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**SCENARIO**

|  |
| --- |
| Jonas and his classmates are having lunch at Koufu after attending their US2 lesson. As they are eating, they share their views on the various topics covered in class:  **Diya**: “Singapore is known to be a very safe place. There are policemen and cameras everywhere. There is no need to be afraid of terrorists or extremist groups.”  **Erica**: “To survive in international diplomacy, smaller nations like Singapore should align ourselves with bigger nations. They will be able to protect us no matter what.”  **Fauzi**: “All countries should choose protectionism over globalisation. We should focus on improving our own economy and helping our local workforce first.”  **Gary**: “Climate change is something that will happen no matter what we try to do. I don’t know if there is a point in engaging in environmental efforts to save our planet.”  Based on the discussions covered during your US2 lessons, respond to **ANY THREE** of the statements above. Please ensure that each response is **at least 200 words**. |

**RESPONSE #1 (20 MARKS)**

|  |
| --- |
| **I am responding to Erica.**  In the context of international disputes such as wars, it seems logical to align ourselves with the stronger contender. However, in light of other matters outside of war, there are pros and cons to aligning with smaller states and larger nations respectively. Alliances between small nation states (as with Singapore and its neighbouring ASEAN countries), that has fewer resources, can provide for mutual development at rates closely resembling each other. This similarity in growth provides for the creation of a stronger and more stable region, both politically and economically. Whereas, forming alliances with nations stronger and with more resources can affect the autonomy and sovereignty of ours.  While aligning ourselves with stronger and bigger players in the international plane provides many benefits like potential sources of resources, there are other factors that should be considered with whom we should form alliances with. For example, in a war between two major powers, forming an alliance with one power can strain our existing relationships that are invaluable to our security due to their relationship with the other power. In addition, smaller states, like Singapore, ought to be careful of their dependency on such alliances that they do not lose their sovereignty. For when they do, i.e. being incapable to stand on their own, their worth as a nation, let alone an ally, truly diminishes. |

**RESPONSE #2 (20 MARKS)**

|  |
| --- |
| **I am responding to Fauzi.**  Choosing protectionism over globalisation shuts doors to innumerable amounts of opportunities and resources, whereas choosing globalisation over protectionism risks a country being vulnerable to sudden changes in the supply chain that, if not prepared for sufficiently, can topple the country’s economic and political balance. For larger countries with a lot of land and natural resources, protectionism provides for rapid development. In contrast, smaller countries with fewer natural resources are much more likely to benefit from globalisation that allows for international trade, opening paths to other sources of necessities.  There are also other factors to consider when determining a preferred principle, like the preservation of culture and traditions that seem to erode due to the larger connectivity provided by globalisation. Foreign norms and cultures enter and leave much more frequently and easily with globalisation, thus risking local cultures to be overshadowed with more “relevant” ones. So it’s important to ask: is it important to a country to preserve its culture and traditions, or is it more important to ensure its economic growth?  So, while the question of whether protectionism is better than globalisation is multifaceted, a country should look for an answer that best meets its unique circumstances and needs. It’s not accurate to say that every country will benefit from protectionism the same way another country will. The same goes for globalisation. |

**RESPONSE #3 (20 MARKS)**

|  |
| --- |
| **I am responding to Gary.**  A negative perception of being incapable of making a difference before trying to make a difference is the largest contributor to why any progress towards a cleaner and greener world is not being made. Consider the scale of human population and the advancement of technology (albeit most of those advancements were made on the backbone of pollution). With our numbers and our modern technology, it is not a far-off dream to make a cleaner environment for ourselves and our successors. Even if we are unable to significantly change our situation due to the vast amounts of pollution and waste that has been released into our environment, we can start the change that will ultimately lead to a world with zero waste. A world with greener practices. Ultimately, pollution, and the effects thereof like climate change, are the consequences of the accumulation of human decisions over the past few centuries, and thus, can (and should) be undone with human decisions.  We can always start small. From using environmentally friendlier alternatives in our day-to-day lives, like paper bags and reusable bags to carry groceries, to participating in beach cleanup voluntary events. These, if carried out repeatedly, will eventually turn into long-lasting habits, that if done in every other community, that can solve, or at least improve, the situation brought about by climate change. |