



# Cambridge Pre-U

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**9777/03**

Paper 3 Presentation

**October/November 2020**

PRE-RELEASE MATERIAL



**To be given to candidates**

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS

- This material contains stimulus material to be used by candidates preparing their presentation for 9777/03. Give one copy to each candidate.
- Presentations must be prepared in a four-week period. This may take place at any point before 31 October 2020, by which date all presentations must have been submitted to Cambridge International via the Cambridge Secure Exchange (MOVEit).
- The presentation is worth 40 marks.

## INFORMATION FOR 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 material (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.

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

This document has **12** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

**Document 1**

**'The Trump Vision for America Abroad'**

Adapted from an article by H.R. McMaster and Gary D. Cohn in *The New York Times*, a US newspaper, 13 July 2017.

**The authors were National Security Adviser of the United States and Chair of the National Economic Council respectively.**

President Trump just concluded a second overseas trip to further advance America's interests and values, and to strengthen our alliances around the world.

**Content removed due to copyright restrictions.**

The American delegation returned from the trip with tremendous optimism about the future and what the United States, our allies and our partners can achieve together.

**Document 2**

**‘Labour will make Britain a force for good – the Tories would take us to war’**

**Adapted from an article by Emily Thornberry in the *Guardian*, a UK newspaper, 11 May 2017.**

**The author was the UK Shadow Foreign Secretary.**

Twenty years ago today, within the ornate golden walls of the foreign office’s Locarno room, Robin Cook set out the incoming Labour government’s mission statement on foreign policy. He committed Labour to protect national security through Nato, to promote exports, and to prioritise the environment. Then, introducing his fourth objective, Cook said: ‘Labour does not accept that political values can be left behind when we check in our passports.’ He added: ‘Our foreign policy must have an ethical dimension, and must support the demands of other peoples for the democratic rights on which we insist for ourselves.’

Last week, in a similar setting at the state department, Rex Tillerson – Cook’s modern-day American counterpart – defined his own mission. ‘It is really important,’ he said, ‘that all of us understand the difference between policy and values. Freedom, human dignity, the way people are treated – those are our values, not our policies.’ An over-emphasis on values, he explained, ‘creates obstacles to our ability to advance on our national security and economic interests.’

Where Cook saw promoting human rights as indivisible from protecting national security and prosperity, Tillerson sees them as irreconcilable.

What would Labour do differently? As our manifesto will make clear, we will not just return to the Cook doctrine, but take immediate steps in government to enact it. Like Cook, we will root our national security in the Nato alliance and defend British interests at home and abroad, and as he promised in the Locarno room, we will strive to reduce not increase global tensions, and give new momentum to talks on non-proliferation and disarmament. Like Cook, we will work to increase British exports and build the global prosperity from which all trading countries benefit, while ensuring that climate change remains at the top of the international agenda, and that all countries stick to their Paris treaty commitments. And, like Cook, we will put human rights back at the heart of foreign policy.

Labour will work with other progressive governments to help fill the gaps left by Trump’s cuts in funding for women’s empowerment and the promotion of democracy in the developing world. And from day one we will stand up to his administration, making clear that the special relationship is based above all on shared values, and that if Trump continues to ignore and abuse those values, we will criticise him openly, as we would do any other leader.

None of this will happen under the Tories. Sliding recklessly out of Europe without a deal to protect British business and jobs, the Tories will be so desperate for trade deals with the rest of the world, no partner will be beyond the pale. Twenty years ago, Cook saw Britain choosing between becoming ‘a leading partner in a world community of nations’ or continuing ‘the Tory trend towards not so splendid isolation’. How appalled he would have been now to see the Tories not just trending but hurtling towards isolation: destroying our relationships with Europe; planning unilateral military actions; and treating British values not as something to be promoted overseas, but to go tactfully unmentioned for fear of upsetting the Chinese or the Saudis.

**Document 3**

**‘Unresolved dilemma at heart of Ireland’s ‘ethical’ foreign policy; Realpolitik and principle make for an uncomfortable dilemma for Irish foreign policy’**

**Adapted from an article by Patrick Smyth in *The Irish Times*, an Irish newspaper, 26 April 2018.**

Ireland’s successful attempt last week to dilute the European Union’s expression of unequivocal support for the military strike against Syria was a significant assertion of key pillars of the State’s distinctive foreign policy – our strong commitment to a multilateral, rules-based order whose cornerstone is the United Nations.

**Content removed due to copyright restrictions.**

that remains unresolved at the heart of Ireland’s “ethical” foreign policy.

It is a real dilemma

**Document 4****‘Economics will trump our liberal values’**

**Adapted from an article by Andrew Grice in the *Independent*, a UK newspaper, 15 December 2016.**

Brexit will mean UK foreign policy will be driven more by economics and less by liberal values. A trade deal with the United States will be the primary goal of UK-US relations, even if it means tolerating Donald Trump’s lukewarm attitude to Nato or a rash, dangerous response to a foreign policy crisis. Downing Street’s slapdown of Boris Johnson for accusing Saudi Arabia of fighting “proxy wars” in the Middle East tells us Theresa May’s foreign policy will be a trade policy. There is another way: the outgoing Obama administration halted the sale of precision-guided weapons to Saudi Arabia because of civilian deaths caused by its bombing in Yemen. Britain should follow suit, but won’t: arms sales to the Saudis were worth £4bn in the past five years and more lucrative trade deals will be needed after Brexit.

Parliament might be about to make it easier to sell arms to regimes that violate human rights. The important job of monitoring these arms exports is likely to go to the new select committee that oversees the Department for International Trade.

At present, it is shared by four select committees meeting jointly. But when two of them, Business and International Development, wanted to call for a ban on arms sales to the Saudis, it was squashed by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Another sign that Brexit could mean a shift away from an ethical foreign policy was the confirmation that the UK’s landmark pledge to spend 0.7 per cent of gross national income on international aid will form part of a Government-wide spending review of what the nation can afford in the next parliament. Scrapping it would send the wrong signal to the world; May should resist the temptation to toss a bone to the right-wing.

In her first foreign policy speech last month, the Prime Minister outlined her goal for the UK to be ‘the true global champion of free trade’ and avoided the intervention issue. May’s foreign policy will be determined by Brexit and little else. Her mantra that “government can and should be a force for good” seems to apply only on the domestic front.

**Document 5**

**‘Davos 2018: Isolationism is a bad path, warns Angela Merkel’**

**Adapted from an article by Sanya Burgess in *The National*, an Abu Dhabi newspaper, 24 January 2018.**

Protectionism will not lead to a good future, warned German chancellor Angela Merkel.

**Content removed due to copyright restrictions.**

Tackling ISIL and coping with the pressure of mass migration, two big domestic issues for the German politician, would benefit from a more active and unified response from countries across the world, she said.

**Document 6****'US a real threat to global rules and norms'**

**Adapted from an article by Chen Weihua in *China Daily*, a Chinese newspaper, 19 May 2018.**

**The author was the chief Washington Correspondent of *China Daily*.**

For years, many US officials and politicians have been trying, albeit with ulterior motives, to portray China as a rising power which challenges international rules and norms, but judging by what we've seen in the past years, especially past weeks, no country deserves the title of a coercive and disruptive power more than the United States.

The Donald Trump administration has isolated the United States, even from some of its close allies, by taking actions that challenge international rules and threaten world peace.

The decision to shift the US embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, announced by US President Donald Trump in December, not only breaks with decades of Washington's foreign policy but also violates United Nations Security Council resolutions that Jerusalem should be the shared capital of Israel and Palestine. Fittingly, the UN General Assembly denounced Trump's decision in December despite US ambassador to the UN Nikki Haley's open threat to UN members who 'disrespected' the US on the issue.

The embassy decision not only shows that the US cannot be an honest mediator in the Middle East, especially between Israelis and Palestinians, but also demonstrates that the US is a major destabilizing force in the region.

In August 2017, the Trump administration notified the UN that it intends to withdraw from the Paris climate accord reached by more than 190 countries in December of 2015 to fight carbon emissions. Incidentally, the US is historically the largest carbon emitter and its per capita emission is still more than twice that of China's. In October, the US State Department announced the US would withdraw from the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at the end of 2018. The US stopped funding the organization in 2011 after UNESCO admitted Palestine as a full member, and its decision to pull out of the UN body reflects a desperate move after it failed to coerce UNESCO to make changes according to its demands.

Trump has also made unilateral moves that threaten the free flow of trade and investment between the US and China, which include such unreasonable demands as China should reduce its trade surplus with the US by \$100 billion each year for the next two years and the Chinese government should stop 'subsidizing' its industries. Almost all economists emphasize that the US trade deficit is a result of its fiscal policy and American people's low savings rate, and that the US and many other advanced countries, too, subsidize their industries. Last week, David Gergen, a professor at Harvard Kennedy School and an adviser to several former US presidents, described Trump's actions as 'bullying China'.

So far, most critics have used unilateralism and isolationism to describe Trump's actions. Indeed, the US has been quite isolated, even from some of its close allies, for taking actions that have disrupted and challenged international rules and norms and are threatening world peace. It's important therefore for Trump to know that his disruptive actions run contrary to his slogan of "Make America Great Again", as they will "make America less great".

**Document 7**

**'We need to work together'**

**Adapted from a speech given by Emmanuel Macron, President of France, to the United States Congress, 25 April 2018.**

Today, the international community needs to step up our game and build the 21st century world order, based on the perennial principles we established together after World War II.

**Content removed due to copyright restrictions.**



**Content removed due to copyright restrictions.**

I believe, facing all these challenges, all these fears, all this anger, our duty, our destiny is to work together and to build this new, strong multilateralism.

**Document 8****‘GM crops offer hope in hotter times’**

**Adapted from an article by Ivar Virgin in *The Bangkok Post*, a Thai newspaper, 20 May 2018.**

**The author was a Senior Researcher at the Stockholm Environment Institute.**

Feeding a rapidly growing world in the face of climate change and resource scarcity will be an immense challenge and test for human ingenuity. The effects of climate change on food production around the world are accelerating and could lead to more than 500 000 deaths by the year 2050, according to a grim new study. Rising temperatures, more frequent droughts and extreme weather events will result in crop productivity losses for farmers in many parts of the world. Agricultural biotechnology is playing an increasingly important role in assisting farmers all over the world.

A wide ranging and rapidly expanding toolbox of technologies, including controversial and fast evolving techniques, such as genome editing and genetic modification, have produced crops that today are cultivated by about 18 million farmers. All in all, genetically modified crops cover about 180 million hectares, or roughly 13% of all global cropland.

But to what extent can these technologies also help smallholder farmers – those farming less than five hectares – in developing countries foster more sustainable and secure food systems? The early reports on conventional agro-biotechnology and genetically modified (GM) crops are impressive. GM crops developed by “cutting and pasting” genes from one organism to another are improving livestock vaccines, disease diagnostics and using DNA marker assisted breeding to speed up development of new crop varieties. All of these technologies have already improved crop and livestock productivity for millions of small-scale farmers around the world. The benefits of the first generation of GM crops include better soil management, a reduction in the use of insecticides and increased farm profitability.

The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) and many agricultural experts are positive about the use of agro-biotechnology, but the use of GM technologies is continuing to cause debate in the international community. Controversies about GM crops revolve around a combination of concerns about safety for human and environmental health, market control and proprietary issues linked to the use of technology, and to what extent GM technologies are relevant for and accessible to smallholder farmers in the global south.

Climate-related impacts on agriculture will hit developing countries especially hard, only amplifying the importance of getting these God-like innovations into the hands of those farmers who need it most. Given the magnitude and the urgency of the challenge, it will be crucial to include modern biology in the broad portfolio of tools supporting smallholder farmers in developing countries in their struggle to meet rising demands in a sustainable manner.

**Document 9**

**‘Genetically modified food, which has its own problems, cannot solve global hunger’**

**Adapted from an article in the *South China Morning Post*, 11 April 2018.**

Many people are convinced that GM food is the answer to solving the food-security crisis and putting an end to global hunger.

With the help of gene technology, some foods can be made capable of resisting specific types of diseases, warding off pests and growing in harsher environmental conditions, while retaining desired qualities in terms of looks and nutrients, thereby providing more quality food for the world’s population.

However, though GM crops can undoubtedly be healthier, the goal of resolving the food crisis is difficult to achieve, if not impossible. The reason is that the problem is not inadequate supply of food, but its uneven distribution.

According to the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, the world is producing more than enough food. Yet, 815 million people went hungry in 2016. Of that total, 489 million lived in countries affected by conflict. So, producing more GM food will not get to the root of the problem.

Some studies also suggest that GM foods can have a detrimental effect on human health. It is feared that the presence of antibiotic-resistance marker genes in such foods would diminish the efficacy of antibiotics. The presence of such genes in the environment and soil, and in the food we consume, could pass on the trait of antibiotic resistance rapidly and widely, rendering antibacterial medicines useless.

GM food can have an adverse impact on the environment as well. US studies have indicated that growing herbicide-resistant GM crops, such as soy and corn, has led to an uptick in the use of powerful herbicides on chemical-resistant “superweeds”.

Also, farmers in Brazil report higher use of pesticides, as their GM corn can no longer stave off tropical bugs. These chemicals contaminate the environment through the air, and they leach into the ground, ending up in freshwater sources and affecting aquatic life and land organisms. Thus, caution is warranted on promoting genetically modified food. As the WHO says: ‘It is not possible to make general statements on the safety of all GM foods.’

**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 Assessment International Education Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at [www.cambridgeinternational.org](http://www.cambridgeinternational.org) after the live examination series.

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