

NAMIBIA SENIOR SECONDARY CERTIFICATE

FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH HIGHER LEVEL

8302/1

PAPER 1 Reading and Directed Writing

2 hours 30 minutes

Marks 60

2013

Additional Materials: Answer Book

INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMATION TO CANDIDATES

- Write your Centre Number, Candidate Number and Name in the spaces provided on the answer book.
- Write your answers in the separate answer book provided.
- Start each question on a new page.
- Write in blue or black pen.
- Do not use correction fluid.

- Answer **all** questions.

- Start each question on a new page.
- The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.
- Dictionaries are not permitted.

HIGHER LEVEL

This document consists of 7 printed pages and 1 blank page.



Republic of Namibia
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION



PART 1

Read the following two passages carefully and then answer Questions 1 and 2.

Passage A**THE WORLD HERITAGE HUSTLE** by Hannah Beech**Making it onto UNESCO's list can often be as much a curse as a blessing**

The historic centre of Hoi An looks just how Vietnam is supposed to look: narrow lanes; wooden shop houses; a charming, covered bridge. From the 16th century onward, the port attracted traders from as far away as Portugal and Persia. The well-preserved architecture of Hoi An led UNESCO to deem it a World Heritage site in 1999, praising it as an “outstanding material manifestation of the fusion of cultures over time in an international commercial port.”

Thirteen years ago when Hoi An was first inscribed on the World Heritage list, the city welcomed 160 300 visitors. In 2011, 1,5 million tourists arrived. Today tour buses crowd the edge of Hoi An's old town, disgorging sunburnt foreigners. Hundreds of nearly identical storefronts, which are catering to tourists and selling the same tailored clothes, shoes and lanterns, colonise the 1 254 heritage structures. Cyclists prowl the perimeter of the historic centre, even as locals complain they can no longer afford the bicycle rickshaws because tourists have driven up the prices. In the rush to squeeze tourism revenue from the area, a hospital has been evicted. The building now houses a tailoring business.

There are 725 World Heritage cultural sites in the world today. UNESCO says these sites boast “outstanding universal value,” and descriptions of them often employ the same adjectives: *unique, authentic, well preserved*.

It is true that a World Heritage designation can save a historic urban centre from becoming yet another undifferentiated, concrete-and-glass dystopia*. However, many cash-poor countries are fixated on World Heritage because they believe that making the list will unlock tourism riches. A 2008 UNESCO report that sounded the alarm over Hoi An's development could be applied to any number of World Heritage sites. “While local government officials and business owners' view... changes in the old quarter positively, tourists are beginning to notice the loss of authenticity in Hoi An,” it warned. “Unless tourism management can be improved, the economic success generated by tourism will not be sustainable in the long term.” Just how do you lure travellers to historic locales without destroying their integrity in the process?

The biggest disappointments arise in countries where World Heritage status is used as a tourist honey trap rather than a tool to preserve a national treasure. Take Lijiang, home to the Naxi minority in south-western China, as an example. Despite the plenty of backpackers converging on the town back in 1994 (as a foreign student in China I was one of them) Lijiang had a soul. Three years (and one devastating earthquake) later, the old town of Lijiang gained World Heritage status. Walking its lanes today, crammed with tour groups and assaulted by the techno blaring from bars, it is hard to imagine what “outstanding universal value” existed there. Many historic buildings have been gutted and replaced with replicas. The bulk of costumed maidens posing for tourists are not even Naxi: they are migrants from elsewhere in China! Half the original residents have left.

Conversely, there is also the danger that World Heritage recognition preserves a place in amber*, forcing it to become a theme park instead of a living landmark. In recent months historic parts of Liverpool and Seville have both been threatened with de-listing because of plans for skyscrapers. (The Dresden Elbe Valley was booted off the list in 2009 “due to the building of a four-lane bridge in the heart of the cultural landscape”.) Yes, skyscrapers can puncture an urban fabric, but these are magnificent cities with real residents going about their real business. Compare that with Lijiang or Hoi An, which may adhere to World heritage rules but feel increasingly like outposts of Disney.

(Abridged and adapted, TIME 6 February 2012)

dystopia – an imaginary place or society in which everything is bad

amber – a hard clear yellowish-brown substance, used in making jewellery

Passage B

RAIN FOREST FOR RANSOM by Bryan Walsh of Yasuni National Park

Ecuador's demand: Pay us or we'll drill for oil in the Amazon.

Should the world say yes?

Yasuni National Park is a 10 000-sq-km reserve on the western fringes of the Amazon basin. It is considered by many scientists to be the single most biodiverse spot on the planet. However, it is a paradise in danger of being lost. Oil companies have found rich deposits beneath the park's trees and rivers, nearly 900 million barrels of crude oil worth billions of dollars. That would be money that Ecuador – a small South American country in which a third of the population lives below the poverty line and petroleum already accounts for more than half its export revenue – badly needs, money that oil companies and consumers will be only too happy to provide if drilling is allowed to go forward. If Ecuador follows the usual path of development, that's exactly what will happen – with disastrous consequences for the park.

Yet there may be another way. Ecuadorian President Rafael Correa has told the international community that his country would be willing to forego drilling and leave Yasuni largely intact in exchange for donations equal to \$3,6 billion over 13 years, or about half the expected market value of the park's oil deposits. This plan would conserve Yasuni's unique biodiversity and prevent the emission of over 800 million tons of carbon dioxide. The Yasuni plan would be a first for global environment policy: recognition that the international community has a financial responsibility to help developing nations preserve nature. "Oil is by far the most important part of Ecuador's economy," says Carlos Larrea, a professor at Andean University and a technical advisor on the Yasuni project. "But we are willing to keep that oil indefinitely unexploited if the international community contributes."

If we all really do have a shared stake in the natural heritage represented by hot spots like Yasuni, then we have a shared responsibility in helping a poor country preserve it. "We need these resources to develop the country, but we're also responsible people who want to protect Yasuni," Correa said in New York recently. "If the poor don't receive direct benefits from conservation, conservation won't be sustainable."

Even by the standards of the tropical rain forest, which is by far the richest belt of life on the globe, Yasuni stands out. There are estimated to be about 100 000 insects per hectare, the highest concentration on earth. More woody tree species – 655 by one count – grow in a single hectare of rain forest in Yasuni than in all of North America. The park is home to 28 threatened or near threatened vertebrate species and 95 threatened or near threatened plant species. It is a bird watcher's paradise, with nearly 600 species. What is even more amazing is how much of that life is stuffed into such a small land area. Yasuni harbours nearly one third of the Amazon basin's amphibian and reptile species, despite covering less than 0,15% of its total area.

Yasuni may not survive the oil age. Conservationists fear the effect of oil drilling in

and around Yasuni because they have seen the damage that energy exploration can do to nature, and no one knows that better than Ecuadorians. The oil giant Texaco has been accused of polluting vast stretches of the Ecuadorian Amazon during its operations there in the 1970s and '80s, and the company, now owned by Chevron, is involved in a long-running \$27 billion lawsuit over the damages – the world's biggest environmental case ever.

Exploration requires pipelines, camps and roads, which would cut through the park and lead to direct deforestation. Furthermore, those roads would bring colonization, which would lead to secondary deforestation, fragmentation of habitats and intensified hunting and fishing. A 2006 study showed that the Via Maxus, a road on the north-eastern border of Yasuni, had a 40% lower mammal abundance compared with an intact area in the forest interior. If Yasuni is what it is largely because people are absent – with the exception of a few indigenous tribes that live deep within the forest – the amount of industrialization and human activity required to pump 846 million barrels of oil out of the ground would change the park irrevocably.

If the Yasuni initiative moves forward, all that might be prevented. The plan would require Ecuador to refrain from extracting the oil contained in Yasuni indefinitely in exchange for at least \$3,6 billion, which would go into a capital fund to be administered chiefly by the U.N. Development Programme. That money would be earmarked for investment in renewable energy projects in Ecuador and social development for indigenous communities in and around Yasuni. Although Ecuador has so far managed to gather \$53 million in commitments from a number of countries and even some individuals, the international community seems unconvinced for the most part. There are also other reasons for the international community to be wary of the Yasuni initiative, and Ecuador itself has not been the most stable country politically.

In reality, the chance of success seems to lessen by the day, but the issues raised by the Yasuni project will not go away. South America is becoming an increasingly important oil producer: the continent holds 20% of the world's proven oil reserves, and much of that crude oil is buried in and around the Amazon basin. That puts the rain forest in mortal peril: the global need for oil grows. The financial burden of protecting our most biodiverse forests (nearly all found in developing nations) can't fall only on poor nations like Ecuador. If we cannot protect the rain forest in Yasuni from the drive for oil, we may not be able to protect it anywhere else.

(Abridged and adapted, TIME 19 December 2011)

- 1 Summarise how making it onto the UNESCO list of World Heritage sites (Passage A) and allowing oil drilling in the uniquely bio-diverse Yasuni National Park (Passage B) will ruin the areas concerned.

Write your summary in two parts:

- **Passage A** (World heritage)
- **Passage B** (Yasuni National Park)

You should write about **1 – 1½** pages, allowing for the size of your handwriting.

[20]

- 2 You take a keen interest not only in your surroundings but in areas afar as well.

You are aware of the dilemma faced by the historic centre of Hoi An as a World Heritage site and the Yasuni National Park. You find that you can hardly share your thoughts with the people around you, who seem entirely indifferent to or ignorant of these issues. You feel that something needs to be done to create awareness. You consider that an informative or a persuasive letter to an update newspaper would be a good start.

Write the letter to an update newspaper in which you deal with the question:

Can World Heritage sites and the exceptionally biodiverse Yasuni National Park be preserved in a world pressurised by economic circumstances?

Base your ideas on what you have read in both **Passage A** and **Passage B**.

Start your letter with: *Dear sir/madam*

You should write about **1½ – 2** pages, allowing for the size of your handwriting.

[20]

PART 2

- 3 You and a classmate know that there are plans to erect nuclear power stations in Namibia. In your conversation about nuclear reactors, Japan and its Fukushima Dai-ichi crisis undoubtedly is brought up.

The two of you defend opposing stands on nuclear energy production.

Write the conversation taking place between you and your classmate.

Start your conversation with one of you stating:

.....: Look what happened in Japan! 5500 Japanese took to the streets to celebrate the switching off of the last of the 54 nuclear reactors on 5 May 2012.

.....: Yes, true, but whether Japan will suffer a power crunch is still unclear.

- Continue the dialogue. Base your arguments on the points given below.
- You should write about 1½ - 2 pages on the size of your handwriting.

[20]

The crisis: the quake and tsunami meltdown at the Fukushima Dai-ichi plant on 11 March 2011 – 54 reactors in Japan – Fukushima Dai-ichi still spewing radiation into air and water – public worries about nuclear safety.

Reactions: some Japanese want nuclear reactors back in operation – want jobs, subsidies and benefits to local economy – crowd of 5500 shrugged off government warnings about power shortage – activists found switching off nuclear power fitting to coincide with Children’s Day – one lady said, “Let’s leave an Earth where our children and grandchildren can all play without worries.”

More points to consider: children need protection from radiation – Japan without electricity from nuclear power for first time in decades when reactor at Tomari nuclear plant went offline for routine maintenance on 5 May 2012 – activists maintain not a single nuclear plant will be up and running – government eager to restart nuclear reactors and warned about effects – Japan forced to turn to oil and gas for energy – blackouts and rising carbon emission – electricity shortages expected.

Note: before March 11 catastrophe one-third of Japan’s electricity generated by nuclear power – mayor of Tomari supports nuclear power – reactors halted for checkups not restarted.

(Adapted m.yahoo.com/w/legobpengine/news/thousands-march-japan-shuts-off-nuclear-power)

BLANK PAGE

