



Cambridge Pre-U


GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

9777/03

Paper 3 Presentation

May/June 2022

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 May 2022, by which date all presentations must have been submitted to Cambridge International through Submit for Assessment.
- 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. Any blank pages are indicated.

Document 1**Biodiversity touches every aspect of our lives – so why has its loss been ignored?**

Adapted from an article in the *Guardian*, a UK newspaper, September 2019.

Robert Watson was the chair of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.

The evidence is unequivocal: biodiversity, important in its own right and essential for current and future generations, is being destroyed by human activities at a rate unprecedented in human history.

Governments around the world recognised this at the Earth summit in Brazil in 1992 and established the Convention on Biological Diversity to protect and conserve biodiversity. But the situation has become more and more dire. I have chaired or co-chaired three international assessments on the state of knowledge of biodiversity, and all have repeated the same message – we are destroying it at an alarming rate. Each time we have called for action, only to be largely ignored.

The continued loss of biodiversity is not only an environmental issue. It risks undermining the achievement of most of the UN sustainable development goals. It is central to development, through food, water and energy security. It has significant economic value, which should be recognised in national accounting systems. It is a security issue in so far as loss of natural resources, especially in developing countries, can lead to conflict. It is an ethical issue because loss of biodiversity hurts the poorest people, further exacerbating an already inequitable world. And it is also a moral issue, because we should not destroy the living planet.

In addition to playing a critical role in providing food, fibre, water, energy, medicines and other genetic materials, biodiversity is equally important in regulating climate, water quality, pollution, pollination, flooding and storm surges. It has vital social value, providing wellbeing when walking through forests or by rivers, or green spaces in cities.

The challenge is to transform our agricultural and fishing practices, many of which are unsustainable today, into ones that produce the food we need while conserving biodiversity. For agriculture, this means using sustainable agroecological practices: fewer chemicals, fertilisers and pesticides as well as protecting soils and pollinators.

The climate crisis and the loss of biodiversity are issues that affect each other. Global heating adversely affects genetic variability, species richness and ecosystems. Loss of biodiversity can adversely affect climate – deforestation increases the atmospheric abundance of carbon dioxide for example, a greenhouse gas. So it is essential that the issues of biodiversity loss and the climate crisis are addressed together.

Concerted efforts are needed to address the causes of nature deterioration – poor governance, unsustainable economic systems, inequalities, lack of cross-sectoral planning and incentives, unsustainable social narratives and values. We need to steer away from the limiting paradigm of economic growth that prioritises GDP and recognise the social values of biodiversity and the social costs of environmental degradation. We also need to eliminate harmful agricultural, energy and transportation subsidies and incentivise sustainable production.

Document 2

Agriculture at risk

Adapted from an article by Cema Tork in *Development and Cooperation*, a German magazine, April 2019.

Food security is at risk because humans are reducing biodiversity, according to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). It calls for coordinated international action in a recently published report. The FAO's first report on the State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture explains why biodiversity is essential to food and agriculture. It also spells out what needs to be done to protect it.

Wildlife plays a part in food production, the FAO points out. That is the case, for example, when birds feed on pests. Moreover, three-quarters of crops depend on pollinators. The FAO warns that bees are becoming rare and that other insect populations are dwindling too. Moreover, some species of bats and birds also serve as pollinators, but are at risk of extinction. Scientists know that, as a general principle, biodiversity makes food systems resilient to shocks. Biodiversity is not only threatened by climate change. Invasive species, urbanisation, pollution, resource depletion, destructive consumption habits and unsustainable agriculture practices matter too. These include overharvesting, soil degradation and intensive farming in general. Farms rely on ever fewer species of plants and animals. Industrial scale breeding, moreover, means that the genetic base of varieties concerned is small and keeps shrinking.

Government policies often either harm or ignore biodiversity. For instance, infrastructure development may be destructive – such as, when new roads, dams or mines destroy wildlife habitats. Such projects have caused the degradation and fragmentation of ecosystems, destroying habitats and creating barriers to species' migrations. According to the authors, even development considered 'low impact' and 'environmentally friendly' often threatens ecosystems with high levels of biodiversity.

Scientists still do not fully understand many important issues. More research is needed, for instance concerning pollinators, wild foods and invertebrates. The FAO warns that it is difficult to tell exactly what an ecosystem is worth. The value should be considered, but is mostly not taken into account. The authors suggest that a standard method for measuring what an ecosystem contributes to the economy – for instance in terms of productivity – would be useful. Such a method would help to convince policymakers, for example, and educate the public. The FAO calls for more research on the matter.

In political debate, agriculture and nature conservation are often considered to be opposites. The FAO warns that this assumption is wrong. It calls for more and closer collaboration amongst producers, consumers, marketers, policymakers, state agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Such cooperation, moreover, is needed internationally. The authors call for effective policies and stringent implementation, which depends on financial, technical and human resources. In their view, policies and implementation so far have proved too weak.

Document 3

Brazilian Island wants to show the way to a green future, but business leaders want to make it like Cozumel

Adapted from an article in *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, a US newspaper, October 2019.

Marina Lopes was reporting from Fernando de Noronha, Brazil.

When Guilherme Rocha surveys the golden sand beaches, turquoise waters and dramatic cliffs of this speck of an island in the South Atlantic, he sees a model of sustainable development for Brazil – and the world.

Content removed due to copyright restrictions.

Business leaders say it's more development – building the new port, expanding the desalination plant, reinforcing the infrastructure.

Document 4**EU Biodiversity Strategy must be based on incentives, not obligations.**

Adapted from an article in *The Parliament Magazine*, a UK-based magazine carrying news about the European Parliament, May 2020.

Norbert Lins was a German Member of the European Parliament.

I was elected Chairman of the Agriculture Committee on 10 July 2019. Shortly afterwards, the ‘Species Conservation – Save the Bees’ initiative caused quite a stir in my state, Baden-Württemberg. Farmers felt unfairly accused of being responsible for the extinction of species, particularly insects. They vented their discontent by placing green crosses in their fields, deeming the initiative’s demands for the extensive avoidance of pesticides to be unrealistic. Many even threatened to abandon farming. Discussions between those for and against constantly turned into an exchange of blows. The solution to the crisis was to gather everyone around the table and to draw up a less rigid bill.

You may be wondering how an initiative in one German state could serve as an example for Europe. I wish to address two aspects: first, cooperation and acceptance and second, recognising that there is rarely a single correct solution to any problem. The “Save the Bees” bill succeeded in uniting critics and supporters. Objectives were reduced to a more realistic level and – even more importantly, in my view – agreements were reached on target ranges, rather than precise goals. For example, the initiative called for a 50 percent reduction in the use of chemical/synthetic pesticides. It also specified that the use of pesticides should be reduced by 40 to 50 percent. A range between A and B is what counts, not a specific number. This significantly increases acceptance, given that a reduction of 40 percent is considered a success and failure to achieve a reduction of 50 percent will not result in sanctions.

This involves preserving habitats or farming landscape through voluntary collaboration with landowners. We won’t get farmers on board if we force them to make unrealistic reductions. This model has been very well accepted and its potential for conflict is low. Alongside acceptance, we need to set realistic objectives. Data is circulating suggesting that, as part of the Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, 30 percent of land is to be reserved for organic farming. I believe this is unrealistic. Organic farming currently has a share of 14 percent and we have achieved this over 40 years. How are we supposed to achieve 30 percent within ten years? The same applies to the use of fertilisers and pesticides. We won’t get farmers on board if we force them to make unrealistic reductions.

This is what sparked massive criticism in the “Save the Bees” initiative. Those people working in agriculture are already managing our soil in a responsible manner. Using fertilisers and pesticides costs money and no one is going to spread any more on their fields than is absolutely necessary. Unrealistic objectives, combined with more checks and sanctions, will not help to prevent small, family-owned farms from closing. They are particularly affected by increasingly stringent requirements and restrictions concerning the management of their land.

This means we also need to encourage consumers to change their views and opt for a healthy and sustainable diet. At the same time, we need to increase appreciation for food and farming.

Document 5

Climate Change Will Cost Us Even More Than We Think.

Adapted from an article in the *New York Times: International Edition*, a US newspaper, October 2019.

Naomi Oreskes was a professor of the history of science at Harvard and the author of *Why Trust Science?* Nicholas Stern was chair of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment at the London School of Economics and the author of *Why Are We Waiting? The Logic, Urgency and Promise of Tackling Climate Change*.

Economists greatly underestimate the price tag on harsher weather and higher seas.

Content removed due to copyright restrictions.

if we wait to be more certain, the only certainty is that we will regret it.

But

Document 6**How To Tackle Climate Change, Food Security And Land Degradation.**

Adapted from an article in *Eurasia Review*, a journal and think tank which ‘provides a venue for analysts and experts to disseminate content on a wide range of subjects that are often overlooked or under-represented by Western dominated media’, July 2020.

How can some of the world’s biggest problems – climate change, food security and land degradation – be tackled simultaneously? Some lesser-known options, such as integrated water management and increasing the organic content of soil, have fewer trade-offs than many well-known options, such as planting trees, according to a Rutgers-led study in the journal *Global Change Biology*. ‘We argue that if we want to have an impact on multiple problems, we need to be smart about what options get us multiple benefits and which options come with potential trade-offs,’ said lead author Pamela McElwee, an associate professor in the Department of Human Ecology in the School of Environmental and Biological Sciences at Rutgers University–New Brunswick. ‘We found that many of the better-known solutions to climate mitigation and land degradation come with a lot of potentially significant trade-offs.’

The idea of planting trees in vast areas to remove carbon dioxide from the air and reduce the impact of climate change, for example, has attracted a lot of attention, with some claiming it’s the best “low-hanging fruit” approach to pursue, McElwee said. But large-scale tree planting could conflict directly with food security because both compete for available land. It could also diminish biodiversity, if fast-growing exotic trees replace native habitat. Some potential options that don’t get as much attention globally, but are quite promising with fewer trade-offs, include integrated water management, reducing post-harvest losses in agriculture, improving fire management, agroforestry (integrating trees and shrubs with croplands and pastures) and investing in disaster risk management, she said.

The study examined possible synergies and trade-offs with environmental and development goals. It was based on a massive literature review – essentially 1,400 individual literature reviews – conducted by scientists at many institutions. They compared 40 options to tackle the interrelated problems of climate change, food security and land degradation and looked for trade-offs or co-benefits with 18 categories of services provided by ecosystems, such as clean air and clean water, and the United Nations’ 17 sustainable development goals. The work was done as part of an Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Special Report on Climate Change and Land released last year. Such reports offer only highlights, and this study includes all the details.

Several interventions show potentially significant negative impacts on sustainable development goals and ecosystem services. These include bioenergy (plant-based sources of energy such as wood fuels or ethanol) and bioenergy with carbon capture and storage, large-scale afforestation and some risk-sharing measures, such as commercial crop insurance. The results show that a better understanding of the benefits and trade-offs of different policy approaches can help decision-makers choose the more effective – or at least the more benign – interventions.

Document 7**The West's Power of Attraction.**

Adapted from an article in *Carnegie Europe*, a website of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a US think tank, February 2020.

Judy Dempsey was a non-resident senior fellow at Carnegie Europe and editor-in-chief of *Strategic Europe*, a Carnegie Endowment publication.

The West is not in good shape, but its ability to survive, adapt, and inspire are strengths that need to be recognized and exploited.

Confidence in Europe and others across the West is in short supply. It shouldn't be, for several reasons. First, the West as an idea, as a way of life, as a way of ordering politics continues to be an attraction, indeed, a magnet for those living under authoritarian or semi-democratic systems. The West's precious institutions anchored on the rule of law, on human rights, on individual freedoms are the values that continue to carry influence across the world. Yes, they are being challenged by China, Egypt, Russia, Turkey, and fundamentalist movements. But if the West has become so weak, according to the doomsayers, why do so many individuals and activists not living in the West still want to become part of the West or want the West to help them? Remember those heady days after 1989 when Central and Eastern Europeans yearned to join the "West"?

Second, the West is not a phenomenon based on a geographical area, even though it is often perceived precisely as that. Instead, the attraction of the West is the attraction of universal human rights. When the West's critics accuse Western governments of interference or of imposing their values, it's the West's contagion that they fear and want to contain. That contagion is universal human rights and freedom. The West is synonymous with universal rights.

The complacency of Western governments to explain and protect its institutions and values and address today's major social issues is creating a backlash—on the one hand by populists who fuel anti-establishment sentiment and argue the West's liberal values are too intrusive, and on the other by civil society movements that want a more inclusive, direct democracy. Both phenomena are a reaction to the West's complacency.

If the West (and Europe) wants to remain attractive, it has to adapt to the changing demands of its citizens. It didn't have to do that after 1945 or indeed after the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989. The West assumed it was in the driving seat. In the winning lane. It still is, regardless of what's taking place in China, Russia, India, and across the Atlantic.

But to maintain its attraction, Western leaders need to overcome complacency. That means acting confidently to defend their own political system and, especially, defend those in the world struggling for universal human rights.

It means not writing off the West but defending it.

Document 8**Questioning Western nations' moral values.**

Adapted from an article in *Asia Times*, a newspaper and news website based in Thailand, Hong Kong and India, April 2020.

Mohammed Nosseir was an Egyptian politician.

In any conversation, Western citizens tend to express the pride they take in what they define as "Western values." Arguing that they abide by a set of high moral standards that sets them apart from the rest of the world, they fail to notice that the values they claim may be the accidental product of the strict rules and regulations that control and discipline their societies. Should these provisions ever degenerate, Westerners will behave chaotically and immorally.

Western nations' superiority is derived from the fact that they are scientifically driven nations that offer dignified, prosperous lives to their citizens and provide them with appropriate paths for personal growth, which positively reflects on their societies' evolution.

Moreover, Western nations have articulated ruling mechanisms that allow their politicians to exercise and share power, but do not necessarily serve their citizens' best interests. Meanwhile, moral values can be better observed in the actions of human beings living in the absence of democracy and rule of law.

The authenticity of moral values is most noticeable in individuals who stand by their beliefs and values knowing that voicing these will result in certain disgrace. For example, unlike Westerners whose freedom of expression is protected by law, citizens of autocratic nations often struggle between expressing their opinions, which – if not to the liking of the ruler – could land them in prison for years, and keeping silent, living safe, neutral lives.

"When in Rome, do as the Romans do" is a practical proverb that may safeguard the lives of people living in "Rome," but that lacks the basic essence of morality. It reflects an attitude that encourages people to offer bribes when working in a corrupt nation and to refrain from doing so in nations where strict business regulations are enforced. Although many Western nations penalize their citizens for committing bribery overseas, international companies often manage to overcome this obstacle by assigning a local agency to handle corruption on their behalf.

Decades ago, Western nations habitually committed completely immoral acts such as serious crimes, national wars, gender inequality and sexual harassment, among others – until they put into place a number of transformative rules and regulations that allowed them to live progressive, moral lives, attain their present superior status and develop a constructive Western interstate relationship. The West makes no attempt to build this type of constructive relationship with the rest of the world, where its relationships are driven mostly by economic interests.

The majority of Western populations no doubt behave morally; however, they are powerless citizens who are only able to make their voices heard once every few years, at elections, when choosing their representatives mostly from a predetermined basket of political elites who are often manipulating their nations' policies, regardless of their political leanings, leading us to question the very essence of Western democracy.

By extolling their moral values, Western nations tend to acquire a sense of false moral supremacy, which is eventually translated into imposing their ideas and policies on the rest of the world – a move that in itself dismantles the core of morality. Actually, the true achievement of Western nations came at the hands of previous generations who fought to establish democracy and rule of law in their nations that had been sinking into a state of massive chaos, thus creating the supremacy that the present Western generation is arrogantly harvesting today.

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 after the live examination series.

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