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Task 1

Look at the two texts on page 3. For questions 1 – 6, choose the option (A, B, C or D) which you think fits best according to the texts.

1 Review Extract One explains that tropical islands were useful to the development of European environmental thought because they

A were of a size that limited the scale of problems introduced to them via colonisation.
B featured ecological regimes not already affected by human settlement pre-colonisation.
C had features which made certain impacts of colonisation particularly visible.
D remained largely isolated from most European influences even post-colonisation.

2 The views of the historians referred to in Review Extract One suggest that pre-colonial tropical island societies

A lacked the capacity to resist invasion by the colonisers.
B were more accustomed than Europeans to difficult natural environments.
C consumed fewer natural resources than did the European colonisers.
D were unable to contribute to theoretical enquiry about environmental matters.

3 According to Review Extract One, Grove's viewpoint on the effects of colonialism is 'more nuanced' in that he

A challenges certain beliefs about the expansion of western science into other societies.
B acknowledges the impact of tropical island cultures and environments on European thought.
C questions the degree of harmful change enacted by the colonisers.
D focuses on the views of the indigenous populations on islands colonised by Europeans.
The author of Review Extract Two refers to British agricultural developments to make the point that Grove overlooks

A) the potential significance of European issues and events in the shaping of environmentalism.

B) the new solutions to environmental problems suggested by the experience of native tropical islanders.

C) the growing importance of agricultural practices in the evolution of environmental thinking.

D) the methodological problems associated with a study covering such a lengthy period of European history.

The author of Review Extract Two suggests that ‘Grove’s tropical scientific experimenters’

A) were more comfortable with the non-European cultures found on the tropical islands.

B) did not gain insights useful for the advancement of an environmental perspective.

C) over-emphasised the relevance of the ‘edenic’ in environmental thinking.

D) were not key figures in other major European-based circles of thought.

Which review extract or extracts indicates that Grove has taken a relatively original approach within his study?

A) Neither review extract

B) Both review extracts

C) Review Extract One only

D) Review Extract Two only
Task 2

Look at the four texts on pages 4 – 5. For questions 7 – 14, choose the option (A, B, C or D) which you think best answers the questions.

7. Which writer mentions a limitation which affected an investigation of mathematical beauty?

8. Which writer gives a broad overview of certain attempts to exploit mathematical beauty?

9. Which writer highlights the fact that finding order out of chaos is not the only aspect of mathematical beauty?

10. Which writer says that expressing a particular mathematical notion in physical form would not do justice to it?

11. Which writer says that a visual representation of mathematics can produce a moment of illumination?

12. Which writer includes the idea that mathematics is beautiful when it sheds light on the biggest scientific questions?

13. Which writer suggests that academics do not proclaim the notion of mathematical beauty?

14. Which writer implies that for most people the high cognitive element in mathematics would obstruct any notion of mathematical beauty?
Task 3

Look at the text on pages 6 – 7. For questions 15 – 24, choose the answer (A, B, C or D) which you think fits best according to the text.

15 In the context of paragraph 1, ‘reasons’ has the meaning of

A causes.
B explanations.
C motives.
D justifications.

16 What is the main point that the author makes about actions in paragraph 1?

A Agents are not always responsible for the consequences of their actions.
B Actions must be interpreted according to their consequences as well as their reasons.
C If an action is well intentioned there are no grounds for blame or need for apology.
D Agents cannot know in advance how their actions will affect others.

17 In paragraph 2, the writer suggests that

A without our shared experience of consequences we could not understand the private reasons people have for their actions.
B without communication skills it would not be possible to convey the intentions behind our bodily behaviour.
C without a satisfactory account of actions we fail to take the agent’s point of view into consideration.
D without a proper explanation for our own bodily behaviour we cannot explain our reasons for actions.
18 The author introduces a reference to game theory

A to illustrate a distinction between causes and effects.
B to demonstrate the ethical value of consequentialism.
C as a useful analogy for real-life situations.
D as an example of consequentialism in practice.

19 The main point that the author is making in paragraph 4 is that

A people may act for different reasons in different circumstances.
B the nature of consequences makes them simpler to deal with than reasons.
C despite its problems, consequentialism is the only valid form of evaluation.
D the problem with reasons is that it is often difficult to distinguish between them.

20 In paragraph 5 it is stated that for a serious consequentialist,

A people are accountable for their actions even after they are dead.
B an important ethical question concerning action disappears.
C the alleviation of worldwide suffering is no single person’s responsibility.
D there is a subtle difference between doing something and doing nothing.

21 The example in paragraph 6 of medical research and equipment is meant to draw attention to

A the feeling of guilt that comes from inaction.
B the responsibility we feel towards those in need.
C the fact that our resources are finite.
D the claim that actions are essentially goal-directed.
22 Judging by paragraph 6, the author thinks that the doctrine of unlimited negative responsibility

A is a recipe for inactivity.

B derives from a prevailing sense of guilt.

C has no moral justification.

D is inconsistent with consequentialism.

23 The main point put forward in paragraph 7 is that

A bringing happiness to a limited number is a good thing to aim for.

B the welfare of all of humanity should not be our sole moral preoccupation.

C there is no virtue in depriving one’s children to maximise charitable giving.

D it is better to give money to those in need than to spend it selfishly.

24 In paragraph 7, the author concludes that the real contrast is between

A legitimate spending on one’s family and the need to give to charity.

B spending that has genuine value and spending that does not.

C unlimited negative responsibility and ordinary kindness.

D feelings of moral obligation and a desire to make people happy.
Task 4

Look at the text on pages 8 – 9. For questions 25 – 36, choose the option (A, B, C or D) which you think fits best according to the text.

25 Having introduced us to the book’s central contention, which feature of it does the author attempt to justify next?
   A its inevitability
   B its significance
   C our likelihood of accepting it
   D its basis in human psychology

26 What is the importance of ‘modernity’ for the author’s argument in paragraph 2?
   A It was a turbulent period which presented a series of difficult challenges.
   B The transition to it saw changes that were particularly violent.
   C It represents a period of profound socio-cultural change.
   D Its impact on our lives depends solely on one’s perspective.

27 What view does the author reject in paragraph 3?
   A Accepting the biological basis of human existence commits you to a pessimistic view of human nature.
   B Society has had a positive effect on the moral conduct of human beings.
   C Human beings ought to be thought of in terms of being essentially vicious or virtuous.
   D It is possible to know for certain what the natural state of man was like before civilisation began.
28 The author says this has to be a ‘big book’ because

A it has to oppose our natural tendencies to form certain kinds of beliefs.
B it is telling a different story from the one that is portrayed to us by the media.
C there is still enough violence for it to feature regularly in the news.
D people have a tendency to be critical of the society they happen to live in.

29 Which phrase in paragraph 5 picks up on the central idea of paragraph 4?

A ‘recruited activists to a cause’
B ‘lull people into complacency’
C ‘the illusion of ever-present violence’
D ‘a decline in attitudes that tolerate or glorify violence’

30 What view is suggested by the author in paragraph 5?

A People have a preference for hearing bad news over good news.
B Some humans will always have a tendency to commit acts of horrendous evil.
C Adherence to a belief or ideology can motivate people to act selfishly and unethically towards others.
D Ideas about human progress are not always greeted enthusiastically by an educated audience.
31 What further hypothesis does the author put forward in paragraph 5 to explain why people find it so hard to accept the book’s central contention?

A  The fact that violent events still occur means that we are unlikely to accept the view that violence has declined.

B  The decline in violent behaviour is the result of a change in our attitudes towards violence.

C  We think things are getting worse because our views of what is acceptable are becoming stricter.

D  Certain influential groups of people may determine the viewpoints of the general public.

32 What is the main point exemplified by the reference to lethal injections and racial hate crime in paragraph 5?

A  The moral beliefs and cultural practices of humans today are superior to those of people living in former ages.

B  We have made less moral progress in terms of our propensity to violence than we might like to think.

C  While our attitudes to violence may have substantially changed, our potential for violent behaviour has unfortunately not.

D  The extent to which an action is viewed as nasty or violent depends to some extent on the prevailing norms of the time.

33 What idea first raised in paragraph 3 does the writer pick up on in paragraph 7?

A  a theory of human nature rooted in biology

B  a blank slate view of human nature

C  a theory about the natural state of human beings

D  an optimistic view of human progress
34 What phrase in paragraph 3 anticipates what the author professes to be seeking in his conclusion to paragraph 7?

A ‘the arithmetic sign of trends in violence’
B ‘fatalism about violence’
C ‘the natural state of life’
D ‘the artifices of civilization’

35 Throughout the final paragraph, the author discusses problems associated with

A identifying cause and effect.
B understanding social phenomena.
C identifying trends in psychology over time.
D establishing the priority of ideas in historical change.

36 Which statement characterises the author’s view of human nature as it emerges throughout the text as a whole?

A The idea of ‘human nature’ fails to provide an explanation for some human tendencies.
B Human nature and therefore human behaviour are largely dictated by evolution.
C Although human nature is partly determined by our genes, we can learn to modify our behaviour.
D Human nature is essentially a product of the society we live in.
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Task 1

Read the two adapted extracts below, which are taken from reviews of Richard Grove’s *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860.*

**REVIEW EXTRACT ONE**

*Jane Carruthers*

In this book, Grove diverts the field of environmental history from a too-customary North American focus and gives attention to other parts of the globe whose history has been more recently shaped by the colonial experience. Using insights from postmodern literary theory, resource economics and other disciplines, Grove traces the origins of modern environmental concern to European expansion in general, but especially to contact with tropical islands and their plant and animal species. Being isolated and relatively small, the tropical islands rapidly and dramatically demonstrated the mechanisms and processes of ecological change brought about by European penetration, thus generating theoretical enquiry about such matters. While some historians consider imperialism to have been totally detrimental to colonial environments by disrupting pre-colonial ecologies and by aggressive resource extraction, Grove presents a more nuanced view. He sees the course of environmentalism as a two-way process, observing it not only from a colonial perspective but also in terms of how that perspective was shaped by the different climates and ecological regimes encountered by the colonizers. Much of what today is referred to as indigenous knowledge, Grove shows, was not ridden over roughshod by colonizers, but indeed permeated western science.

**REVIEW EXTRACT TWO**

*Bill Luckin*

Focusing on the multiple meanings of the ‘edenic’ and the ‘newly discovered’ non-European world between 1600 and the mid-nineteenth century, Grove makes convincing connexions between the ways in which British, Dutch and French men of science were able to draw on everyday experience and specialist knowledge of remote islands to build up an understanding of the potential fragility and exhaustability of nature. Over-playing the edenic theme, however, Grove devotes too little attention to possible alternatives to scientific fascination with island milieux as major determinants of emerging global environmentalism. Thus, it would have been revealing to have juxtaposed structural similarities and dissimilarities between agricultural intervention in eighteenth-century Mauritius against analogous developments of enclosure and agrarian improvement in Britain between 1750 and 1815. Such a comparison might have convinced sceptical readers that Grove’s tropical scientific experimenters really were more influential than Eurocentric ideologues and cultural critics in preparing opinion in England and France in particular for the possibility that ‘progress’ might generate severe, socially disruptive environmental disequilibria. Instead, Grove’s reluctance to trace ideological and intellectual connexions between broader Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment discourses weakens the thrust of his study as he moves from the eighteenth into the mid-nineteenth century.

---

1 edenic: evoking a sense of the unspoilt or idyllic
Task 2

Read the four extracts below, which give the views of four writers on the beauty of maths.

A  Justin Mullins

The philosopher and logician Bertrand Russell famously claimed that mathematics has ‘a beauty cold and austere, like that of sculpture’. Sculpture, indeed, is widely admired in our societies, but mathematical beauty is barely recognised beyond the confines of the ivory towers of scholars and even by them is never celebrated. This seems curious because it is clear that artists have long found inspiration in mathematics, from Ancient Greek architects using ‘the golden ratio’ when designing the Parthenon, through Da Vinci's linking of human beauty and geometry in *Vitruvian Man* to modern-day computer graphics of fractal patterns.

But mathematicians are not normally thinking of images, models and sculptures when they talk about beauty. Mathematical beauty is not so much visual quality: the generally accepted view is that it involves employing a minimal number of assumptions, or gives some original and important insight, or throws other work into new perspective. The most famous example of a function that meets all these requirements is Euler’s formula $e^{ix} = \cos x + i\sin x$ which links together fundamental mathematical concepts and draws together geometry, the study of space, and algebra, the study of structure and quantity. I have never seen an ‘artistic’ model of Euler’s formula, but it would be impossible to get a sense of the function’s power and majesty from such a thing.

B  Semir Zekil et al

Art and mathematics are, to most, at polar opposites; the former has a more ‘sensible’, perceptually-based source and is accessible to many while the latter has a strongly intellectual source and is accessible to few. Yet both can provoke the aesthetic emotion and arouse an experience of beauty, although neither all great art nor all great mathematical formulations do so. Plato thought that ‘nothing without understanding would ever be more beauteous than with understanding,’ making mathematical beauty, for him, the highest form of beauty.

The premium thus placed on the faculty of understanding when experiencing beauty creates both a problem and an opportunity for studying the neurobiology of beauty. Unlike our previous studies of the neurobiology of musical or visual beauty, in which participating subjects were neither experts nor trained in these domains, in the present study we had, of necessity, to recruit subjects with a fairly advanced knowledge of mathematics and a comprehension of the formulae that they viewed and rated.
C Doris Schattschneider
When mathematical patterns or processes automatically generate art, a surprising effect can occur: the art often clarifies the mathematics. Who could have guessed the mathematical nuggets that might otherwise be hidden in a torrent of symbolic or numerical information? At a basic level, the process of coloring the numbers resulting from some formula, for example, allows the information to take on a visual shape that provides identity and recognition. Who could guess the shape or the marvellous symmetry of an algorithmically produced fractal?

Sometimes the beautiful clarification of mathematics can be a serendipitous outcome of art created for other reasons. But equally there are examples in which the artist's main purpose is to express, even embody mathematics. Several prints by M.C. Escher are the result of his attempts to visually express such mathematical concepts as infinity, duality, dimension, recursion, topological morphing, and self-similarity.

However, patterns and forms that are the ‘automatic’ product of purely mathematical processes are usually so precise, symmetrical, mechanical or repetitive that they fail to hold the art viewer's attention. They can be pleasing and interesting, and are fun to create but are mostly devoid of the subtlety, spontaneity, and deviation from precision that artistic intuition and creativity provide.

D David Bailey et al
Almost all research mathematicians pepper their descriptions of important mathematical work with terms like 'unexpected,' 'elegance,' 'simplicity' and 'beauty.' Henri Poincaré (1854–1912), often described as a polymath, wrote, in his essay ‘Mathematical Creation’, that ignoring the subjective experience 'would be to forget the feeling of mathematical beauty, of the harmony of numbers and forms, of geometric elegance. This is a true aesthetic feeling that all real mathematicians know, and surely it belongs to emotional sensibility.' So what exactly is the source of mathematical beauty?

All aesthetic responses seem to come in part from identifying simplicity in complexity, pattern in disharmony, structure in stasis. But as pointed out in an article in *The Economist* (2005), we should also bear in mind that maths is useful, and that its utility depends in part on its certainty, and that that certainty cannot come without a notion of proof. Some argue that mathematical principles are experienced as ‘beautiful’ because they point directly to the fundamental structure of the universe. Physicist Max Tegmark argues further that the reason that mathematics works so well, and so elegantly, in physics is because the universe (or, more properly, the multiverse) is, ultimately, just mathematics.
Consequences and negative responsibility

1. Actions are two-faced. They are done by agents intentionally and are therefore expressive of what the agent has in mind. But they are also causes of effects in the public external world of events, and have consequences irrespective of whether they were intended or not. Actions typically both manifest reasons and bring about results. Both aspects of action are essential, but it is common for thinkers to concentrate on one to the exclusion of the other. Where blame is at issue, or apology called for, the agent thinks only of his intentions, and says ‘I didn’t mean to’. The impersonal spectator, on the other hand, tends to discount the agent's perspective, and to consider actions solely in the light of their consequences, and hold people responsible for all the consequences of their action or inaction.

2. Either exclusion eviscerates the concept. If we think of actions solely as communications conveying the agent's intentions, we ignore the conditions which alone make communication possible. It is not just that the way to hell is paved with good intentions, but that there is a conceptual link between what is intended and what actually happens, and it is only in virtue of our sharing a common world of cause-and-effect that we can construe the bodily behaviour of another as expressing his intentions towards us. Equally, however, we fail to give an adequate account of actions if we try to see them simply as causes, and do not see them also from the agent's point of view, and ask ourselves what his reasons were for doing as he did.

3. Once we acknowledge that the consequences of actions count, it is tempting to adopt an entirely consequentialist position, in which the distinction between an action and its consequences ceases to signify, and each course of action is evaluated entirely and exclusively in the light of its consequences. Even if we admit that actions are not merely causes, it is very largely as causes that they are significant for us. The terminology of game theory strongly suggests that the payoffs, in terms of which outcomes are to be evaluated, are consequences, and most game theorists unwittingly assume a consequentialist outlook.

4. Consequentialism has many merits. It offers a unitary scheme of evaluation, which takes full account of the fact that consequences are important. Consequences are much more definite than motives or intentions: consequences are states of affairs, and it is moderately easy to distinguish between one state of affairs and another, and to decide which, if either, obtains. Reasons, by contrast, are much more indeterminate: often there is no way of telling what were the reasons behind a particular action. Although the scheme for evaluating states of affairs put forward by consequentialism runs into difficulties, states of affairs are the sort of thing that could be evaluated objectively, and often are. We often do take consequences into account in deciding what to do, and are able to assess their value, and it is not clear that there is anything else that could enter into our reckoning with equal validity and weight.
However, consequentialism has difficulties of time perspective. It is not clear when the consequences are to be evaluated: is it on the morrow of the action, or the following year, or in the long run when we are all dead, and everything will be much the same whatever we have done? An exclusive emphasis on consequences also obliterates the distinction, important in our ordinary moral thinking, between action and inaction. According to the consequentialist we are as much responsible for the consequences of what we do not do as for the consequences of what we do: if at any time I failed to alleviate sufferings in the remotest parts of the Third World, I am as responsible as if I had deliberately chosen to bring them about.

From a conceptual point of view such a doctrine of unlimited negative responsibility is flawed. It misconstrues the nature of action. To act is to focus on some end result and therefore away from others. I must keep my eye on the ball, and therefore turn a blind eye to other needs. If I am doing medical research, I ought not to sell my equipment to relieve immediate hunger. Negative responsibility is also a hard doctrine. It loads everyone with unassailable feelings of guilt. For that very reason, we sense, it must be wrong. I cannot be responsible for alleviating all the ills in the world. Moreover, an all-pervasive feeling of guilt is, in practice, counter-productive. What is the general responsibility of all becomes the responsibility of nobody in particular. And since, however much one does there will be countless tasks undone for which one will be blamed, it is tempting to just give in, and wallow with everybody in feeling bad without actually doing anything to make some things better.

In criticising the consequentialist's doctrine of unlimited negative responsibility, I do not maintain that nobody should have a wide-ranging concern for the general welfare of mankind, but merely reject the unbending Procrustian tenet that this is the only concern that any moral agent should have. Although that may be the vocation for some, for many it is a good vocation to make just a few people happy, as in family life. The man who gives his children only sardine sandwiches for Christmas, so as to give more to Oxfam, is not self-evidently doing right. One may even spend something on oneself. This is not to say that money should be spent on one's family or oneself regardless of the needs of others, as it too often is. Many people are selfish and many devote their lives to the trivial and valueless, and it would be far better if they gave money and time to help their less fortunate fellow human beings. But that is a call for generosity, not an obligation arising from their being always responsible for every ill they could conceivably have prevented.
Read the text below, which is taken from the opening to a book called *The Better Angels of Our Natures* by the cognitive psychologist Steven Pinker.

1. This book is about what may be the most important thing that has ever happened in human history. Believe it or not – and I know that most people do not – violence has declined over long stretches of time, and today we may be living in the most peaceable era in our species’ existence. The decline, to be sure, has not been smooth; it has not brought violence down to zero; and it is not guaranteed to continue. But it is an unmistakeable development, visible on scales from millennia to years, from the waging of wars to the spanking of children.

2. The historical trajectory of violence affects not only how life is lived but how it is understood. What could be more fundamental to our sense of meaning and purpose than a conception of whether the strivings of the human race over long stretches of time have left us better or worse off? How, in particular, are we to make sense of modernity – of the erosion of family, tribe, tradition and religion, by the forces of individualism, cosmopolitanism, reason and science? So much depends on how we understand the legacy of this transition: whether we see our world as a nightmare of crime, terrorism, genocide, and war, or as a period that, by the standards of history, is blessed by unprecedented levels of peaceful coexistence.

3. The question of whether the arithmetic sign of trends in violence is positive or negative also bears on our conception of human nature. Though theories of human nature rooted in biology are often associated with fatalism about violence, and the theory that the mind is a blank slate is associated with progress, in my view it is the other way around. How are we to understand the natural state of life when our species first emerged and the process of history began? The belief that violence has increased suggests that the world we made has contaminated us, perhaps irretrievably. The belief that it has decreased suggests that we started off nasty and that the artifices of civilization have moved us in a noble direction, one in which we can hope to continue.

4. This is a big book, but it has to be. First I really have to convince you that violence really has gone down over the course of history, knowing that the very idea invites skepticism, incredulity, and sometimes anger. Our cognitive faculties predispose us to believe that we live in violent times, especially when they are stoked by media that follow the watchword, ‘If it bleeds, it leads.’ The human mind tends to estimate the probability of an event from the ease with which it can recall examples, and scenes of carnage are more likely to be beamed into our homes and burned into our memories than footage of people dying of old age. No matter how small the percentage of violent deaths may be, in absolute numbers there will always be enough of them to fill the evening news, so people’s impressions of violence will be disconnected from the actual proportions.
Also distorting our sense of danger is our moral psychology. No one has ever recruited activists to a cause by announcing that things are getting better, and bearers of good news are often advised to keep their mouths shut lest they lull people into complacency. Also, a large swath of our intellectual culture is loath to admit that there could be anything good about civilization, modernity, and Western society. But perhaps the main cause of the illusion of ever-present violence springs from one of the forces that drove violence down in the first place. The decline of violent behaviour has been paralleled by a decline in attitudes that tolerate or glorify violence, and often the attitudes are in the lead. By the standards of the mass atrocities of human history, the lethal injection of a murderer in Texas, or an occasional hate crime in which a member of an ethnic minority is intimidated by hooligans, is pretty mild stuff. But from a contemporary vantage point, we see them as signs of how low our behaviour can sink, not of how high our standards have risen.

The problem I have set out to understand is the reduction in violence at many levels – in the family, in the neighbourhood, between tribes and other armed factions, and among major nations and states. If the history of violence at each level of granularity had an idiosyncratic trajectory, each would belong in a separate book. But to my repeated astonishment, the global trends in almost all of them, viewed from the vantage point of the present, point downward. That calls for documenting the various trends between a single pair of covers, and seeking commonalities in when, how, and why they have occurred.

A large part of the book will explore the psychology of violence and nonviolence. The theory of mind that I will invoke is the synthesis of cognitive science, affective and cognitive neuroscience, social and evolutionary psychology, and other sciences of human nature that I explored in my previous books. According to this understanding, the mind is a complex system of cognitive and emotional faculties implemented in the brain which owe their basic design to the processes of evolution. Some of these faculties incline us toward various kinds of violence. Others – ‘the better angels of our nature,’ in Abraham Lincoln’s words – incline us toward cooperation and peace. The way to explain the decline in violence is to identify the changes in our cultural and material milieu that have given our peaceable motives the upper hand.

Finally, I need to show how our history has engaged our psychology. Everything in human affairs is connected to everything else, and that is especially true of violence. Across time and space, the more peaceable societies also tend to be richer, healthier, better educated, better governed, more respectful of their women, and more likely to engage in trade. It’s not easy to tell which of these happy traits got the virtuous circle started and which went along for the ride, and it’s tempting to resign oneself to unsatisfying circularities, such as that violence declined because the culture got less violent. Social scientists distinguish ‘endogenous’ variables – those that are inside the system, where they may be affected by the very phenomena they are trying to explain – from the ‘exogenous’ ones – those that are set in motion by forces from the outside. Exogenous forces can originate in the practical realm, such as changes in technology, demographics, and the mechanisms of commerce and governance. But they can also originate in the intellectual realm, as new ideas are conceived and disseminated and take on a life of their own. The most satisfying explanation of a historical change is one that identifies an exogenous trigger. To the best that the data allow it, I will try to identify exogenous forces that have engaged our mental faculties in different ways at different times and that thereby can be said to have caused the declines in violence.
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INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Please read these instructions carefully, but do not open the question paper until you are told that you may do so. This paper is Section 2 of 2.

This question paper requires you to read a single passage and answer three related questions.

You should write your answer in the space provided in this question paper. Please complete this section in black pen.

You can use the blank inside front and back covers for rough working or notes, but no extra paper is allowed. Only answers in the space indicated in the paper will be marked.

Dictionaries may NOT be used.

Please wait to be told you may begin before turning this page.

This question paper consists of 12 printed pages and 4 blank pages.
Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow.

Write your answers in the space provided in this booklet. Your answers must be in English.

**World Lite: What is global literature?**

World Literature certainly sounds like a nice idea. A literature truly global in scope ought to enlarge readers’ sympathies and explode local prejudices, releasing us from the clammy cells of provincialism to roam, in imagination, with people in faraway places and times. The aim is unimpeachable. Accordingly, nobody says a word against it at the humanities department conclaves, international book festivals, or lit-mag panel discussions where World Literature is invoked. People writing and reading in different languages (even if one language, English, predominates) about different histories and cultures and ideas: who could be against that?

Still, in a sick, sad world, it’s hard not to be suspicious of anything as wholesome as World Literature. The word *literature* itself has come to sound fake. Is there something the addition of *world* is making up for, a blemish it’s trying to conceal?

This much is clear: by the late ’90s, a new literary globalism had begun to flourish. In 1997, Arundhati Roy’s *God of Small Things* won the Booker Prize, soon selling 6 million copies; in 2001, Oprah had her book club read Rohinton Mistry’s *A Fine Balance*, an excellent novel, published in 1995, about Indira Gandhi’s Emergency; in 2003, reading the bestselling *Kite Runner*, by the Afghan-born Khaled Hosseini, made some Americans feel better, and others worse, about our war over there. Literary scholars have focused on World Literature especially since 1999, when the French literary critic Pascale Casanova published her pathbreaking *World Republic of Letters*. In the ’00s, Franco Moretti, from Italy but resident (with Google) in Silicon Valley, instigated data-based debates about the world-system of literature in the *New Left Review*.

The geographic broadening of literary sensibility has taken place alongside the beginnings of a remarkable economic catch-up of poorer with richer countries. In 2013, for the first time since the Industrial Revolution, more economic growth will take place in “developing” than in developed countries. The Indian market for Anglophone literature will soon be bigger than the British one. Chinese writers have won two of the last thirteen Nobel Prizes. A South American is now pope, for the first time since Columbus brought Christianity to the New World.

What has all this meant? In literature, no more folkloric long poems or dreary tales of hardscrabble villages with non-potable water, which everyone in grad school pretended to like. In the new millennium, literature has taken a Jason Bourne–like tour through the emerging financial capitals of what used to be the third world: big books about Mumbai and Beijing, Nairobi and São Paulo, have joined books about London and New York in a glittering constellation rotating across the night sky. In the new economic era of northern slowdown and southern catch-up, the exemplary novelists have seemed to be those, like Orhan Pamuk, Ma Jian, and Haruki Murakami, who successfully transcend their homelands and emerge into a planetary system where their work can acquire a universal relevance.

The progress of World Literature since the ’90s has accompanied that of global capitalism. In the past, the spread of money strengthened rather than weakened national boundaries and languages. It wasn’t so much “world literature” as vernacular literature—composed in Florentine Italian, say, rather than universal Latin—that developed alongside international finance in northern Italy in the late 15th century. Later, the headquarters of capitalism shifted to Holland, then England, then the US, countries mainly inhabited by Protestants who distinguished themselves from Catholics (the word *catholic* meaning simply “universal”) largely by listening to, but especially by reading, the Bible in the same Dutch or English they spoke over dinner. Not coincidentally, these countries attained mass literacy sooner than Catholic ones. In these countries, and others gathered into the capitalist world-system, questions about how money was to be distributed, for example, were discussed in publications produced in the local and/or national language and thus legible to far more people than any “universal” language had ever been. The overall nationalization of literature, throughout modernity, didn’t mean there could never be an internationalist literature, of the kind once imagined by 19th-century radicals. But an internationalist literature would be different from World Literature as we know it.

Source: *n + 1*, Issue 17: The Evil Issue (Fall 2013)
QUESTIONS

1. What is this excerpt about? Answer in no more than 100 words.

2. What do you understand by the term 'World Literature'? What situations have led to its emergence?

3. In our globalising world, there can be no such thing as national literature (e.g. English literature, Italian literature, Japanese literature). Do you agree? Why (not)?
Write your answer in the space below.