ST ANDREW'S JUNIOR COLLEGE

JC2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION

GENERAL PAPER
8807/02

Paper 2 27 AUGUST 2015

1 hour 30 minutes

INSERT

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

This Insert contains the passages for Paper 2.

PASSAGE 1 ***Jennifer Jacquet argues that shaming can lead to positive social action***

1 Guilt-free shopping will not solve the world's problems. It is time for more shame.

2 Guilt may be an understandable response to environmental destruction, poor labour standards, animal cruelty or carbon emissions from budget holiday flights. "It's up to me to change," we have been encouraged to think. I can vividly remember the first time I felt this kind of guilt: I was nine years old and saw a haunting black-and-white photo of a dead dolphin that had been hoisted on to a tuna boat. Fishing for tuna was killing dolphins, which would get caught in the nets and drown. I ate tuna, so apparently I, too, was to blame.

3 I insisted that my family boycott tuna, and we were not alone. After a large-scale boycott, tuna certified as "dolphin-safe" or "dolphin-friendly" was introduced and we started buying tuna again. My guilt was assuaged and I did not think about it again for more than a decade. When I revisited it as a graduate researching overfishing, I realised the problem was more complicated. I could see that the tuna boycott had been powerful, but the dolphin-safe logo of 1990, which eased my conscience, arose during the anti-regulatory Reagan-Thatcher era, which underlined the importance of individual consumer choice, rather than government oversight over large scale producers. If demand changed, the argument went, supply would respond.

4 Those who felt concerned about the state of the planet, or guilty about sweatshops overseas or factory farming, were reminded that they are not innocent bystanders: they were part of the problem as a result of their own patterns of consumption. This was, of course, true. We were encouraged to engage with our guilt primarily as consumers; with ethical shopping, or taking fewer flights, we could feel better and be part of the solution through the power of our pockets. The rise of dolphin-safe, cage-free, organic, fair-trade, shade-grown, sustainable, cruelty-free, carbon-neutral products suggested that responsibility for a wide array of problems was in the hands of individuals, rather than being something that society, or the political system, needed to address.

5 But here is the thing: most consumers continue to buy the same old stuff. Only the portion of the industry that wants to cater to consumers with consciences has changed; the rest of the industry continues to use pesticides, or unfair trade, or destructive fishing gear – and can sell those products at lower prices to people who do not feel bad about buying them. This is how entire industries shirk reform, while niche products ease the consciences of the few.

6 Collective problems such as the use of pesticides and excessive levels of carbon emissions cannot be solved through individual choice. If I buy organic foods, but pesticides are in everybody else's food, those pesticides will still leach into our shared water supply. If I stop flying and everyone else continues, carbon emissions continue to increase. Although guilt is an appropriate response to social and environmental problems, the way we have addressed our guilt is not. As individuals, we of course have more power than just our purchasing power.

7 The guilt that might mobilise a minority to activism has been co-opted and used as a marketing tool to distract that *same* minority with easy acts of consumption. Over the past quarter-century, the movements to encourage better environmental protection, labour standards and animal welfare have all, to varying degrees, used guilt and guilt-alleviation products that engage people primarily as consumers rather than as citizens. Guilt tactics have eclipsed the older strategy, shame.

8 It is tempting to think about shame as something Western societies have outgrown. Shaming punishments expose a transgressor to public disapproval – dunce caps, whipping poles, or hot-iron branding come uncomfortably to mind. Most Western countries have abolished such punishments, especially shaming by the state. There are observable differences between guilt and shame that are worthy to note. Psychologists suggest that guilt is largely a Western phenomenon (many Eastern cultures do not even have a word for it). Compared to shame, it is also more recent (Shakespeare used the word "guilt" only 33 times, while he used "shame" 344 times). Guilt requires in the first place a conscience and makes you feel bad if you transgress your own standards. Because guilt requires a conscience, its use is limited to individuals, since groups, such as the tuna-fishing industry, lack a conscience and therefore

cannot feel guilty. Yet, I believe we need shame now more than ever in this self-promoting and self-indulgent world, and that it is possible to employ shame to serve us in new, larger ways.

9 Unlike guilt, which is primarily a private emotion, shame can be used to influence the way groups – even entire industries – behave. Shame can also be used by the weak against the strong. Environmental groups traced the responsibility for mountaintop removal in Appalachia to nine banks that financed the coal companies involved, and singled them out year after year (by 2014, the fifth year of the campaign, both Wells Fargo and JPMorgan Chase have pledged to end their financial relationship with mountain-top-removing coal companies). Shaming can also be used against entire countries. Human rights groups persuaded the US government to stop executing juvenile offenders by pointing out that only seven countries apart from America (Bangladesh, Iran, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen) had executed juveniles since 1990. In 2005, the US Supreme Court outlawed juvenile executions.

10 Shaming makes a difference, but it is more difficult to make a profit employing shame than it is with guilt. There are no financial returns from singling out bad products, bad banks or the worst air polluters. In contrast, products or industries marketed as "guilt-free" can be sold at higher prices. It is time to realise, however, that although guilt-free shopping might be a morally correct thing to do, it is not making enough of a difference. It does not lead to large-scale reform. We need more shaming.

PASSAGE 2 ***Julian Baggini believes that acts of shaming need to be used with caution.***

1 The act of shaming has in recent years surfaced in unexpected places, such as social media platforms. In California, one form of such shaming is #droughtshaming. People found using excessive amounts of water when the state is as dry as a bone find themselves facing trial by hashtag. The actor Tom Selleck is the latest target, accused by online citizens of taking truckloads of water from a fire hydrant for his thirsty avocado crop.

2 Most people seem happy to harness the power of shame when the victims are the rich and powerful. But our attitudes to shame are actually much more ambivalent and contradictory. That is why it was a stroke of genius to call Paul Abbott's BBC series *Shameless*. We are at a point in our social history where the word is perfectly poised between condemnation and celebration.

3 Shame, like guilt, is something we often feel we are better off without. The shame culture is strongly associated with oppression. So-called honour killings are inflicted on people who bring shame to their families, often for nothing more than loving the "wrong" person or, most horrifically, for being the victims of rape. In the case of gay people, shame has given way to pride. To be shameless is to be who you are, without apology.

4 And yet in other contexts we are rather conflicted about the cry of shame. You can protest against honour killings one day, then name and shame tax-evading multinationals the next. When politicians are called shameless, there is no doubt that this is a very bad thing. Shame is like rain: whether it is good or bad depends on where and how heavily it falls.

5 There should be no question that we need shame. Morality is in essence the means by which we control the way we treat each other to maintain as much peace, fairness and social harmony as possible. Both guilt and shame are central to this. Guilt works from the inside out, emerging in the privacy of your own conscience. You can feel guilty about something no one else ever finds out about. Shame works the other way around. Shame is all about how you are perceived in the eyes of others. This is why the innocent can be made to feel shame, and why the guilty who evade detection can evade shame.

6 Anthropologists distinguish between guilt and shame cultures, depending on which is more important. The broad, simplistic generalisation is that guilt is more prevalent in Western, Christian cultures, whereas shame is more potent in Asia insofar as societies in the latter are more collectivistic and what is 'right' is often enshrined in the community. The link between guilt and certain religions such as Christianity is not

accidental. Guilt has most power when you have a sense of a divine eye who sees what your peers might not – a soul that can be stained without any physical sign of defilement. In that sense, guilt is a kind of internalisation of shame.

7 As Christianity loses its power, we might then expect guilt also to loosen its grip. And if conscience provides a weaker motivation to behave morally, we might need to rely more on the overtly social mechanism of shame. If we want people to pick up litter, pay their employees a fair wage or worry about whether their noise bothers others, shaming them might be the only way.

8 If we are to use shame positively, however, we must be mindful of how easy it is to abuse it. Because shame is a social mechanism, it can all too easily become a tool of bullying, a psychological form of mob violence. This is what Jon Ronson warns against in his book *So You've Been Publicly Shamed,* in which he worries about the causal cruelty of social media turning against people often on the basis of flimsy or no evidence.

9 That is why shame is a dish best served cold. But if we are to use it, we ought to stop and think whether it is really merited. Hot-headed indignation too often leads to hasty judgment and the vile scene of the masses turning on the vulnerable. Shame is a strong moral medicine – and, as with any pharmaceutical, applying the wrong dose is worse than not using it at all.