethal	致死的な
immediate	即座の、直接の		

## The Root of Inequality #2

Probably the most \_\_\_\_\_ explanation is that the \_\_\_\_\_ is the result of biological differences between \_\_\_\_\_. Europeans who colonized New Guinea in the 19th century believed that the power and \_\_\_\_\_ were \_\_\_\_\_ by race. They thought they were genetically \_\_\_\_\_ to local New Guineans. To them, it was natural that Europeans were culturally more \_\_\_\_\_ native population simply because they were more \_\_\_\_\_. But this answer is not just \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_. There is no firm evidence of genetic differences in \_\_\_\_\_ ability among peoples of different races or cultures.

If there is no genetic difference \_\_\_\_\_ ability between races, why did some cultures develop \_\_\_\_\_? The answer, I believe, is geography. Some parts of the world \_\_\_\_\_ more \_\_\_\_\_ environment for \_\_\_\_\_. Geography determined the \_\_\_\_\_ human \_\_\_\_\_. So, if New Guineans had enjoyed the same geographic \_\_\_\_\_ as Europeans, they \_\_\_\_\_ the ones to \_\_\_\_\_ guns, \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_.

Probably the most familiar explanation is that the inequality is the result of biological differences between races. Europeans who colonized New Guinea in the 19th century believed that the power and wealth were determined by race. They thought they were genetically superior to local New Guineans. To them, it was natural that Europeans were culturally more advanced than native population simply because they were more intelligent. But this answer is not just arrogant, but it is also wrong. There is no firm evidence of genetic differences in intellectual ability among peoples of different races or cultures. If there is no genetic difference in our ability between races, why did some cultures develop faster than others? The answer, I believe, is geography. Some parts of the world have had more suitable environment for prosperity. Geography determined the fate of human societies. So, if New Guineans had enjoyed the same geographic advantages as Europeans, they would have been the ones to Invent guns, steam engines and the internet.

biological	生物学的な	geography	地理、地理学
colonize	植民地化する	suitable	適した、ふさわしい
superior	より優れた、勝っている	prosperity	繁栄、成功
intelligent	知的な、知能が高い	determine	左右する、決定する
arrogant	傲慢な、横柄な	steam engine	蒸気機関

## The Root of Inequality #3

Human history \_\_\_\_\_ several millions years, and most of the time our \_\_\_\_\_ as hunter-gatherers. They made their living by running across \_\_\_\_\_ to hunt wild animals and walking \_\_\_\_\_ the woods to gather wild food plants. Around ten thousand years ago, some people began \_\_\_\_\_.

Agriculture was a very \_\_\_\_\_ phenomenon. The transition to farming was clearly a decisive \_\_\_\_\_ human history. There were only a few parts of the \_\_\_\_\_ world that developed farming \_\_\_\_\_, and in most places \_\_\_\_\_ farming began, a large \_\_\_\_\_ civilization \_\_\_\_\_.

How did agriculture bring civilization? Farming made it \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ far more people \_\_\_\_\_. Therefore human population became larger and \_\_\_\_\_. Large and dense population is necessary \_\_\_\_\_ government, military power, effective network of \_\_\_\_\_ and the evolution \_\_\_\_\_ infectious diseases. Farming also \_\_\_\_\_ extra food \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ some people don't \_\_\_\_\_ work for getting food. They can spend their time on specializing advanced technologies like \_\_\_\_\_ working and manufacturing.

Human history is as long as several millions years, and most of the time our ancestors had lived as hunter-gatherers. They made their living by running across savanna to hunt wild animals and walking through the woods to gather wild food plants. Around ten thousand years ago, some people began domesticating plants and animals. Agriculture was a very recent phenomenon. The transition to farming was clearly a decisive turning point in human history. There were only a few parts of the ancient world that developed farming independently, and in most places where farming began, a large advanced civilization emerged.

How did agriculture bring civilization? Farming made it possible to feed far more people with far less land. Therefore human population became larger and denser. Large and dense population is necessary for centralized government, military power, effective network of cooperation and the evolution of infectious diseases. Farming also produce extra food surplus, with which some people don't have to work for getting food. They can spend their time on specializing advanced technologies like metal working and manufacturing.

hunter-gatherer	狩猟採集民	feed	餌をやる、養う
domesticate	家畜化する、栽培する	therefore	それゆえに、したがって
phenomenon	現象、事象	dense	密集した、密度が高い
transition	推移、移行	surplus	余剰、黒字
emerge	現れる、生じる		

## The Root of Inequality #4

\_\_\_\_\_ farming is so useful, why did only \_\_\_\_\_ choose to do it? Well, actually they \_\_\_\_\_ a choice. For agriculture to be the basis for technological \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ be an \_\_\_\_\_ way of producing food. And for agriculture to be \_\_\_\_\_, you need \_\_\_\_\_ productive plants and animals.

There were only few species of wild plants and animals \_\_\_\_\_ for domestication, and they were \_\_\_\_\_ around the world. Rice \_\_\_\_\_ a southwest part of China. \_\_\_\_\_ and barley were growing \_\_\_\_\_ in the \_\_\_\_\_ Crescent in the \_\_\_\_\_. The Eurasian Continent were \_\_\_\_\_ the most productive and nutritious \_\_\_\_\_ species.

Eurasia also had the best animals for farming. There are nearly 2 million known species of wild animals, but the vast majority have never been \_\_\_\_\_ because they don't \_\_\_\_\_ domestication. For example, carnivores such as lions are not suited because you have to grow other animals just to \_\_\_\_\_ them. They also have to be social animals and \_\_\_\_\_ humans \_\_\_\_\_ humans can \_\_\_\_\_ them. That \_\_\_\_\_ a \_\_\_\_\_ of the reason why Africans have \_\_\_\_\_ farm zebras \_\_\_\_\_ horses. Throughout history, only 14 \_\_\_\_\_ species have ever been successfully domesticated. Out of these 14, none was from Australia, North America or \_\_\_\_\_ Africa. South America only had llama. The other 13 were all from the Eurasian Continent, including the big 4 \_\_\_\_\_ animals; cows, pigs, sheep and goat.

My years in New Guinea \_\_\_\_\_ me that people around the world are \_\_\_\_\_. \_\_\_\_\_ you go, you can find people who are smart, intelligent and dynamic. Eurasian \_\_\_\_\_ faster not because they were more \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_, but simply because they were \_\_\_\_\_ to have \_\_\_\_\_ like useful species for domestication.

If farming is so useful, why did only few ancient societies choose to do it? Well, actually they didn't have a choice. For agriculture to be the basis for technological development, it has to be an efficient way of producing food. And for agriculture to be efficient, you need to have productive plants and animals.

There were only few species of wild plants and animals suitable for domestication, and they were distributed unequally around the world. Rice originated from a southwest part of China. Wheat and barley were growing wild in the Fertile Crescent in the Middle East. The Eurasian Continent were blessed with the most productive and nutritious plant species.

Eurasia also had the best animals for farming. There are nearly 2 million known species of wild animals, but the vast majority have never been farmed because they don't meet the requirements for domestication. For example, carnivores such as lions are not suited because you have to grow other animals just to feed them. They also have to be social animals and get along with humans so that humans can easily control them. That gives a part of the reason why Africans have failed to farm zebras though they resemble horses. Throughout history, only 14 mammal species have ever been successfully domesticated. Out of these 14, none was from Australia, North America or sub-Saharan Africa. South America only had llama. The other 13 were all from the Eurasian Continent, including the big 4 livestock animals; cows, pigs, sheep and goat.

My years in New Guinea have convinced me that people around the world are fundamentally similar. Wherever you go, you can find people who are smart, intelligent and dynamic. Eurasian societies advanced faster not because they were more intelligent or diligent, but simply because they were lucky enough to have environmental advantages like useful species for domestication.

Vocabulary List: No. 27~46

The roots of inequality around the \_\_\_\_\_ come down to geographic \_\_\_\_\_. People living in the Eurasian Continent were geographically \_\_\_\_\_ two ways. One is that they \_\_\_\_\_ to the best crops and animals for domestication, \_\_\_\_\_ wheat, barley, rice, cows, pigs, sheep and horses. All these species originated \_\_\_\_\_ Eurasia.

Another luck \_\_\_\_\_ the shape of the \_\_\_\_\_. Eurasia is long \_\_\_\_\_ east to west and \_\_\_\_\_ north to south, \_\_\_\_\_ the American Continents and African Continent are long \_\_\_\_\_ north to south. Therefore, Europe, the Middle East, India and China are \_\_\_\_\_. Any places that share the same \_\_\_\_\_ share similar \_\_\_\_\_ and vegetation. Crops and animals in the Middle East can also \_\_\_\_\_ in many other \_\_\_\_\_ of the continent. That is why, for example, wheat spread quickly from the Middle East to Europe, and metal working technology from China to the \_\_\_\_\_ the continent. \_\_\_\_\_ other hand, the journey from \_\_\_\_\_ the America to the other is a journey from north to south, a journey through different climate zones and vegetation. These differences \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ of crops and animals, \_\_\_\_\_ people, ideas and technologies.

The next question is why it was Europe and not China or the Middle East. Most of the useful plants and animals came from the Middle East. But because the environment was very \_\_\_\_\_, they couldn't \_\_\_\_\_ continuous farming. China was \_\_\_\_\_ by a single unified \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ Europe have been divided by a lot of states competing to each other. "\_\_\_\_\_ China, European land is \_\_\_\_\_ by high mountains and \_\_\_\_\_, making it difficult to be unified. This diversity and \_\_\_\_\_ are \_\_\_\_\_ Europe a \_\_\_\_\_. Geography shapes the course of history. On a broad \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ determines who you are.

The roots of inequality around the globe will eventually come down to geographic luck. People living in the Eurasian Continent were geographically blessed in two ways. One is that they had access to the best crops and animals for domestication, namely wheat, barley, rice, cows, pigs, sheep and horses. All these species originated from Eurasia.

Another luck they had is about the shape of the continent. Eurasia is long from east to west and narrow from north to south, while the American Continents and African Continent are long from north to south. Therefore, Europe, the Middle East, India and China are all at the same line of latitude. Any places that share the same latitude automatically share similar climate and vegetation. Crops and animals in the Middle East can also thrive in many other parts of the continent. That is why, for example, wheat spread quickly from the Fertile Crescent to Europe, and metal working technology from China to the rest of the continent. On the other hand, the journey from one end of the America to the other is a journey from north to south, a journey through different climate zones and vegetation. These differences prevented the spread of crops and animals, as well as people, ideas and technologies.

The next question is why it was Europe and not China or the Middle East. Most of the useful plants and animals came from the Middle East. But because the environment was very fragile, they couldn't sustain continuous intensive farming. China was almost always ruled by a single unified authority, while Europe have been divided by a lot of states competing to each other. Unlike China, European land is separated by high mountains and intricate coastlines, making it difficult to be unified. This diversity and competition are what gave Europe a head start. Geography shapes the course of history. On a broad scale, where you live determines who you are.