| "There is no practical value in learning l | biology in my life."                |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| do you                                     | statement? You                      |
| the  | this tha                            |
| biology with history, philosop             | phy,, and so on                     |
| arts, such as social science and           | science, may seem to lack           |
| and nothing                                |                                     |
| You might rather want to learn fo          | or climbing up the                  |
| or visualizing your way to being rich.     |                                     |
| than books of the                          | , learning liberal arts             |
| can actually provide profound insights in  | nto humans and society that will    |
| support life. Fe                           | or example, the knowledge of life   |
| science insights                           | s into human nature and society,    |
| you challenge the traditional ide          | ea about organizational management, |
| and  | and What kind of                    |
| lessons can we from life science?          | ?                                   |

"There is no practical value in learning biology in my life." <u>To what extent</u> do you <u>agree with this statement?</u> You <u>might have heard the slightly different versions of</u> this <u>assertion</u> that <u>replace</u> biology with history, philosophy, <u>classics</u>, and so on. <u>Liberal</u> arts, such as social science and <u>natural</u> science, may seem to lack <u>pragmatic</u> <u>utility</u> and nothing <u>more than intellectual entertainment</u>. You might rather want to learn <u>tips</u> for climbing up the <u>career ladder</u> or visualizing your way to being rich. <u>Although it may seem less straightforward</u> than books of the <u>self-help genre</u>, learning liberal arts can actually provide profound insights into humans and society that will support <u>and enrich your</u> life. For example, the knowledge of life science <u>will deepen our</u> insights into human nature and society, <u>help</u> you challenge the traditional idea about organizational management, and <u>bring about essential humility</u> and <u>maturity</u>. What kind of lessons can we <u>draw</u> from life science?

| profound     | 深い   | organizational | 組織に関する |
|--------------|------|----------------|--------|
| insight      | 洞察   | humility       | 謙虚     |
| liberal arts | 人文科学 | maturity       | 成熟     |
| pragmatic    | 実用的な | self-help      | 自助     |
| intellectual | 知的な  |                |        |

The \_\_\_\_\_\_ of organizational management is probably \_\_\_\_\_\_ and control. It is a \_\_\_\_\_\_ system \_\_\_\_\_ upper managers are \_\_\_\_\_ making decisions and taking responsibility for their decisions, and \_\_\_\_\_\_ follow these commands and \_\_\_\_\_\_. Today, many companies \_\_\_\_\_\_ this concept, but they don't necessarily have to work this way. Learning life science \_\_\_\_\_\_ another possibility of how organizations function. In fact, some of the \_\_\_\_\_ business leaders use the \_\_\_\_\_ of a living organism or an \_\_\_\_\_\_ talk about their organization. For example, our bodies \_\_\_\_\_\_ 40 trillion cells that are working \_\_\_\_\_\_ but \_\_\_\_\_. The Human brain has 100 billion neurons, but there is no "president" neuron that directs and controls the function of other neurons. When we \_\_\_\_\_ someone speak, neurons of the \_\_\_\_\_\_ cortex \_\_\_\_\_\_ start working. It doesn't receive a \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ cortex \_\_\_\_ have a discussion with the \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_ a consensus. Likewise, some companies thrive without topdown management. Any member in these organizations, regardless of their position, is \_\_\_\_\_ to make decisions by themselves \_\_\_\_\_ it's necessary, as long as they \_\_\_\_\_ people \_\_\_\_\_ and people who will be \_\_\_\_\_ by the decision. Companies like Buurtzorg and Morning Star have successfully operated this way \_\_\_\_\_ their \_\_\_\_\_ more than a thousand employees.

The <u>common typical image</u> of organizational management is probably <u>command</u> and control. It is a <u>hierarchical</u> system <u>where</u> upper managers are <u>in charge of</u> making decisions and taking responsibility for their decisions, and <u>subordinates</u> follow these commands and <u>execute them</u>. Today, many companies <u>adopt</u> this concept, but they don't necessarily have to work this way. Learning life science <u>suggests</u> another possibility of how organizations function. In fact, some of the <u>innovative</u> business leaders use the <u>metaphor</u> of a living organism or an <u>ecosystem when they</u> talk about their organization. For example, our bodies <u>consist of about</u> 40 trillion cells that are working <u>collaboratively</u> but <u>autonomously without any central command</u>. The Human brain has 100 billion neurons, but there is no "president" neuron that directs and controls the function of other neurons. When we <u>hear</u> someone speak, neurons of the <u>auditory</u> cortex <u>automatically</u> start working. It doesn't receive a <u>command from</u> the <u>prefrontal</u> cortex <u>nor</u> have a discussion with the <u>amygdala</u> to form a consensus. Likewise, some companies thrive without top-down management. Any member in these organizations, regardless of their position, is <u>empowered</u> to make decisions by themselves <u>when they feel</u> it's necessary, as long as they <u>seek</u> <u>advice from</u> people <u>with expertise</u> and people who will be <u>impacted</u> by the decision. Companies like Buurtzorg and Morning Star have successfully operated this way <u>despite</u> their scale of more than a thousand employees.

| hierarchical  | 階層的な | autonomously | 自律的に       |
|---------------|------|--------------|------------|
| subordinate   | 部下   | neuron       | ニューロン、神経細胞 |
| metaphor      | 隠喩   | cortex       | 皮質         |
| ecosystem     | 生態系  | consensus    | 合意         |
| collaborative | 協力的な | empower      | 権限を与える     |

## Pragmatic Life Science #3

There is an \_\_\_\_\_\_ famous book called "The Selfish Gene" \_\_\_\_\_ by the biologist Richard Dawkins in 1976. The title of the book is \_\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_\_, an impression that living organisms are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ selfish and egoistic. But we often \_\_\_\_\_. He \_\_\_\_\_ genes that are selfish, not individual creatures. If we take a closer look, \_\_\_\_\_ that acts of \_\_\_\_\_\_ altruism of the individuals are actually selfishness of the gene \_\_\_\_\_. In other words, altruistic behavior by an individual for the benefit of the community sometimes \_\_\_\_\_\_ the interests of genes. \_\_\_\_\_\_ example of the \_\_\_\_\_ behavior of worker bees. This is an effective defense against \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_, but they are like kamikaze fighters. They \_\_\_\_\_\_ the act of stinging. This suicide act \_\_\_\_\_\_ altruistic on an individual level, \_\_\_\_\_ actually beneficial for the genes. A social insect colony is a huge family, usually all \_\_\_\_\_ the same mother, and all bees in the same colony \_\_\_\_\_\_ a similar \_\_\_\_\_ genes. If the act of self-sacrifice benefits the other members of the colony, it makes sense \_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ of the genes. Altruism within a group often \_\_\_\_\_\_ selfishness between groups. Genes might be \_\_\_\_\_\_ selfish, but \_\_\_\_\_, individuals can \_\_\_\_\_ altruism because of the selfishness of genes.

There is an <u>exceptionally</u> famous book called "The Selfish Gene" <u>written</u> by the biologist Richard Dawkins in 1976. The title of the book is <u>somewhat misleading</u>, <u>giving us</u> an impression that living organisms are <u>inevitably</u> selfish and egoistic. But we often <u>get him wrong</u>. He <u>meant that it is</u> genes that are selfish, not individual creatures. If we take a closer look, <u>it often turns out</u> that acts of <u>apparent</u> altruism of the individuals are actually selfishness of the gene <u>in disguise</u>. In other words, altruistic behavior by an individual for the benefit of the community sometimes <u>coincides with</u> the interests of genes. <u>Take an</u> example of the <u>stinging</u> behavior of worker bees. This is an effective defense against <u>honey robbers</u>, but they are like kamikaze fighters. They <u>die soon after</u> the act of stinging. This suicide act <u>appears</u> altruistic on an individual level, <u>but it is</u> actually beneficial for the genes. A social insect colony is a huge family, usually all <u>descended from</u> the same mother, and all bees in the same colony <u>share</u> a similar <u>set of</u> genes. If the act of self-sacrifice benefits the other members of the colony, it makes sense in terms of <u>survival</u> and propagation of the genes. Altruism within a group often <u>goes with</u> selfishness between groups. Genes might be <u>inherently</u> selfish, but <u>paradoxically</u>, individuals can <u>exhibit</u> altruism because of the selfishness of genes.

| misleading | 誤解を招く | stinging      | 刺す   |
|------------|-------|---------------|------|
| egoistic   | 利己的な  | altruistic    | 利他的な |
| altruism   | 利他主義  | propagation   | 繁殖   |
| disguise   | 変装    | paradoxically | 逆説的に |
| coincide   | 一致する  |               |      |

## Pragmatic Life Science #4

We Homo sapiens are quite interesting animals \_\_\_\_\_\_ altruism. A number of studies on psychology and \_\_\_\_\_\_ economics have demonstrated that we often \_\_\_\_\_\_ personal economic rationality and \_\_\_\_\_\_ other's interests. This is probably because humankind is a species \_ survived and by trusting and cooperating with each other. Biologically speaking, there is nothing particularly special about our bodies and brains. We are genetically very similar to our relatives, chimpanzees and bonobos. larger brains and bodies than Homo sapiens, and \_\_\_\_\_\_speculate that they were \_\_\_\_\_\_to us in both physical and \_\_\_\_\_\_abilities. However, chimpanzees are in zoos and became while Homo sapiens prosperity. This is because of the simple fact that we can cooperate more effectively than other species. Our ancestors effectively cooperated to hunt large \_\_\_\_\_\_ that any individual hunter could never \_\_\_\_\_. everyone making both \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ only for themselves, people in making either bows or spears and exchanged them, \_\_\_\_\_\_ each of them saved time. The same is true today. We are all \_\_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ network of \_\_\_\_\_, and nobody can \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_. \_\_\_\_ Homo sapiens is trust and cooperation. We \_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ by trusting each other, sharing skills and knowledge with each other, and contributing to each other. Thus, it is no wonder that we are genetically \_\_\_\_\_\_. We feel happy \_\_\_\_\_\_. \_\_\_\_\_ others. We get motivated and \_\_\_\_\_\_ our job when we \_\_\_\_\_\_ for society. We become even physically \_\_\_\_\_ good relationships. You will \_\_\_\_\_ come to realize that only \_\_\_\_\_ your own success or well-being never brings about happiness in the \_\_\_\_\_. This is not \_\_\_\_\_, but biological reality.

We Homo sapiens are quite interesting animals in terms of altruism. A number of studies on psychology and behavioral economics have demonstrated that we often disregard our personal economic rationality and behave in favor of other's interests. This is probably because humankind is a species that have survived and thrived by trusting and cooperating with each other. Biologically speaking, there is nothing particularly special about our bodies and brains. We are genetically very similar to our closest relatives, chimpanzees and bonobos. Neanderthals possessed larger brains and bodies than Homo sapiens, and researchers speculate that they were superior to us in both physical and cognitive abilities. However, chimpanzees are locked up in zoos and Neanderthals became extinct while Homo sapiens enjoy unprecedented prosperity. This is because of the simple fact that we can cooperate more effectively than other species. Our ancestors effectively cooperated to hunt large mammals that any individual hunter could never bring down. Instead of everyone making both bows and spears only for themselves, people specialized in making either bows or spears and exchanged them, thereby each of them saved time. The same is true today. We are all dependent on the enormous network of cooperation, and nobody can live alone. What defines Homo sapiens is trust and cooperation. We have survived and thrived by trusting each other, sharing skills and knowledge with each other, and contributing to each other. Thus, it is no wonder that we are genetically hardwired to be social. We feel happy when we receive gratitude from others. We get motivated and engaged in our job when we find its significance for society. We become even physically healthier when we have good relationships. You will inevitably come to realize that only caring about your own success or well-being never brings about happiness in the truest sense. This is not sentimental idealism, but biological reality.

| behavioral economics | 行動経済学     | unprecedented | 前例のない |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|-------|
| rationality          | 合理性       | specialize    | 専門化する |
| thrive               | 繁栄する      | cooperation   | 協力    |
| genetically          | 遺伝的に      | sentimental   | 感傷的な  |
| Neanderthal          | ネアンデルタール人 | idealism      | 理想主義  |
| cognitive            | 認知の       |               |       |

## Pragmatic Life Science #5

There is a famous phrase that says, "nice guys finish last," which means that those who behave and \_\_\_\_\_\_ will \_\_\_\_\_ ? We can \_\_\_\_\_? We can \_\_\_\_\_? this proposition from a biological perspective. An American political scientist Robert 

 Axelrod used the famous "Prisoner's \_\_\_\_\_" as a \_\_\_\_\_, and he simulated on computers the \_\_\_\_\_\_ of individuals taking various \_\_\_\_\_\_

behaviors. In his simulation, when two individuals cooperate with each other, the both can benefit \_\_\_\_\_ well. When one intends to cooperate but the other betrays, the betrayer enormously benefits and the other loses out. When the two betray each other, both of them \_\_\_\_\_\_. Each individual \_\_\_\_\_ a number of \_\_\_\_\_ in the next generation \_\_\_\_\_ to the size of the benefits. After a thousand generations of reproductive competitions, what type of behavior thrives and becomes \_\_\_\_\_\_ within the group? He \_\_\_\_\_ the simulation several times, and in most cases, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ succeeded the most was the strategy named "Tit for Tat," in which individuals generally behave \_\_\_\_\_ but can betray in \_\_\_\_\_ only \_\_\_\_\_ betrayed. As the generation \_\_\_\_\_\_, nasty betrayers disappeared from the group and nice cooperative individuals became . Some of the nasty strategies for a . When the group was already dominated by selfish individuals, other strategies were exploited and struggled to \_\_\_\_\_. But their prosperity was usually \_\_\_\_\_\_. In evolutionary \_\_\_\_\_, a successful strategy is one that has become the majority in the \_\_\_\_\_, and for a strategy to \_\_\_\_\_ successful, it has to do well \_\_\_\_\_\_ the majority. Selfish strategies \_\_\_\_\_\_ be to be the dominant one, but they often \_\_\_\_\_\_ because they cannot benefit \_\_\_\_\_\_ gathering and cooperating. \_\_\_\_\_\_ in this simulation, nice guys finish first.

There is a famous phrase that says, "nice guys finish last," which means that those who behave kindly and trustfully will lose out in the end. But will they really? We can examine this proposition from a biological perspective. An American political scientist Robert Axelrod used the famous "Prisoner's Dilemma" as a basis with some modifications, and he simulated on computers the reproductive competition of individuals taking various cooperative behaviors. In his simulation, when two individuals cooperate with each other, the both can benefit pretty well. When one intends to cooperate but the other betrays, the betrayer enormously benefits and the other loses out. When the two betray each other, both of them lose out a little. Each individual leaves a number of offspring in the next generation that is proportional to the size of the acquired benefits. After a thousand generations of reproductive competitions, what type of behavior thrives and becomes dominant within the group? He ran the simulation several times, and in most cases, what succeeded the most was the strategy named "Tit for Tat," in which individuals generally behave cooperatively but can betray in retaliation only when they are betrayed. As the generation proceeded, nasty betrayers disappeared from the group and nice cooperative individuals became dominant. Some of the nasty strategies thrived for a while. When the group was already dominated by selfish individuals, other strategies were exploited and struggled to flourish. But their prosperity was usually short-lived. In evolutionary terms, a successful strategy is one that has become the majority in the cluster, and for a strategy to remain successful, it has to do well specifically when it is the majority. Selfish strategies can occasionally be the dominant one, but they often fail to persist because they cannot benefit from gathering and cooperating. At least in this simulation, nice guys finish first.

| proposition  | 提案       | dominant     | 支配的な |
|--------------|----------|--------------|------|
| reproductive | 生殖の      | exploit      | 利用する |
| simulation   | シミュレーション | flourish     | 栄える  |
| betray       | 裏切る      | evolutionary | 進化の  |
| retaliation  | 報復       | persist      | 持続する |