Cambridge Pre-U

Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES (SHORT COURSE) **1340/03/PRE**

Paper 3 Presentation **May/June 2017**

PRE-RELEASE MATERIAL

To be given to candidates

4096382963

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Guidance for Teachers

This Resource Booklet contains stimulus material to be used by candidates preparing their presentation for 1340/03. One copy should be given to each candidate.

Presentations must be prepared in a four-week period. This may take place at any point before 31 May 2017, by which date all presentations must have been submitted to Cambridge via the Cambridge Secure Exchange (MOVEit).

The Presentation is marked out of 40.

Instructions to Candidates

- You should use the enclosed stimulus material to help you identify the subject for your presentation.
- Your presentation should attempt to answer a question.
- Your presentation must address alternative perspectives on the question you select and must engage directly with an issue, an assumption, evidence and/or a line of reasoning in one or more of the documents within this Booklet (i.e. you should not just pick an individual word or phrase which is not central to the reasoning of or the issues covered by the documents).
- You are expected to reflect on these perspectives using your own research.
- Your presentation should be designed for a non-specialist audience.
- Originality in interpretation is welcomed.
- Your presentation may be prepared in a variety of formats and should normally include an oral commentary.
- The speaking or running time of your presentation should be a maximum of 15 minutes.
- Whether presented or not, the submission must include a verbatim transcript of the presentation.

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **11** printed pages and **1** blank page.

DC (ST) 143013
© UCLES 2017

CAMBRIDGE International Examinations

[Turn over

Document 1

‘Nationalism is Back: Bad News for International Co-operation’

Adapted from an article by Gideon Rachman in *The Economist, The World in 2015*, 20 November 2014.

The author was Chief Foreign Affairs Correspondent for the *Financial Times*.

In recent years, any writer who predicted that nationalism was the wave of the future would have been regarded as eccentric – at best. All the most powerful forces in business, technology and finance seemed to be pushing towards deeper international integration. New supranational organisations such as the World Trade Organisation, the G20 and the International Criminal Court were set up to handle the cross-border issues that proliferated in a globalised world. Meanwhile the European Union, an organisation in which countries pool sovereignty and forswear nationalism, set itself up as the political model for the 21st century.

It is increasingly clear, however, that nationalism is back. From Europe to Asia to America, politicians who base their appeal on the idea that they are standing up for their own countries are growing in power and influence. The result is an increase in international tensions and an unpromising background for efforts at multilateral co-operation, whether on climate, trade, taxation or development.

The resurgence of the nationalist style in politics became evident in 2014. In India Narendra Modi, who is often referred to as a Hindu nationalist, won a sweeping general-election victory. Nationalist parties made big gains in the elections to the European Parliament. Scottish nationalists came unnervingly close to winning a referendum on independence from the United Kingdom. Nationalist rhetoric also surged in Vladimir Putin’s Russia, as the Kremlin rallied domestic support for the annexation of Crimea by using the Russian media to portray the outside world as hostile, even fascist.

Fuel for the fire

A widespread disillusion with political and business elites, after years of disappointing economic growth, is a common factor that underpins resurgent nationalism across the globe. In western Europe the added ingredient is anger at high levels of immigration. In Russia it is lingering humiliation about the collapse of the Soviet Union and nostalgia for great-power status. In Asia the extra spice is a shifting balance of power that has encouraged nations such as China and South Korea to focus on historical grievances, particularly against Japan. In America outrage at the growth of Islamic State has begun to stoke an appetite for a return to a more assertive and militarised foreign policy.

Many of these forces will continue to strengthen. So the nationalist tone to global politics will be more marked.

The relationship between nationalist rhetoric and territorial disputes will also be critical to the future of Asia. Mr Modi of India, Shinzo Abe of Japan and Xi Jinping of China are all energetic nation-builders who have used nationalism as a spur to domestic reforms. But their nationalism also has an outward-looking face. Asia’s big question is whether the urge to get on with domestic reforms in China, India and Japan will trump international rivalries. There are grounds for optimism. Though tensions remain high over issues such as the dispute between China and Japan over islands, political leaders are likely to try to manage their differences without conceding on basic issues of principle.

© UCLES 2017

Document 2

'Nationalism thrives in these volatile times'

Adapted from an article by Fareed Zakaria in *The Daily Star*, a Lebanese newspaper, 7 July 2014.

The author was a US-based Indian journalist who was published weekly by *The Daily Star*.

In the recent elections for the European Parliament, nationalist, populist and even xenophobic parties did extremely well. Many commentators have explained the rise of these parties as a consequence of the deep recession and slow recovery that still afflict much of Europe. But similar voting patterns can be seen in countries such as Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands, Finland and Sweden, which are thriving economically. And the parties that do well center their agendas not on economics but on immigration and expressions of nationalism.

You can see this rise of nationalism not just in Europe but around the world. Consider Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's plan to reinterpret his country's pacifist constitution. Leaders such as Vladimir Putin in Russia, Recep Tayyip Erdogan in Turkey and Xi Jinping in China have made appeals to nationalism a core part of their agenda and appeal.

There is, of course, a healthy nationalism that has often been part of the expansion of liberty and democracy. Britons and Americans take pride that their countries embody values they hold dear. Poles and now Ukrainians take pride in their struggles for independence and success. But today we seem to be witnessing mostly a different kind of nationalism, based on fear, insecurity and anxiety. And, as the philosopher Isaiah Berlin noted, like a bent twig, this kind of nationalism always springs back with a vengeance.

Why is this happening now? One explanation is that as globalization and technological revolutions race ahead and transform the world, people feel uneasy with the pace of change, and search for something they can hold onto as a source of succor and stability. If the bond is strongest at the level of the nation, nationalism surges. But if the national project is fragile or viewed as illegitimate, then you see the pull of older, deeper forces. From Catalonia to Scotland to the Middle East, subnational identities have taken on new meaning and urgency.

© UCLES 2017

[Turn over

Document 3

'Are Our Leaders Practicing Patriotism or Nationalism?'

Adapted from an article by Enoch Mwesigwa in *The Daily Monitor*, a Ugandan newspaper, 31 May 2014.

The words "nationalism" and "patriotism" are frequently used interchangeably and usually in terms of admiration of those who possess these qualities. The truth, however, is that the two ideas are poles apart, and lead to dramatically different results in a body politic.

Nationalism is a feeling among a group of people that they are "a nation", a people distinct from all the others. The group may base this feeling on a belief in a common origin, on the use of a common language, or religion, or on any other attribute, as long as that attribute serves to emphasise a difference of that group from the other people and groups.

Nationalism is a state of mind independent of State borders, as for example, in African nationalism, Arab nationalism, and even religious nationalism such as Hinduism, Sikh, and Catholic/Protestant nationalism in Northern Ireland.

In early human history, man as an individual would have been vulnerable without a supporting group within which to wrest a living from nature. The need to know oneself as part of a group thus developed to the level of an instinct. This is probably why Aristotle described man as "a political animal".

Patriotism on the other hand, (derived from the Spanish word *patria*, meaning one's country or homeland) is a more modern "feeling" of one being aware that one's destiny is linked to a particular country or Patria, within its geographic confines; of wanting to advance the common good for all who find themselves within the borders of that country.

Patriotism is not concerned with the origins of the people and rejects the notion that any differences in people could affect their political rights, obligations or benefits. As a means of attaining political office, the leader of a group finds nationalism an incredibly efficient recruitment tool. All the leader has to do is remind "his" people who they are, point out some other people as the enemy, and the faithful will instinctively rally to the call.

There can be no nationalism without "the enemy". The patriotic leader's job is not easy; he or she must explain what the real issues and problems are that need solving, how they came about, and what should be done. This takes more deliberative effort on the part of the supporters as well, as they shift their focus from who to what the problem is. Clearly, patriotism would be the way to go to serve the interests of the people. But in the rush for political office, many leaders prefer to use nationalist sentiments, unable to resist the easy (but very transient) political dividends.

What is your leader telling you today? Is he or she a patriot or a nationalist? Is he/she promoting our differences or the ties that bind us? You had better know the difference, for the sake of all those upon whom you wish peace.

© UCLES 2017

Document 4

'Americans only figured out free speech 50 years ago. Here's how the world can follow our lead.'

Adapted from an article by Lee C Bollinger in *The Washington Post*, a US newspaper, 12 February 2015.

We have been negotiating between the new and the old, the foreign and the familiar, tolerance and censorship forever. But digital communications and global commerce are remaking the world: Last year, there were more than 1 billion international travellers. Some 2.7 billion people around the world are online. Smartphones and satellite dishes are the symbols of our time, pushing people everywhere to demand more control over their futures, greater openness and more responsiveness from governments.

These trends draw previously separate cultures into contact with one another: Turkish soap operas are popular in the Balkans, and Taiwanese animators skewer Scottish secession efforts. But technologies that convene different cultures do not always help them interact peacefully.

As those tensions rise, governments and reactionary groups resort to nationalism, victimization and suppression to keep foreign or offending speech at bay. The Pew Research Center found that, as of 2011, nearly half of the world's countries punished blasphemy, apostasy or defamation of religion. Russia has just legislated harsher punishments for those guilty of offending religious sensibilities, and violent protests in Pakistan halted attempts to soften anti-blasphemy laws. China employs more than 2 million people to monitor online activity and support government censorship, according to the BBC. And last year, the ownership of Venezuela's oldest daily newspaper, El Universal, changed hands under mysterious circumstances, a move accompanied by a much softer editorial stance toward the government. These salvos against freedom of speech and the press force the question: Can the global society emerging today also be a tolerant one?

Governments whose authority is ebbing have been increasingly brazen in their attempts to silence critics. Turkey used charges of tax fraud and massive fines against a conglomerate of newspapers and TV stations critical of President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's policies. Hungary's government established a media authority to impose restrictions on content deemed inappropriate.

To counter these regressive trends, it is critical that we nurture the norms, laws and institutions needed to support free expression globally. There is a sound foundation on which to build. Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly after World War II and subsequently reaffirmed by the nations of the world, unequivocally asserts the freedom of expression and the right to "receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

The surest way to make this happen is to harness the prevailing international commitment to free markets and a global economic system, which demands the open sharing of information. For example, Washington should signal the economic importance of ideas by developing a new international trade regime that protects journalism, academia and digital information. The administration has already gestured in this direction by urging the World Trade Organization to investigate how Chinese censorship blocks commerce and not just speech.

Next, the U.S. government should insist that regional and bilateral trade pacts commit all parties to the free flow of information and ideas integral to trade and investment. The Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement being negotiated by the U.S. trade representative, for instance, should contain not only provisions concerning the environment and labor standards, but also vigorous protections for freedom of information and expression. Columbia's own Global Freedom of Expression and Information project is cataloguing international legal precedents on freedom of speech, and next month it will present the first awards for legal attempts to strengthen international norms.

© UCLES 2017

Given the breadth of attacks on speech and the press around the globe, this approach may appear to elevate hope over experience. It will, no doubt, take a long time. But the American experience shows that the backlash to new ideas and cultures, now evident in many countries, can be overcome. The yearning for freedom of expression is universal. There is nothing uniquely American about it at all.

© UCLES 2017

Document 5

'Patriotism a Dirty Word'

Adapted from an article by Tanveer Ahmed in *The Australian*, an Australian newspaper, 24 October 2014.

The author was an Australian psychiatrist and journalist.

"It is a strange fact, but it is unquestionably true that almost any English intellectual would feel more ashamed of standing to attention during God Save the King than of stealing from a poor box." So wrote George Orwell. His sentiments could scarcely be more applicable in modern Australia.

On patriotism, as with other national characteristics and policy strategies, Australia sits between individualist, nationalist America and collectivist, patriotically reluctant Europe.

Two world wars left a deep scar on the European psyche, especially on the notion of nationalism, which was seen as causing the rise of fascist Italy and Germany. This ambivalence spawned a belief that countries such as Britain should be a culturally blank canvas; that patriotism is an old fashioned trapping of empire and countries such as Britain could be shaped afresh with new cultures living side by side in unity. While we may lack the imperial guilt, there can be little doubt this view is apparent in Australia, perhaps even more so given our relative youth and more malleable historical and cultural foundations.

Orwell made a clear distinction between nationalism and patriotism. He qualified nationalism as "the worst enemy of peace", the belief one's country was superior to others while patriotism was an attachment to and admiration of a nation's way of life and "of its nature defensive, both militarily and culturally".

While Islamic terrorism is attractive to a very small proportion of the population, it highlights a weakness of liberal democracies in their lukewarm, sometimes conflicted promotion of a collective identity. The gap for Islamists is filled by the fierce transnational identity that the Islamic notion of the ummah can build, a piety so strong they are prepared to sacrifice their lives.

French philosopher Michel Onfray said in an interview last year on the topic of the decline of the West: "Who is ready to die for the values of the West or the values of the Enlightenment?" Onfray questions the will of Westerners to fight for anything, believing we have been numbed by consumerism in a secular age that creates no attachment to God and country.

The strong patriotism of the US that integrates its extremely diverse population so successfully may explain why so few American-Muslims, as a proportion of the population, have gone to fight in Syria, compared with many thousands from Europe.

© UCLES 2017

[Turn over

Document 6

'Should the nation be divorced from the state?'

Adapted from an article by Joe Humphreys in *The Irish Times*, 14 March 2014.

The author was Education Correspondent for *The Irish Times* and author of the paper's weekly 'Unthinkable' philosophy column.

St Patrick's Day is an occasion of national celebration. But is the nation state itself deserving of applause?

The crisis in Ukraine is just the latest example of how a Europe of competing nation states challenges peace. While debate about the future of Europe has largely been focused on economic policy, political theorists believe it's time for a radical review of government structures.

Philosopher Attracta Ingram gives voice to these thinkers, exploring an idea loosely associated with the German thinker Jürgen Habermas.

Just as church and state have separated, so too should nation and state. Is it time to rethink the nation state?

Attracta Ingram: "At bottom the question is about whose interests government exists to serve. The 19th-century utilitarian Henry Sidgwick identified two rival answers given by the two rival principles of political organisation. The first principle he called the national ideal, where the job of government is to serve the interests of 'a determinate group of people bound together by a tie of common nationality … admitting foreigners and their products solely from this point of view'."

"On the alternative cosmopolitan principle, the job of government is to maintain order over a particular territory 'but not in any way to determine who is to inhabit this territory, or to restrict the enjoyment of its natural advantages to any particular portion of the human race'."

"We see these alternatives playing out most sharply in debates over immigration, which was also the context in which Sidgwick was writing. Then, as now, free movement of labour was seen as the key to competitiveness."

Which side did Sidgwick take?

"Both Sidgwick and John Stuart Mill believed, as utilitarian philosophers, that their 'greatest happiness' principle applies to human beings as such. But, as a matter of empirical politics, where there is strong national sentiment, you have to go with it rather than against it."

"So their solution was to go with the national ideal and to harness that sense of national belonging to progressive social causes. In the late 20th century rethinking of the national ideal as a moderate civic nationalism, much the same line is taken. David Miller, for example, sees civic nationalism as an important factor in the support of the welfare state."

What happened to the cosmopolitan ideal?

"Sidgwick thought it might be an ideal of the future, and Habermas thinks its time has come. He argues that the nation can no longer perform its role of providing social unity and integration in the new circumstances of internal pluralism and globalisation."

© UCLES 2017

"His proposal is to uncouple state and nation, giving the task of social unity and integration to the idea of common citizenship in the broadly similar constitutional orders of each European state. National identities, like religions before them, would continue to flourish as valuable ways of life, but there would be a separation of nation and state."

© UCLES 2017

[Turn over

Document 7

'Cheap coal helps fuel the economy and heats hospitals and schools'

Adapted from an article by Chris Baker in *The Dominion Post*, a New Zealand newspaper, 26 May 2014.

The author was Chief Executive Officer of Straterra, a body representing the New Zealand mining industry.

The latest rant of Green Party politician Jeanette Fitzsimons against coalmining is a distraction from the real debate on climate. There is a need to decarbonise the global economy, and New Zealand must play its part – we can agree on that. Coal is used because it is typically around one-third the price of electricity as a source of heat. Biomass alternatives are coming down in price, but are still much more expensive than coal. At present, steel-making has no commercial alternative to coal. That is the nub of the issue.

Fitzsimons' call for New Zealand to end coalmining will lead only to our importing coal, and products made elsewhere with coal. That merely shifts the issue overseas, hardly a responsible solution to climate change.

China may have closed steel mills, however its economy is projected to quadruple over the next 20 years, and demand for steel and energy will grow apace. Efficiency and technological progress will help but coal will continue to have an essential role in the Chinese economy.

The International Energy Agency has reported that 60 per cent of new electricity generation globally in the decade to 2010 was produced using coal.

Fitzsimons' statement that "solar, wind and geothermal are now cheaper for new power generation" may apply to a few places in the world; it is not a general truth. The Orkney Islands are offered as an example to follow, as a "centre for renewable energy". New Zealand is already a centre, ranking second in the world to Iceland for renewable electricity generation.

She notes the coal-price downturn and its effect on coalmining. That has occurred because of increased shale oil and gas production in the US arising from fracking and in-line drilling, and over-investment in infrastructure in China. Commodities are cyclic – that is not an argument against commodities.

Fitzsimons wants change toward energy alternatives such as wood waste, and says that "none of these alternatives will happen automatically". If it was cheaper, it would. It's not, so we can, and do, invest to advance those technologies.

I do agree with her underlying argument – the world needs to move to a lower-carbon economy. And of course New Zealand must do its fair share. We differ on how. The country has many opportunities in the energy sector; we are well advanced in renewables; in co-generation – the use of fossil fuels and biomass to produce cost-effective industrial heat with a reduced carbon footprint; and energy efficiency including industrial coal-fired boilers; to identify a few.

Steel production (using iron and coal) will continue, and that is vital for renewable energy. A single turbine contains 150 tonnes of steel, as well as copper, aluminium and other metals, and concrete (produced using coal).

Opponents need to throw aside the rhetoric, and debate the changes needed to address climate change, on the facts and evidence.

© UCLES 2017

Document 8

'Fossil Fuel Habit Puts Energy Future at Risk'

Adapted from an article by Paritta Wangkiat in *The Bangkok Post*, a Thai newspaper, 12 February 2015.

The author was a Thai journalist based in Bangkok.

The discovery of the first commercial natural gas field in the Gulf of Thailand in 1981 was hailed as a milestone that would propel Thailand to economic prosperity.

There is no denying the availability of uninterrupted energy from indigenous sources is crucial for the country's rapid industrialisation and is the lifeblood of modern comforts and conveniences people cannot do without.

While scare tactics are being used to heighten the public's fear of an energy crisis, the public is constantly told by TV advertising campaigns that "clean coal" is the saviour that can support the government's coal power plants in Krabi province. However, it will seriously affect the Andaman Sea's marine ecosystem.

At a time when drilling for more oil does not guarantee successful finds, the world is ushering in a bright new future of renewable energy from solar and wind energy which is currently largely untapped in Thailand. The Ministry of Energy's Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency estimates that technical potential for Thailand's renewable energy is as high as 71,518 megawatts of which 42,356 is potential solar and 14,141 wind energy. But only 6% is currently being exploited, mostly by private investors.

I recently visited a group of farmers in Buri Ram who are using energy from solar panels in their farms to run drainage systems without the government's subsidy. They save money that would instead be spent on expensive diesel. Still, energy authorities continue to perpetuate the myth that solar and wind energy are expensive and unstable.

Despite the energy surplus ahead, the government insists on increasing the use of fossil fuels, despite global trends for solar and wind energy and the severe threat of global warming. According to the United Nations-led Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the remaining sources of coal, oil, and gas must be left untapped to prevent natural disasters. The government must make wise decisions for the future because renewable energy technology will be inexpensive in contrast to the higher cost of fossil fuel exploration.

Thailand must take a bold step and move away from fossil fuels to a low carbon energy future. It can start by no longer manufacturing fears of energy shortages to undermine renewable energy.

© UCLES 2017

BLANK PAGE

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cie.org.uk after the live examination series.

Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.

© UCLES 2017